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: Technical Accounting Knowledge
Students demonstrate technical accounting knowledge and skills in financial accounting, auditing, accounting information systems, taxation, and managerial accounting

G 2: Analytical Accounting Knowledge and Skills
Students demonstrate analytical accounting knowledge and skills in financial accounting, auditing, accounting information systems, taxation, and managerial accounting

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102) (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students display knowledge of Principles of Accounting

6 Quantitative Skills

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Faculty

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113) (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
Students display financial accounting knowledge

SLO 3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210) (G: 2) (M: 12, 13, 14)
Students display knowledge about Managerial Accounting

SLO 4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310) (G: 2) (M: 15, 16, 17, 18)
Students display knowledge about accounting information systems

SLO 5: Taxation (ACCT 4510) (G: 2) (M: 19, 20, 21)
Students display knowledge about Taxation

SLO 6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610) (G: 2) (M: 22, 23, 24, 25, 26)
Students display Audit and Assurance knowledge

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Translate business activities into accounting information (ACCT 2101 and 2102) (O: 1)
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: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)**

Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Average on exam questions ranged from 62% to 95%. As in previous years, some questions improved and others did not! However, we did see more improvements than declines. Of the seventeen assessment questions, five of them showed percentage increases greater than 3%. Six of the assessment questions showed percentage increases of 0 – 3%. Five questions showed declines of 0 – 3% and only one question showed a decline greater than 3%. Although not depicted in the tables since that data encompasses an entire academic year, the 2009/2010 academic year was a year of very different semesters. The fall 2009 students were a strong group that ended with a class grade point average of 2.2 while the spring 2010 group ended with a class grade point average of 1.9. The biggest factor we can identify for this dramatic decrease in grade point average from fall to spring is attendance. Most semesters including fall 2009 our average attendance is 75%. During the spring 2010 semester, the average was just below 70%. In addition, attendance at the supplemental instruction sessions in spring 2010 was down significantly and 55% of the F grades were the result of students not taking one or more exams. We did have some encouraging results. More students watched the five iTunesU videos! Last year (the first year for the videos) only 21% of the students watched them. This year that increased to 33%. Finally, we saw an increase in students coming to the teaching assistant office hours. We averaged 10 students per week last year and 15 students per week this year. These last two items were desired improvements mentioned in last year's assessment report.

**M 2: Solve operating problems using accounting information (ACCT 2101 and 2102) (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: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)**

Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Mean on exam questions ranged from 52% to 86%. As in previous years, some questions improved and others did not! However, we did see more improvements than declines. Of the seventeen assessment questions, five of them showed percentage increases greater than 3%. Six of the assessment questions showed percentage increases of 0 – 3%. Five questions showed declines of 0 – 3% and only one question showed a decline greater than 3%. Although not depicted in the above tables since that data encompasses an entire academic year, the 2009/2010 academic year was a year of very different semesters. The fall 2009 students were a strong group that ended with a class grade point average of 2.2 while the spring 2010 group ended with a class grade point average of 1.9. The biggest factor we can identify for this dramatic decrease in grade point average from fall to spring is attendance. Most semesters including fall 2009 our average attendance is 75%. During the spring 2010 semester, the average was just below 70%. In addition, attendance at the supplemental instruction sessions in spring 2010 was down significantly and 55% of the F grades were the result of students not taking one or more exams. We did have some encouraging results. More students watched the five iTunesU videos! Last year (the first year for the videos) only 21% of the students watched them. This year that increased to 33%. Finally, we saw an increase in students coming to the teaching assistant office hours. We averaged 10 students per week last year and 15 students per week this year. These last two items were desired improvements mentioned in last year's assessment report.

**M 3: Comprehend the usefulness of accounting information (ACCT 2101 and 2102) (O: 1)**

Comprehend the usefulness of accounting information to stakeholders making business decisions

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)**

Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Mean ranged from 59% to 79% As in previous years, some questions improved and others did not! However, we did see more improvements than declines. Of the seventeen assessment questions, five of them showed percentage increases greater than 3%. Six of the assessment questions showed percentage increases of 0 – 3%. Five questions showed declines of 0 – 3% and only one question showed a decline greater than 3%. Although not depicted in the above tables since that data encompasses an entire academic year, the 2009/2010 academic year was a year of very different semesters. The fall 2009 students were a strong group that ended with a class grade point average of 2.2 while the spring 2010 group ended with a class grade point average of 1.9. The biggest factor we can identify for this dramatic decrease in grade point average from fall to spring is attendance. Most semesters including fall 2009 our average attendance is 75%. During the spring 2010 semester, the average was just below 70%. In addition, attendance at the supplemental instruction sessions in spring 2010 was down significantly and 55% of the F grades were the result of students not taking one or more exams. We did have some encouraging results. More students watched the five iTunesU videos! Last year (the first year for the videos) only 21% of the students watched them. This year that increased to 33%. Finally, we saw an increase in students coming to the teaching assistant office hours. We averaged 10 students per week last year and 15 students per week this year. These last two items were desired improvements mentioned in last year's assessment report.

**M 4: Identify, analyze and record journal entries (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)**

Identify, analyze and record journal entries for business transactions, including adjusting and closing entries

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**

Mean of 60% or more on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Mean scores ranged from 85% to 99%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Prepare financial statements (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the financial statements of a business with no complex transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 60% or more on Exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores ranged from 29% to 77%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Recognize Revenue (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize revenue for a variety of business models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 60% or more on exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores ranged from 51% to 86%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Time Value of Money (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply time value of money concepts to financial accounting measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 60% or more on exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 65.6%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Record Assets (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record the assets of a business using professional accounting standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 70% or more on exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean was 76%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Record Liabilities (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record the liabilities of a business using professional accounting standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 70% or more on exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean was 77%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Apply theory, standards and judgment (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply financial accounting theory, professional standards and judgment to record business transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 70% or higher on a case assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean was 92%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Analyze firm performance (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze firm performance using financial accounting information, footnotes and industry data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 70% or higher on a case assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 12: Develop performance measures (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)
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 O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)
Mean was 92%

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Mean was 75%, decreased from 80% last year. Performance does not demonstrate significant improvement. One cause may be the increased enrollment. The number of graded students increased 18.7% from the '08-'09 school year (513 students) to the '09-'10 school year (609 students) and we experienced a slight decline in overall grade average. Another may be that students find this course difficult because it requires application of concepts discussed in prerequisite classes. We will continue to keep this requirement our highest priority, while attempting to improve the knowledge students demonstrate regarding these three objectives.

M 13: Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)
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 O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)
Mean of 65% or more on exam questions

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Mean was 75%, decreased from 80% last year. Performance does not demonstrate significant improvement. One cause may be the increased enrollment. The number of graded students increased 18.7% from the '08-'09 school year (513 students) to the '09-'10 school year (609 students) and we experienced a slight decline in overall grade average. Another may be that students find this course difficult because it requires application of concepts discussed in prerequisite classes. We will continue to keep this requirement our highest priority, while attempting to improve the knowledge students demonstrate regarding these three objectives.

M 14: Structure and model business problems (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)
Structure and model business problems to evaluate alternatives, conduct sensitivity analysis on assumptions, and analyze outcomes to determine causes and variances.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Target for O3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)
Mean score of 65% or higher on exam questions

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Mean was 64%, increased from 63% last year. Performance does not demonstrate significant improvement. One cause may be the increased enrollment. The number of graded students increased 18.7% from the '08-'09 school year (513 students) to the '09-'10 school year (609 students) and we experienced a slight decline in overall grade average. Another may be that students find this course difficult because it requires application of concepts discussed in prerequisite classes. We will continue to keep this requirement our highest priority, while attempting to improve the knowledge students demonstrate regarding these three objectives.

M 15: Query Databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)
That students query databases to provide insights about business operations and performance
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)
Existing norm for set 1 (Warranty Call Center case): 65.3. Better than prior year’s performance for set 2: 62.2 (BloomScape case).

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
For set 1, academic year 2010 least-squares means adjusted for student GPAs (75.2) were not significantly different than the mean for the prior year (75.6), 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), 2010 least-squares means adjusted for student GPAs (60.8) were statistically similar to the average for the prior year (62.2), which is the target level.

M 16: Design Business Processes (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)
That students design business processes and represent them with documentation tools
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)
Performance on 24-Seven part 1 case questions: 72.2

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Academic year 2010 least-squares means adjusted for GPA (74.1) were not significantly different from the prior year mean (73.7), both of which are slightly above the target level (72.2).

### M 17: Design and Implement Databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)
That students design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)**
Better than 2006-07 performance on BloomScape case questions (62.2)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met
For the integrative exam including the learning outcome of designing and implementing databases, academic year 2010 least-squares means adjusted for student GPA (62.0) were not statistically different from prior year means (61.4). The means are not statistically different from the target (62.2).

### M 18: Evaluate Internal Control (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)
That students evaluate internal control in information systems and design controls to mitigate risks associated with information systems

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)**
2006-07 norm for the 24-Seven Part 2 case: 62.3

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Partially Met
Although not statistically different (p = 0.05) from the 2006-07 norm (62.3), academic year 2010 least-squares means adjusted for GPA (59.3) were 3.0 percentage points lower than the norm, which is 0.4 points better than in academic year 2009.

### M 19: Identify Tax issues (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)
Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)**
Mean of 75% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Not Met
Mean score was 73%

### M 20: Select and Apply Tax Laws (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)
Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)**
Mean of 75% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met
Mean score was 75%

### M 21: Make Investment Decisions using Tax Law (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)
Make investment decisions requiring knowledge of the tax law and its effect

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)**
Mean of 75% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met
Mean score was 75%

### M 22: Differentiate among the various types of auditing (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Differentiate among the various types of auditing and the procedures applied on the financial statements audits and audits of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
Mean of 70% or above

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Not Met
Mean score was 60%.
### M 23: Evaluate the components of audit risk (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
Mean score of 70% or higher

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 87%

### M 24: Apply the opinion formulation process (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
Mean of 70% or more on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Mean score was 48%

### M 25: Understand evaluate the auditor’s responsibility (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Understand and evaluate the auditor’s responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 92%

### M 26: Evaluate, integrate and apply different types of audit information (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)
Evaluate, integrate, and apply different types of audit information and knowledge to form independent judgments. Present, discuss, and defend their views through written and spoken language. Conclusions and critical points of view must be complete and demonstrate an understanding of the audit problem.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)**
Mean score of 75% or higher on team project

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 95%

---

### 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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** A. Faye Borthick

#### 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 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 first week of class during the lecture or Friday breakout session so that students see the value of the digital tutors right from 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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Cathy Patridge

**ACCT2101 and ACCT2102**
See Action Plan for Measure 1
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Finished
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Cathy Patridge

**ACCT2102 and ACCT2102**
See Action Plan for Measure 1.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Finished
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Cathy Patridge

**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 master these concepts.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
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
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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Fenn

**ACCT4510**
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
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 don't know how to prepare or understand those parts of the financial statements. Since ACCT4110 omitted many important topics, students were ill-prepared for ACCT4410 on these topics and performed poorly on them. The above two issues indicate an urgent need to revise the curriculum to include more financial accounting. Given that there is a course similar to ACCT4410 at the graduate level (ACCT8700) we 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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
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 don't know how to prepare or understand those parts of the financial statements. Since ACCT4110 omitted many important topics, students were ill-prepared for ACCT4410 on these topics and performed poorly on them. The above two issues indicate an urgent need to revise the curriculum to include more financial accounting. Given that there is a course similar to ACCT4410 at the graduate level (ACCT8700) we 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
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
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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Attendance and TA Hours

For academic year 2010/2011, we will have two primary focal points: (1) improve attendance and (2) continue increasing the number of students who attend teaching assistant office hours. To improve attendance we will adjust the posted lecture material to leave out more information to be completed during class. We will also reduce the number of drops for the non-exam grading components. We have been very generous with the drops due to the large classes and the administrative challenge of keeping track of doctor's notes, emergencies, etc. We think we have been too generous! To continue to increase the number of students attending teaching assistant office hours, we will adjust the office hours to include more late afternoon/evening hours. We have found that our attendance during those hours is much better than during early afternoon office hours.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Solve operating problems using accounting information (ACCT 2101 and 2102) | Outcome/Objective: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010

Attendance and TA Hours

For academic year 2010/2011, we will have two primary focal points: (1) improve attendance and (2) continue increasing the number of students who attend teaching assistant office hours. To improve attendance we will adjust the posted lecture material to leave out more information to be completed during class. We will also reduce the number of drops for the non-exam grading components. We have been very generous with the drops due to the large classes and the administrative challenge of keeping track of doctor's notes, emergencies, etc. We think we have been too generous! To continue to increase the number of students attending teaching assistant office hours, we will adjust the office hours to include more late afternoon/evening hours. We have found that our attendance during those hours is much better than during early afternoon office hours.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comprehend the usefulness of accounting information (ACCT 2101 and 2102) | Outcome/Objective: Principles of Accounting (ACCT 2101 and 2102)
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark

Attendance and TA Hours

For academic year 2010/2011, we will have two primary focal points: (1) improve attendance and (2) continue increasing the number of students who attend teaching assistant office hours. To improve attendance we will adjust the posted lecture material to leave out more information to be completed during class. We will also reduce the number of drops for the non-exam grading components. We have been very generous with the drops due to the large classes and the administrative challenge of keeping track of doctor's notes, emergencies, etc. We think we have been too generous! To continue to increase the number of students attending teaching assistant office hours, we will adjust the office hours to include more late afternoon/evening hours. We have found that our attendance during those hours is much better than during early afternoon office hours.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Check prerequisite knowledge
Check if students have knowledge of the required prerequisites.

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems (ACCT 4210) | Outcome/Objective: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Ron Guymon

Do homework problems in class
We will complete the solutions to the homework problems that practice this objective during the lecture on Audit Reports and Opinions.

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Recognize Revenue (ACCT 4111) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Jennifer Joe

Emphasis on selected topics
Revenue theory, analysis of discontinued operations, cash flow statement, cash versus accrual basis, revenue recognized using installment method, and using PV/FV will be emphasized during 2010 since those were the lowest percent correct on the cumulative final exam. Instruction will include providing more homework in these areas and spending more class time on these topics. A "Digital Tutor" (short instructional video) will be added on Installment Method Accounting to improve the learning outcomes for this harder topic. Further, students will be given more guidance on how to get started on Jag & Elk to help them get a quick start on the project.

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Prepare financial statements (ACCT 4111) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Taewoo Park

Incorporate in-class activities
We will incorporate in-class activities to the lecture to model problem solving on this objective for the students.

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Differentiate among the various types of auditing (ACCT 4610) | Outcome/Objective: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: Jennifer Joe

Move topic to weeks 9-11
In academic year 2011, the study of internal control will be moved from the last three weeks of the term to weeks 9-11, and the internal control case used for performance assessment will be condensed to make it tractable for a term that is one week shorter beginning fall 2010.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Refine Chris Notes and reallocate class time
For learning objectives with exam scores below 70%, 1. the lecture notes, i.e., “ChrisNotes,” pertaining to them will continue to be refined and 2. in-class time will continue to be spent: a) explaining the related learning objectives and b) applying tax law to real-life factual situations pertaining to those learning objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Verify prerequisite knowledge
Check if students have knowledge of the required prerequisites.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

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
4 Critical Thinking
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**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 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
- 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**
- 2 Oral Communication
- 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
- 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.

**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

**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 take the Critical Analysis seminar to gain skill in critically evaluating working papers. All students beyond the first year will provide comments to presenters during research workshops.

**M 3: Research with faculty (O: 3)**

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

**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

**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

**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

**M 7: Teaching - training (O: 7)**

Successful completion of 9200, Seminar in University Teaching.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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

**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

**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: Finished
- 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: Planned
- 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: Finished
- Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive exams
Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive exams

Implementation Description: Comprehensive exam date for students admitted after formal feedback program was initiated.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: SOA PhD Program Committee

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Actuarial Science BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

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
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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to all quiz results in 2009. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0:
- No. 1 – Understand Life Tables and Survival Curve
- No. 3 – Standard products offered by life insurance companies
The following criteria failed to meet the standard, with an average score of 1.5:
- No. 2 - Concepts and mathematical formulae in valuing life insurance contracts

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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to all quiz results in 2009. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0:
- No. 1 – Understand Life Tables and Survival Curve
- No. 3 – Standard products offered by life insurance companies
The following criteria failed to meet the standard, with an average score of 1.5:
- No. 2 - Concepts and mathematical formulae in valuing life insurance contracts

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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to all quiz results in 2009. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0:
- No. 1 – Understand Life Tables and Survival Curve
- No. 3 – Standard products offered by life insurance companies
The following criteria failed to meet the standard, with an average score of 1.5:
- No. 2 - Concepts and mathematical formulae in valuing life insurance contracts

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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The MEASURE TWO RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0:
- No. 1 – Apply basic Probability and Statistics in a business risk analysis application
- No. 2 – Be able to perform simple simulations of standard probability distributions
- No. 3 – Be able to perform some probabilistic analysis given some historical data

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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The MEASURE TWO RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 – Apply basic Probability and Statistics in a business risk analysis application No. 2 – Be able to perform simple simulations of standard probability distributions No. 3 – Be able to perform some probabilistic analysis given some historical data

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The MEASURE TWO RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 – Apply basic Probability and Statistics in a business risk analysis application No. 2 – Be able to perform simple simulations of standard probability distributions No. 3 – Be able to perform some probabilistic analysis given some historical data

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

MEASURE THREE RUBRIC was applied to all student exams in Fall 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 – Understand the time value of money (compounding interest theory) No. 2 – Valuation of mortgage (schedules of interest payments and remaining principal) No. 3 – Valuation of Bond and the concept of yield curve

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

After reviewing exam pass lists posted by the Society of Actuaries and the Casualty Actuarial Society and comparing them to our 2009-2010 graduation roster, we found that only 26% of our BBA-AS graduates had passed 1 exam (FM) and that a very low 9% had passed two or more exams (FM, P). One student passed 3 exams (FM, P, and MLC).

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

**Course revision to improve instruction across relevant items**

The course will be revised to improve instruction on random variable distributions, recursion formulas and interest conversion formulas.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected and Identified Quiz Questions in AS 4340</td>
<td>Comprehension of theoretical &amp; technical materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of life contingencies</td>
<td>Structure and solve problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Eric Ulm

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Actuarial Science MAS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

MAS PROGRAM MISSION: The MS in Actuarial Science is designed to prepare students to: (1) Undertake actuarial valuation of
liabilities and financial risk modeling of assets for insurance companies, financial institutions and consulting firms; (2) Develop integrated thinking and communication skills; and (3) Pass the early professional actuarial exams offered by the Society of Actuaries and the 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: Actuarial valuation and risk modeling**  
Upon completion of the MAS program, students will be prepared to undertake actuarial valuation of liabilities and financial risk modeling of assets for insurance companies, financial institutions and consulting firms.

**G 2: Integrated thinking and communication skills**  
Upon completion of the MAS program, students will be prepared to develop integrated thinking and communication skills.

**G 3: Pass the first two SOA/CAS professional exams**  
Upon completion of the MAS program, students will be prepared to pass the early professional actuarial exams offered by the Society of Actuaries and the Casualty Actuarial Society.

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to course projects in 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 - Concepts and tools in calculating market risks (stocks, real estate) No. 2 - Concepts and tools in calculating credit risks (yield spreads, Credit Default Swaps, rating transition matrix) No. 3 - Basic shapes of the yield curve and interest rate risk measures (duration and convexity) No. 4 - Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies

### 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); and (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 all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 - Concepts and tools in calculating market risks (stocks, real estate) No. 2 - Concepts and tools in calculating credit risks (yield spreads, Credit Default Swaps, rating transition matrix) No. 3 - Basic shapes of the yield curve and interest rate risk measures (duration and convexity) No. 4 - Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The MEASURE TWO RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 - Concepts and tools in calculating market risks (stocks, real estate) No. 2 - Concepts and tools in calculating credit risks (yield spreads, Credit Default Swaps, rating transition matrix) No. 3 - Basic shapes of the yield curve and interest rate risk measures (duration and convexity) No. 4 - Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
The MEASURE THREE RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 - Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies No. 2 - The regulatory environment, the role of rating agencies and investors No. 3 - Different accounting (financial reporting) requirements (statutory, GAAP and fair value)

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
The MEASURE THREE RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 - Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies No. 2 - The regulatory environment, the role of rating agencies and investors No. 3 - Different accounting (financial reporting) requirements (statutory, GAAP and fair value)

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
The MEASURE THREE RUBRIC was applied to all student projects in Fall 2009. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0: No. 1 - Standard products offered by life insurance companies and property-casualty companies No. 2 - The regulatory environment, the role of rating agencies and investors No. 3 - Different accounting (financial reporting) requirements (statutory, GAAP and fair value)

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

**Develop new coursework on in-depth analysis of accounting practices, conventions, and their implications**
Develop a student team project to discuss, in which the various teams will have to perform an in-depth analysis of various accounting practices, conventions, and their implications.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Performance on project (AS 8810 Graduate Seminar) | Outcome/Objective: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
  - Concept of Risk Evaluation
  - Explanation of technical concepts
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang

**Improve instruction using integrated insurance company data**
Improve instruction using integrated insurance company data with an asset portfolio and liability portfolio.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case examples using real company balance sheets | Outcome/Objective: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation
  - Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Shaun Wang

**Improve instruction with more effective written materials**
Improve instruction using more effective written materials on standard insurance policies.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case studies from current events (AS 8810)
- Outcome/Objective: Concepts of Investment Risk Evaluation
  | Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

**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?

Since last year’s assessment report, MAS faculty have increased the breadth and depth of the topics covered in the Actuarial Graduate Seminar to ensure that all major areas listed in our Assessment Plan are covered and that student performance on assignments, quizzes, and course projects is monitored and analyzed.

**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 the coming year, more case studies will be added to coursework across the curriculum, especially using real insurance company financial reporting data in applying various concepts and risk metrics. The goal is to emphasize learning through doing in an Excel-based data modeling environment.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 African American Studies Assessment of Core**

(As of: 12/13/2010 03:57 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Department of African American Studies (DAAS) at Georgia State University is the advancement of knowledge of people of African descent and their empowerment within the local, national, and international arena. As an interdisciplinary field of concentration, the department offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of African people nationally and globally. The department’s guiding philosophy is African-centered in that we believe that an understanding of the specific cultural and historical experiences of a people must guide and inform any productive analysis and interpretation of that people’s past and present, and must guide any viable directives that are offered for their future.

**Goals**

**G 1: To develop Critical Thinking**
At the bachelors-level, African American Studies contributes to the university’s broader mission of encouraging critical thinking by understanding and communicating how the experience and trajectory of African-descended people is influenced by historical, cultural, geographical, and political factors. In so doing, we prepare our students to identify forms and mechanisms of oppression and apply strategies of advocacy and social change that advance social and economic justice.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Communication (G: 1) (M: 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**
Students will be able to make connections between the African American experience and larger events in the community and world.

### 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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Service Learning Papers (O: 1, 2)
Students engaged in community service activity and wrote reflection papers based on their experience. The reflection paper assesses student learning based on their ability to analyze and communicate core course concepts. The analytic rubric is a five-item scale where a rating of 5 indicates that the paper reflects a careful reading and understanding of the material. Additionally, the paper focuses on a careful critique of the material, as opposed to a restatement of what the author has stated. 4 = Same as 5 above, but paper lacks a careful critique of the material; 3 = Same as 4 above, but paper over generalizes and / or does not use material from the reading to support conclusions.; 2 = Paper simply restates what the author has said, but ignores careful critique of the material; and 1 = Paper relies primarily on rhetoric (personal expression) and generalized arguments.

The communication rubric is also a five-item scale where a score of 5 reflects a paper that is clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Paper is typed, no greater than 12 point font, double-spaced, no more than one-inch margins, and minimum three full pages of text. Reference cited page is included if sources other than those assigned are used; 4) Same as 5 above with some minor (2 – 4) punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; 3) Same as 4 above with no more than 6 punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; 2) Paper has some lack of clarity as well as several punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; and 1) Paper is confusing or unclear in structure and includes several punctuation, grammar and syntax mistakes. Reference cited page is not included when sources other than those assigned were used.

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

**Target for O1: Analytic**
Target: 80% of the students will receive a rating of 3 or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Outcome: Twelve student papers were randomly selected by the instructor and submitted for review. Based on the independent evaluations of the three member AAS WEAVE assessment committee 91% of the students received scores of 3 or higher.

**Target for O2: Communication**
Target: 80% of the students will receive a score of 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Outcome: 79% of the students received 3 or higher on communication skills.

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

#### 2010 Action Plan
No action planned required as benchmarks were exceeded or nearly met.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**No action**
No action will be taken since the target was nearly met and the findings could be a sampling error.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Service Learning Papers
- **Outcome/Objective:** Communication

**Implementation Description:** N/A
**Responsible Person/Group:** N/A
### 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**
1.11 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)

The final papers in two courses are used to assess these outcomes: AAS 3975 and 4980. Each course assignment requires students to integrate, synthesize, and interpret concepts relevant to theory and research. The assessment for each of the three areas is as follows: Analytical Skill: 5) Paper reflects skillful collection of data required for research. The paper reflects a careful reading and understanding of social science and humanities research. Paper includes a strong critique of ideas and theories and their application to social, cultural, political and economic lives of African American people. Paper reflects an understanding and application of interdisciplinary scholarship; 4) As 5 above but paper lacks a critique of ideas and theories and application to social, cultural, political, and economic lives of African American people; 3) As 4 above but paper overgeneralizes and / or fails to organize data to support conclusions; 2) Paper reflects collection of data, but ignores critique and application of interdisciplinary scholarship; and 1) Paper relies primarily on rhetoric and generalized arguments. Communications Skills. 5. Paper is clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Paper is free of and uses appropriate (APA) writing style required for course. Citations are appropriately included to leave no room for charges of plagiarism. References are included appropriately according to required style; 4) As 5 above with some minor (2 – 4) punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes) 3) As 4 above with no more than 6 punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes; 2) Paper has some lack of clarity as well as several punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes and does not properly make citations or references; 1) Paper is confusing or unclear in structure and includes several punctuation, grammar and syntax mistakes. Paper does not use appropriate writing style and / or does not include citations or references. Acquisition of Knowledge. 5. Paper articulates key concepts and theoretical stance that informs the research. Paper includes a clearly stated hypothesis. Paper reflects use of multiple levels of data acquisition (primary, secondary, etc.). Paper demonstrates an understanding of relationship between the lived experiences of African Americans and the Global African community. Paper applies an application of data to understanding the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent; 4) As 5 above, but the paper does not include a clearly stated hypothesis; 3). As 4 above but the paper does not reflect us of multiple levels of data acquisition; 2) Paper is overly focused on personal opinion and generalizations. No data is included to support thesis and / or no application is made to the lived experiences of people of African descent; 1) Paper has no clear hypothesis and no clear articulation of conceptual / theoretical stance informing research. Data is not applied appropriately to the lived experience of people of African descent.

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

### Target for O1: Demonstrate logical reasoning

80% of the students will be receive a rating of 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

AAS 3975: Six student papers were randomly selected and submitted to the AAS WEAVE Assessment Committee. 100% of the students received scores of 3 or higher on logical reasoning. AAS 4980: Five student papers were randomly selected and submitted to the AAS WEAVE Assessment Committee. 100% of the students received scores of 3 or higher on logical reasoning.

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

80% of the students will receive a score of 3 or higher on communication.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

AAS 3975: 100% of the six students received scores of 3 or higher on communication. AAS 4980: 80% of the five students received scores of 3 or higher on communication.

### Target for O3: Demonstrate knowledge of field

80% of the students will receive a score of 3 or higher on acquisition of knowledge.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

AAS 3975: Only 58% of the six students received scores of 3 or higher on acquisition of knowledge. AAS 4980: 80% of the five students received scores of 3 or higher on acquisition of knowledge

### 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
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

Action
The assignment will incorporate a purpose or relevance statement which is designed to help students apply the findings of their research to a larger body of work in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Written Assignment
  Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge of field

Implementation Description: The statement will be incorporated in the course syllabus
Responsible Person/Group: The instructor assigned to the course.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 African American Studies MA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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
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 first year graduate 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. A panel of three external reviewers will observe and rate student's oral presentation of their research proposal on a rubric of 0-100.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Analytic

AAS 6010: 25% of the students will score at the 25th and 100th percentiles with the remaining 50% between the two.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

AAS 6010: A total of eight students scored between 56 and 83 with an average score of 73.5. Two students (25%) scored 80 and higher with the remaining six students scoring between the 50th and 75th percentiles.

Target for O2: Communication

AAS 6010: 100% of the students will score above the 80th percentile on the communication portion of the research proposal.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Outcome: 100% of the students scored above the 80th percentile on the communications portion of the proposal.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2009-2010 Anthropology Assessment of Core

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

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

Mission / Purpose

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

Goals

G 2: Application of anthropological perspectives on contemporary social phenomena

Students should understand the applicability and application of the holistic, biocultural anthropological approach to complex phenomena and contemporary issues among human societies, with particular attention to human diversity.

G 1: Biocultural evolution of humans

Students are expected to understand the linkages between human biology and culture in an evolutionary framework. This is a core element of the anthropological perspective on humanity and a main orientation of the Department of Anthropology at GSU
### Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Biocultural evolution of humans (G: 1) (M: 1)

Students are expected to demonstrate an understanding of the biocultural evolution of the human species, with topics and examples including but not limited to: bipedalism and its consequences on diet, tool use etc. as related to the human evolutionary trajectory, consequences of stone tool technology, food sharing, subsistence strategies and long term social group formation.

#### 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

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

Students should understand the multifaceted anthropological critique of the concept of race as applied to human variation. Human variation and race are major factors in a multitude of contemporary social problems. Through the application of the scientific method and both the natural and social history of humans and human variation students should become competent in critiquing the race concept from a biological and sociocultural perspective. This outcome is aligned with a number of institutional priorities including learning about the global and cultural reality of human variation, and positioning the self with respect to human cultural and biological diversity.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

#### Institutional Priority Associations

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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Biocultural evolution of humans (O: 1)

The faculty of the Department of Anthropology has been working to collaboratively move toward a standardized assessment of its learning outcomes/objectives. The faculty has been sharing resources ad has begun to build a shared database of examination questions that target these outcomes. Students in all sections are required to respond to several of these questions (3-5) at in-class examinations. Examples of these questions can be found in the attached document. Additionally, faculty members utilize a variety of other instructional and assessment tools (Examples of instructional tools: documentaries, online resources, guest lectures. Examples of assessment tools: written assignments, exercises graded with a rubric). These however are not standardized.

**Source of Evidence:** Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Biocultural evolution of humans**

Pooling data from 1102 sections across the department, 80% of the students (above average) are expected to correctly identify the relationship between culture and biology in examination questions designed to address human biocultural evolution.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met

As a numerical indicator of performance, two randomly chosen examination questions (see attached document for examples) on the biocultural evolution of humans were sampled from 4 sections of the course with a total of 285 students. 87% of students (247 of 285) responded correctly to these questions. We find this outcome to be satisfactory, indicating that students grasp the relationship between biology and culture in human evolution.

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

The faculty of the Department of Anthropology has been working to collaboratively move toward a standardized assessment of its learning outcomes/objectives. The faculty has been sharing resources ad has begun to build a shared database of examination questions that target these outcomes. Students in all sections are required to respond to several of these questions (3-5) at in-class examinations. Examples of these questions can be found in the attached document. Additionally, faculty members utilize a variety of other instructional and assessment tools (Examples of instructional tools: documentaries, online resources, guest lectures. Examples of assessment tools: written assignments, reflection and extra credit papers, exercises graded with a rubric). These however are not standardized.
**Target for O2: Critique of the race concept**

Pooling data from multiple 1102 sections, 80% of the students are expected to correctly answer examination questions designed to address critical anthropological understandings surrounding the race concept.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

Two randomly selected examination questions on the anthropological critique of the race concept were selected from 4 sections of ANTH 1102, with a total of 285 students. 70% (N=197) responded correctly. While this number is substantial, it does not meet the set target. Further action is required.

### 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:** Biocultural evolution of humans | **Outcome/Objective:** Biocultural evolution of humans
- **Measure:** Critique of the race concept | **Outcome/Objective:** Critique of the race concept

**Implementation Description:** The departmental learning outcomes committee will recommend for the faculty teaching ANTH 1102 to monitor and encourage students who do not complete assignments.

- **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:** Critique of the race concept | **Outcome/Objective:** Critique of the race concept

- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010

#### Integrating Instructional and Testing Tools

- The faculty will continue to develop an integrated approach to the teaching of the anthropological critique to race. This will include:
  1. Further collaborating on instructional techniques and tools and assessments
  2. Monitoring student performance

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

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

#### 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 program has further integrated its assessment strategy by moving to create a shared testing pool for questions and issues related to the topics the department has identified as objectives. The reason for this change was to streamline outcomes and allow
assessment across the core. The change has allowed sampling student learning across multiple sections of the core course. In the
coming academic year the process of building the testing pool will continue, and the department will consider extending the process
to further key issues.

**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 the assessment data will be to allow faculty to communicate about strategies that produce desired results as well as share possible ways to strengthen instruction in areas that showed partially met results. In this cycle, the area in question has to do with the anthropological critique of the race concept. This is a complex topic which articulates evolutionary/biological, archaeological, cultural and linguistic dimensions. Faculty can use these findings to identify and draw on the expertise of colleagues for successful strategies.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Anthropology BA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology focuses the comparative and holistic study of humanity across space and time. Undergraduate education in the Department of Anthropology is committed to: 1. A holistic and comparative understanding of human diversity derived from the anthropological 4-field approach. Students are exposed to biological, linguistic, cultural and archaeological anthropology, their intersections, and their application. 2. A solid grounding in anthropological theory and methodology, including both quantitative and qualitative components. 3. The combination of academic rigor with global social awareness, and community engagement and praxis. The Department fosters politically responsible and ethically sound applications of empirical knowledge that will serve undergraduate in professional fields, spanning medicine, education, environment, forensics, cultural resource management, business and economics.

**Goals**

**G 1: Holistic and Comparative Perspectives**

Upon graduation, students will be grounded in four-field, holistic and comparative anthropology. They will demonstrate an understanding of the interconnections between biology and culture among humans in the past and present and distinguish the social and historical processes involved in the intersections of biology, society and culture in human diversity.

**G 2: Content Knowledge**

Upon graduation students will demonstrate command of established concepts, knowledge and history relevant to the field

**G 3: Engagement with and application of methods and theory**

Students will identify and apply critical anthropological theory as well as key research methods pertinent to the field.

**G 4: Communication skills**

Students will demonstrate literacy in understanding and communicating anthropological knowledge in speech and writing.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Holistic and comparative curriculum (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will successfully complete (score C or better) the specialized survey courses representing all anthropological subfields available in the department in order to advance in the major. By graduation, students will demonstrate synthetic and cumulative understanding and analysis through the mandatory senor seminar course.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Content knowledge (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2)**

By graduation, students must identify, apply and critique fundamental anthropological concepts, theory and knowledge in cultural, biological, and archaeological anthropology.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Literacy in oral and written communication (G: 3, 4) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will interpret and produce appropriate anthropological communication in speech and writing.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Integrated Curriculum (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students must successfully complete (score C or better) courses in all anthropological subfields represented in the department in order to advance in the major. To complete the major, they must integrate this knowledge through writing projects in the Senior Seminar course. The holistic and comparative anthropological perspective is highlighted in the specialized subfield introductions mandated for all students. The relevant coursework includes ANTH 2010 - Biological Anthropology, ANTH 2020 - Cultural Anthropology and ANTH 2030 - Archaeology and World Prehistory. The courses are designed to expose students to historical and contemporary perspectives, emphasizing human cultural and biological diversity, cross-cultural comparison and issues surrounding the production of knowledge. Written assignments, examination questions and exercises are used to assess student success. The holistic and comparative curriculum culminates in ANTH 4970 - Senior Seminar, currently taught as a CTW course, in which students have to demonstrate mastery through a series of written assignments that require them to synthesize various aspects of their training.

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

**Target for O1: Holistic and comparative curriculum**

Upon graduation, all students will have successfully completed the standard requirements for ANTH 2010, ANTH 2020, and ANTH 2030.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

As a curricular requirement for advancing in the major, this target ensures full compliance.

**M 2: CTW Senior Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Normal 0 ANTH 4970 - Senior Seminar represents the culmination of student education in the department of anthropology. Through a series of projects, students synthesize knowledge and demonstrate their topical, theoretical and methodological training in the discipline through original work and presentations. For the first time in the 2009-2010 academic year, the Senior Seminar was taught as a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course. Students were given several writing assignments that challenged them to reflect on their experiences as anthropology majors and to illustrate what they have learned. These included segments designed to assess their command of method and theory. They were asked to choose a peer-reviewed article from an anthropological journal in which the author(s) presented original research. They were required to write an essay describing what methods and theories were employed by the author(s). They were then asked to assess how effective the author(s) were in presenting their research and in making conclusions. In another exercise, students designed a short, hypothetical grant proposal in which they were required to include a brief literature review, a description of the methods they would employ in the field, and a discussion of theories that would inform their work.

Evaluation was based on the following CTW rubric developed by the department.

**Approach**

1. Fully satisfactory identification and summary of a relevant issue, topic, or problem
2. Satisfactory (but needs improvement) identification and summary of a relevant issue, topic, or problem
3. Unsatisfactory identification and summary of a relevant issue, topic, or problem

**Writing**

1. Fully satisfactory presentation of argument in English prose; clarity, organization, and/or grammar require improvement
2. Satisfactory presentation of argument in clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct English prose
3. Unsatisfactory review and contextualization of available theories and methods

**Conclusions**

1. Fully satisfactory development of original and critical approach
2. Satisfactory (but needs improvement) development of original and critical approach
3. Unsatisfactory choice and analysis of relevant examples or data

**Examples**

1. Fully satisfactory development of original and critical approach
2. Satisfactory (but needs improvement) conclusions and analysis of implications and consequences
3. Unsatisfactory conclusions and analysis of implications and consequences
satisfactory conclusions and analysis of implications and consequences

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

### Target for O1: Holistic and comparative curriculum

Students choose and analyze work from any subfield of their choice

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All graduating students showed competence in interpreting and analyzing work from the diverse subfields, through peer-reviewed anthropological articles.

### Target for O2: Content knowledge

Students were expected to score between 1 and 2 in all assignments. Normal 0

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

For each course assignment, the students scored between 1 and 2. The lowest scores were on the first assignment, in which students had to describe how methods and theory were employed in a peer-reviewed anthropological article. Scores for that assignment averaged at 1.21 in first section and 1.34 in the second section.

### Target for O3: Literacy in oral and written communication

Students were expected to score between 1 and 2 on their written projects and oral presentations, as outlined by the departmental rubric for CTW

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Students scored between 1 and 2 on writing assignments. Writing average: 1.2 Oral presentation average: 1.1 Qualitative comments: students excelled particularly at reflexive writing assignments, including a personal statement intended for potential graduate programs and an essay in which they were asked to reflect on their experiences as anthropology majors. With the personal statement, however, some students had trouble tailoring their writing to the intended audience. They did well as a group on assignments in which they were asked to create hypothetical syllabi, grants, and assignments. Students also did very well as a whole in writing and revising short abstracts. Students as a group presented outstanding conference-style 10 minute oral presentations, based on their original research or their original analysis of the work of others.

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

#### Faculty collaboration and student mentoring

The faculty will collaborate to mentor students in identifying theoretical and methodological constructs, and tailor written and oral communication to intended audiences.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: CTW Senior Seminar | Outcome/Objective: Literacy in oral and written communication

#### Restructuring assignments and their sequencing

- Restructure writing assignments as incremental steps feeding into a final project for the course - Further integrate and coordinate curricular development with the rest of the faculty - Further utilize the capabilities of the Online Writing Environment

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: CTW Senior Seminar | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

### 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 reformulated the goals, objectives and outcomes for this cycle to produce more focused and measurable data. We focused on required courses with an emphasis on the senior seminar which is also a CTW course. This allowed for in-depth assessment of students. The changes were made in response to the review of the last cycle’s assessment. In the coming year the department will further research assessment strategies and standards appropriate to the discipline through professional contacts, major professional organizations and conferences.
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.

Goals
G 1: Content and Method Competency
Students will firmly ground their research interests in a broad and relevant body of anthropological knowledge in their field of study. They will demonstrate capacity in a) theory, b) field/area of study and c) appropriate methodologies.

G 2: Contributing to Anthropological Knowledge and Practice
Students will demonstrate competence in the practice of anthropology through the production of original research in their specific subfield.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Synthesizing knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will collect, synthesize, analyze and effectively communicate a broad body of anthropological knowledge, theory and methodology framing their particular research interests.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Producing Original Research (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Students will design, conduct, analyze and present original research in writing and orally. The work of design, data collection in the field, analysis and write-up will be conducted in close interaction with the student's adviser and evaluated by the adviser, and members of the student's thesis committee, selected for their expertise in the relevant field of interest.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.14 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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

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: Synthesizing knowledge

All students that reach the third semester of graduate study at the Department of Anthropology are expected to pass the comprehensive examination in order to continue in the program.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

In the 2009-2010 cycle, 16 third semester graduate students passed their comprehensive examinations demonstrating a. Ability to synthesize and analyze theoretical approaches relevant to their research interests b. Command of anthropological research relevant to the area and topical concerns of their research c. Command of methodological issues, techniques, and ethics relevant to their research interests. 15 students passed at the first attempt. 1 student was required to rewrite a portion of the exam, and successfully completed it on the second attempt.

### M 2: MA thesis or practicum paper (O: 2)

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 their thesis or practicum paper before their committee. The advisor, in consultation with the committee, rates the thesis or practicum paper as a pass, contingent pass or fail. Data recorded included (1) the number of students who wrote and defended a thesis or practicum paper, (2) the number of students who successfully passed the oral defense on the first attempt, (3) the number of students who encountered problems with passing the defense, and (4) the number of students who ultimately passed the defense and graduated.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

### Target for O2: Producing Original Research

All students will produce a satisfactory thesis, conduct revisions and successfully defend their thesis or practicum in order to graduate

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

In the 2009-2010 cycle, a total of 15 students reached their final semester in the program (2 in the Fall and 13 in the Spring semesters). All 15 successfully completed their research projects, and defended their thesis or practicum, completing the study program.

### 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 has refined its definitions of goals, objectives and outcomes in order to more accurately assess student learning at the completion of the program. The measures have remained consistent as demonstration of topical literature and methodology expertise and the production of original research framed in extant literature and problematics represent the culmination of graduate training in the field. In the coming academic year, the department will consider possible changes in the assessment process by researching graduate learning outcomes definitions and measures appropriate to the discipline, through professional contacts, major professional organizations and conferences.
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

M 1: Final examinations in core courses (O: 1)
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)
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target for O1: Core areas of linguistics
80% of students will score at least 70% on the final exams in AL 3021, AL 4011 and AL 4012

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
At least 80% of students scored at least 70% on the final exam in AL 3021. 90% of students scored at least 70% on the final exam in AL 4012. 76% of students scored at least 70% in AL 4011.

M 2: Exam results in SLA (O: 2)
Performance on final examination in AL 3041: Second Language Acquisition will be documented.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Foundations of language acquisition
At least 80% of students will score at least 70% on the final project in AL 3041

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
95% of students scored at least 70% on their final projects in AL 3041

M 3: Language in Society paper (O: 3)
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 “competent” on these four areas will be tabulated.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: Key concepts in sociolinguistics
At least 80% of students will be judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all four relevant criteria on the rubric

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
77.5% of students were judged competent or sophisticated on the four relevant criteria

M 4: Performance on language analysis problems (O: 4)
The final examinations in AL 4011 (Phonetics & Phonology) and AL 4012 (Morphology & Syntax) consist primarily of language analysis problems. The number of students scoring at least 70% on these examinations will be tabulated.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Analysis of linguistic structure
80% of students will score at least 70% on the final examinations in AL 4011 and AL 4012

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
90% of students in AL 4012 scored at least 70% in the final exam. 76% of students scored at least 70% on the final exam in AL 4011.

M 5: Writing assignments in required courses (O: 5)
The final paper in AL 3031 (Language in Society) is rated on a 4 point rubric in five areas. One of these areas is "presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion." The number of students who score "competent" or "sophisticated" in this area will be tabulated.

**Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

### Target for O5: Written Communication and Editing Skills

80% of students will be judged as competent or sophisticated in the area of "presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion"

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

85% of students were judged competent or sophisticated

### 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

---
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### 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
1.1.1 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
2.21 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**

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Technology (M: 2, 4, 5)**

Uses technology effectively in research and teaching

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

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

**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

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
44% of graduating students made at least one conference presentation or written at least one published 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on their use of technology in presentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O5: Communication

90% of students will score "good" or "excellent" on the overall scores for their presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92% (14 out of 17) of the students scored &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on the overall scores for their presentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance for the outcome &quot;teaching methodology&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O5: Communication

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance for the outcome &quot;teaching methodology&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome &quot;knowledge of linguistic systems of English&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome &quot;teaching methodology&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome &quot;professional development&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome &quot;technology&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

70% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% 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.

**Target for O2: Teaching methodology**

The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "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.

**Target for O5: Communication**

The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "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.

**Target for O7: Cultural knowledge**

The syllabus for at least one required course will contain "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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated "excellent" or "good" in writing and formatting/referencing.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

92% of the students were rated "excellent" or "good" in connecting theory to practice and scholarship.

---

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Teaching methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students completed the requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Connecting theory and practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students completed the requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Professional development activities (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to participate in two professional development (PD) activities each semester they are in the program. They document this experience by submitting a reflective essay about each PD activity to their advisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Professional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete the PD requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of graduating students completed all required PD activities.

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

**Connecting theory and practice: Confidence level**

MA advisors will encourage students to reflect on and explicitly discuss in their MA portfolio reflective overview how they have learned to link theory and practice. The MA Committee will begin looking at three-year trends rather than just the limited survey responses obtained in any single year to determine how well the program is helping students make theory/practice connections.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Survey of graduating students | Outcome/Objective: Connecting theory and practice
- **Implementation Description:** MA advisors and MA Paper readers will oversee and support students’ written discussions of connections between theory and practice. The MA Committee will analyze relevant survey responses over a three-year span.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MA advisors

**Professional development: Presentations and publications**

Graduate faculty will encourage and offer more scaffolding, in the form of workshops, for conference participation. "Conference participation" itself will be re-conceptualized by the graduate faculty to be more inclusive of a number of relevant professional activities, such as training sessions for fellow teachers, that graduate students may engage in as novice professionals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Graduate faculty will offer workshops for MA students. The "conference participation" measure will be reconceptualized and rephrased.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department graduate faculty

**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?

Students have been surveyed at the end of their last term in the MA program. Given that survey data in any given year is still limited, we will begin to examine trends in survey responses over a three-year span.

**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 consider expanding the reflective overview component in the MA portfolio. In an effort to increase curricular options for MA students, we will consider adding Sociolinguistics as an alternative to the current requirement of Intercultural Communication.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Applied Linguistics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

### Mission / Purpose
The PhD program prepares students to take leadership positions in the field of applied linguistics. PhD students acquire a broad knowledge of applied linguistics, which enables them to identify new directions for research in AL, design and conduct studies that make significant novel contributions, and disseminate their work, including publishing and conference participation. Areas of research include language and literacy learning and teaching (L2 literacy, especially academic writing and reading; second language acquisition; teacher development; and assessment), language analysis and use (spoken and written discourse analysis, corpus studies, and applied phonetics and phonology), and applied and critical perspectives on language, culture, and society (sociolinguistics, language ideologies, and intercultural communication).

### 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: 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: 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 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
- 3.1 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 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: 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 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.

**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.

**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.

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

**M 4: Teaching experience (O: 1)**
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.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2009-2010 Art and Design Assessment of Core**
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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)**

**revisiting/revamping PhD assessment**
mission outcomes goals

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

---

**Critical thinking in Core Action Plan**
Continue to: 1) include 15-20 CT questions on every exam and 2) include class discussion of critical thinking in test format.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
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 feel that the assessment process is fine, so we have not made any changes. We will continue to utilize the process that we have 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.

We are not making any changes to the program based on this year’s assessment data. Any future changes will be based on hiring more full time TT faculty and the implementation of a Ph.D. program in Art History, the latter of which will allow us to use GTAs and graduate instructors for the core survey classes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Art Education BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Art Education BFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts, art education and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields.

Goals
G 1: Visual Arts Literacy
Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills so that they may effectively relay ideas and responses in visual, oral and/or written communication as it relates to the visual arts.

G 2: Visual Arts Advocacy
Expand students’ understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts who engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

G 3: Technology and Media
Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world through awareness of and facility with a wide range of media and state of the art technologies.

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

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 Hseish

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2009-2010 Art Education MAEd

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

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

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**

Unknown

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.1 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: Unknown**

Unknown

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 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**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**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**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thesis (O: 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

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

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

**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

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2009-2010 Art History BA**

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

The mission of the Art History BA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields.

### Goals

**G 1: Visual Arts Literacy**

Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills so that they may effectively relay ideas and responses in visual, oral and/or written communication as it relates to the visual arts.

**G 2: Visual Arts Advocacy**

Expand students’ understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts who engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

**G 3: Technology**

Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world through awareness of a wide range of media and state of the art technologies.

### 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.

**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: xx, Students achieving goal: xx, Minimum score for successful completion of goal: x, Aim for an average score of: x.x, Average score for this goal this academic year: x.x

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

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. Number of students evaluated for this goal: 13 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 10 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 3.85

**Target for O2: Critical thinking skills**

Evaluation based on review of exam essay questions and the writing project submitted with the graduation portfolio. Number of students evaluated: xx, Number achieving goal: xx, Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3, Aim for an average score of: 4.5, Average score for this goal for this academic year: x.x

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Evaluation based on review of exam essay questions and writing projects submitted with the graduation portfolio. Number of students evaluated for this goal: 13 Number of those students who achieved the goal: 12 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5 Average score for this goal this academic year: 3.58
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
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

Content Knowledge and Critical Thinking Skills
The outcomes for Objective 1 (Knowledge of Content and Critical Thinking Skills. 3.85 and 3.58 respectively) are lower from the previous academic year. While the students we evaluated are meeting most of our goals, the faculty and course content is more rigorous, requiring more out of students. Our goal is to turn out art history graduates who could go on to any top graduate program in
The mission of the Art History MA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and future, with the expectation that it will further improve our students' research skills. We plan to take more advantage of this opportunity in the faculty. 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 US. Our concern last year was the somewhat inflated scores based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, which -- since submission of the graduation portfolio was essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted were not be a representative sample. This year we solved the problem by offering graduating majors a new capstone course (AH 4990), and required all to submit a graduation portfolio. This resulted in a more representative sample of work that included a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, and an advanced writing project involving art-historical research, a research response paper, a critical analysis paper, an art analysis paper, and an art history experience paper. We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breath of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

Content Knowledge and Critical Thinking Skills
The outcomes for Objective 1 (Knowledge of Content and Critical Thinking Skills. 3.85 and 3.58 respectively) are lower from the previous academic year. While the students we evaluated are meeting most of our goals, the faculty and course content is more rigorous, requiring more out of students. Our goal is to turn out art history graduates who could go on to any top graduate program in the US. Our concern last year was the somewhat inflated scores based only on the graduation portfolios submitted, which -- since submission of the graduation portfolio was essentially voluntary -- the portfolios submitted were not be a representative sample. This year we solved the problem by offering graduating majors a new capstone course (AH 4990), and required all to submit a graduation portfolio. This resulted in a more representative sample of work that included a CAPP form, a copy of a test from an upper-level Art History course, and an advanced writing project involving art-historical research, a research response paper, a critical analysis paper, an art analysis paper, and an art history experience paper. We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breadth of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

CTW Alignment
The average score for Objective 4 (Written Communication Skills) dropped from the previous academic year (from 4.1 to 3.58). 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. We also believe that the relatively low scores for Objectives 1 and 4 were in part the result of the greater breadth of assessment material, which gave us the opportunity to target more precisely areas that need improvement. Furthermore, many of the students who took AH 4990 Art History Capstone, did not take AH 3000 - Introduction to Art History Methodology. By taking AH 3000, students receive greater attention in their content, critical thinking, research and written communication skills early in their career resulting in better papers and tests.

Research Plan
The scores for Objective 3 (Research Skills) were quite a bit lower than we'd like to see. The average of 3.75 was considerably below our goal of 4.5, and lower than the results for the other three objectives. We recognize that this is a continuing area of focus for the faculty. 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 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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Analytical Research Skills (M: 1, 2, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Oral Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Written Communication skills (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Research skills (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Analysis and Critical Thinking Skills (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Knowledge of Methods and Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Knowledge of Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Competence in a Foreign Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Foreign Language or Course Grades (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Seminars and/or Student Symposium (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Thesis (O: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Studio Art BFA Program within the School of Art and Design is to provide a rigorous, comprehensive and accessible undergraduate education in the visual arts and art history to a diverse urban constituency. This mission extends to the University at large, to the community and beyond, with the recognition that visual literacy is essential to imagination, creativity and the articulation of ideas in all fields.

Goals
G 1: Visual Arts Literacy
Provide students with sophisticated critical thinking and visual literacy skills so that they may effectively relay ideas and responses in visual, oral and/or written communication as it relates to the visual arts.

G 2: Visual Arts Advocacy
Expand students' understanding as practitioners, scholars and advocates of the visual arts who engage and collaborate with local state, regional, national and global institutions and communities to provide enhanced visual arts opportunities to students and the community.

G 3: Technology and Media
Prepare students to be competitive in an increasingly technological, interdisciplinary and theoretical art world through awareness of and facility with a wide range of media and state of the art technologies.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Unknown (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Unknown

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.2 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.2 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Unknown (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Unknown
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
6 Quantitative Skills

Institutional Priority Associations

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

Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 6: Communication (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 3)
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
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 12: Interdisciplinary Knowledge (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)
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
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 14: Professional Preparation in the Arts (G: 1, 3) (M: 2, 3)
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
Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

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

Institutional Priority Associations

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 2.1 Faculty
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**O1: Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff**

- Target: Met

**O2: Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students**

- Target: Partially Met

**O3: Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation**

- Target: Met

---

**M 1: Gateway (Foundations) Portfolio and Statement (O: 2, 6)**

Gateway Portfolio of Artwork from first year foundation studio courses plus 2 upper level studio courses including written essay 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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Assessing for Quantitative Skills, 84 student portfolios were evaluated as follows: 23 scored 5 - excellent (27%), 23 scored 4 - very good (27%), 24 scored 3 - good (29%), and 14 scored 2 - fair (17%). Assessing for Analytical Skills, 92 student portfolios were evaluated as follows: 1 scored 6 - outstanding (1%), 13 scored 5 - excellent (14%), 29 scored 4 - very good (32%), 28 scored 3 - good (29%), and 23 scored 2 - fair (25%). On average, 50.5% of students evaluated met or exceeded the target score threshold for Quantitative and Analytical Skills.

**Target for O2: Unknown**

Gateway Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in five major categories: Communication; Analytical Skills; Critical Thinking Skills; Collaborative Group Skills; and Quantitative Skills. The scoring ranges from 1-6 in each category with 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score for Communication and Critical Thinking is a minimum of 4.

---

**M 2: Final Portfolio, Artist’s Statement, Resume and BFA Senior Exhibition (O: 1, 2, 12, 14)**

Final Portfolio submitted containing 15-20 examples of studio work done in 4500 courses and in capstone classes 4940 and 4950 including artist’s statement evidencing knowledge and understanding of one’s own artistic practice. Artist Statement and Resume further evidence students’ competence in writing and communication skills.

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

**Target for O1: Unknown**

Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in nine major categories: Technical Skills; Interdisciplinary Knowledge; Technology Skills; Health and Safety; Collaborative Skills; Contemporary Theoretical Issues; Historical Knowledge, Multi-cultural Awareness; and Professional Preparation in Art. The scoring ranges from 1-6 in each category with 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score for Historical Knowledge and Multi-cultural Awareness is a minimum of 4.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Assessing for Historical Knowledge, 55 student portfolios were evaluated as follows: 10 scored 6 - outstanding (18%), 19 scored 5 - excellent (35%), 18 scored 4 - very good (33%), 6 scored 3 - good (11%), and 2 scored 2 - fair (4%). Assessing for Multi-Cultural Awareness, 54 student portfolios were evaluated as follows: 14 scored 6 - outstanding (26%), 16 scored 5 - excellent (30%), 20 scored 4 - very good (37%), and 4 scored 3 - good (7%). On average, 89% of students evaluated met or exceeded the target score threshold for Historical Knowledge and Multi-cultural Awareness.

---

**Target for O2: Unknown**

Gateway Portfolio Review and Assessment (by Faculty committee within each discipline) in five categories: Communication; Analytical Skills; Critical Thinking Skills; Collaborative Group Skills; and Quantitative Skills. Scoring from 1-6: where 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.

---

**Target for O12: Interdisciplinary Knowledge**

Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in nine major categories: Technical Skills; Interdisciplinary Knowledge; Technology Skills; Health and Safety; Collaborative Skills; Contemporary Theoretical Issues; Historical Knowledge; Multi-cultural Awareness; and Professional Preparation in Art. The scoring ranges from 1-6 in each category with 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent, 6=Outstanding. The target score for Contemporary Issues and Interdisciplinary Knowledge is a minimum of 4.
Assessing for Contemporary Issues, 57 student portfolios were evaluated as follows: 9 scored 6 - outstanding (16%), 18 scored 5 - excellent (32%), 19 scored 4 - very good (33%), 7 scored 3 - good (12%), and 4 scored 2 - fair (7%). Assessing for Interdisciplinary Knowledge, 55 student portfolios were evaluated as follows: 13 scored 6 - outstanding (24%), 16 scored 5 - excellent (29%), 15 scored 4 - very good (27%), 8 scored 3 - good (15%), and 3 scored 2 - fair (5%). On average, 80% of students evaluated met or exceeded the target score threshold for Contemporary Issues and Interdisciplinary Knowledge.

Assessing for Professional Practice and Technology related issues, approximately 55 student portfolios were evaluated. 30% scored 4 - very good, 40% scored 5 - excellent, and 19% scored 6 - outstanding. In total, 89% of students evaluated met or exceeded the target score threshold of 4 - very good for Professional Practice and Technology.

A group art exhibition of artwork by all BFA candidates whose work demonstrates school of art and design standards for graduation.

Target for O6: Communication
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.

Of total students evaluated approximately 21% scored 6 - outstanding, 35% scored 5 - excellent, 30% scored 4 - very good, 10% scored 3 - good, and 4% scored 2 - fair. In summary, 86% of students scored at or above the threshold target of 5-excellent.

All gateway and final portfolios are evaluated utilizing this same rubric and are used to assess general levels of student achievement and relative improvement.

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

Plan for improvement
Our target was that 70% of students score very good in communication. Approximately 56% of those students assessed scored that this year.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Art Studio MFA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Collaboration**
Relating to interdisciplinary projects within the studio practice

**SLO 2: 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
1.14 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**
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: 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
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Communication**
Broad awareness of contemporary art and critical 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
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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio (O: 2)
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

M 2: Portfolio (O: 2)
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

M 3: Professional Resume (O: 2)
Professional artist resume highlighting educational and professional accomplishments
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

M 4: Thesis Paper
Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

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
- Professional Skills
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills

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
- Professional Skills
- Measure: Professional Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Astronomy PhD
As of 12/13/2016 03:57 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 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 EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students 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 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)**

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 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

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

Normal 0 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

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

Normal 0 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

### 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

### 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:** 2009-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Evaluation of Dissertation</td>
<td>Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations and Implications of Research</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense</td>
<td>Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations and Implications of Research</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Exam 2</td>
<td>Collaboration in Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Advisor Evaluation</td>
<td>Collaboration in Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific &amp; Research Technology</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification**

As of 12/18/2016 02:07 PM EST

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

### Mission / Purpose

Through a focus on teacher education as an area of excellence and research, the BLD Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing special educators who can make decisions that enable them to provide high quality instruction and support services consistent with the diverse needs and abilities of individuals with disabilities and their families. Because there is a critical shortage of teachers for students with mild disabilities in Georgia, the members of the BLD Faculty are committed to attracting and retaining highly qualified students who will become special education teachers. The members of the BLD Faculty recognize that the personnel we prepare must have the flexibility to adapt to the changing role of the special educator, the changing patterns regarding how special education services are delivered, and the changing social and economic context in which individuals with disabilities will live. The growing availability of technology tools, improvements in field-based learning experiences, implementation of research-supported practices in special education, a focus on effective communication, and working collaboratively with other special educators, general educators, parents, and support personnel all have bearing on the enhancement of student learning. The BLD certification program is a post-baccalaureate program giving students initial teacher certification in Special Education General Curriculum/Consultative. A new program plan was developed and approved during 05-06 for this certification. During 06-07, the BLD certification program had approximately 130 students in the certification program; approximately 40 of them completed the program. During 07-08, the BLD certification program had approximately 111 students in the certification program; approximately 48 of them completed the certification program. During the current 08-09 academic year, the BLD certification program had approximately 90 students in the certification program; 31 of them completed the certification program. During the current 09-10 academic year, the BLD certification program had approximately 123 students in the certification program; 44 of them completed the certification program.

### Goals
**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
- 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 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**
1.12 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
4.34 Effective utilization of resources
4.43 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
With an N of 44, 88% of students scored a 3 or above on the EXC 7190 teaching sequence rubric. The range was 2-4. The mean score was 3.3.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
With an N of 44, 89% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The range was 1.7-4. The mean score was 3.5.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
With an N of 44, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric. The range was 3-4. 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 plan and assess instruction.**
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
With an N of 44, 93% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The range was 2-4. The mean score was 3.5.
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 again on the new measures established for the 08-09 academic year as recommended in our APR plan. The data indicate that student performance was met for two measures and was at 88% and 89% for the other two measures; target for all was 90%. The faculty have indicated that the student's performance on these measures is adequate since they were within 2% points of the target. We will explore increasing reliability in the future. The faculty members are now using the new rubric for performance (mentioned in the 08-09 report) that aligns with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Lesson Plan | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plan and assess instruction.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator and BLD faculty

Explore reliability of teaching sequence rubric
BLD faculty will discuss teaching sequence rubric and set up trainings for part time instructors and/or graduate teaching assistants as needed to increase the reliability of the instrument.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

Implementation Description: The current instructors using the teaching sequence rubric will meet with any new instructors in order to train new instructors on the use of the rubric. They will determine if further training is warranted.

Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator and faculty

Revise rubric
After discussion, the BLD faculty decided to look at and possibly revise the rubric for the P-12 change project.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Pupil change project. | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Susan Easterbrooks and BLD faculty

Sample plans will be provided for students to review
Faculty will provide samples of previous pupil change projects as they review their expectations for assignments with the students.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Pupil change project. | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.

Implementation Description: Students will be provided sample projects connected with scoring rubrics so they will better understand what is expected of them.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator and course instructor

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 updated weave data continue to be more meaningful and consistent with that collected for our accrediting body, NCATE. For BLD certification programs, with a target of 90% of students scoring at or above a 3 on a rubric of 1-4, students met the goal of 90% or above for 2 of the 4 goals; 1 goal was met at 88% and 1 goal was met at 89%. For the 2010-11 assessment cycle, the BLD faculty will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90%.

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 discussion, the BLD faculty decided to look at and possibly revise the rubric for the P-12 change project.
Mission / Purpose

Through a focus on teacher education as an area of excellence and research, the BLD Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing special educators who can make decisions that enable them to provide high quality instruction and support services consistent with the diverse needs and abilities of individuals with disabilities and their families. Because there is a critical shortage of teachers for students with mild disabilities in Georgia, the members of the BLD Faculty are committed to attracting and retaining highly qualified students who will become new special education teachers. The members of the BLD Faculty recognize that the personnel we prepare must have the flexibility to adapt to the changing role of the special educator, the changing patterns regarding how special education services are delivered, and the changing social and economic context in which individuals with disabilities will live. The growing availability of technology tools, improvements in field-based learning experiences, implementation of research-supported practices in special education, a focus on effective communication, and working collaboratively with other special educators, general educators, parents, and support personnel all have bearing on the enhancement of student learning. The BLD Master's program is a graduate program for students with teacher certification in Special Education General Curriculum:Consultative. A new program plan was developed and approved during 05-06 for this degree. During 06-07, the BLD Master's program had approximately 60 students in the program, with 21 students completing the Master's program. During 07-08, the BLD Master's program had approximately 33 students in the program, with 10 students graduating with Master's degrees in BLD from Summer 07 through Spring 2008. During 08-09, the BLD Master's program had approximately 46 students in the program, with 10 students graduating with Master's degrees in BLD from Summer 08 through Spring 2009. During 09-10, the BLD Master's program had approximately 60 students in the program, with 6 students graduating with Master's degrees in BLD from Summer 09 through Spring 2010.

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
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
With an N of 5, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The range was 3.5-4. The mean score was 3.9.

**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 rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
With an N of 5, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3.5-4. The mean score was 3.8.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
With an N of 5, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3-3. The mean score was 3.

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

**Action Plan for All Indicators**
Data for the Masters Program in BLD continued to be collected on new measures from the 08-09 year as recommended in our APR plan. All targets were met, including the comprehensive exam scores. One of the new measures was scores on comprehensive exams; faculty members had noted that the current exam content and format does not reflect key changes in content in core courses sufficiently. A new format for the comprehensive exam is still being designed (sample questions have now been developed). Meanwhile, 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. Therefore, the faculty will continue to implement the course of action adopted for this program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator, and BLD faculty

### 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?

Faculty in the BLD program are pleased with the progress of their master's students as the target of 90% or above was met for all measures. For the 2010-11 assessment cycle, the BLD faculty will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90% while monitoring possible new goals.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2009-2010 Biology Assessment of Core**
*As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST*
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**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: 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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 2: Communication (M: 3)**
Students will be expected to be able to express ideas about biological content both orally and in writing.

**SLO 3: Application of the Scientific Method**
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.

**SLO 4: Analysis**
Students will be able to execute basic problem solving skills and data analysis in biology.

**SLO 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 3: Critiquing the value of a Scientific statement (O: 1, 2)**
Critique and analyze claims of others in a scientific context Biol 2107 Summer 10 63 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: 73 % of students scored 80% or higher. Critique a figure: 84% of students scored 80% or higher.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2009-2010 Biology BS**
**Mission / Purpose**
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.

**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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content in Biology (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22)**
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.

**SLO 5: Basic field/lab techniques (M: 3, 12, 22)**
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 during data collection.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Communication (M: 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 19, 21)**
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: 3, 19, 21)**
Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability to 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, 4, 5, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22)**
Students will be able to execute basic problem solving skills and data analysis in Biology.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Mini Lecture followed by 1 page summary (O: 2, 4)**
Communicate effectively in oral and written forms Biol 4930/6930 Summer 10 n=24 Each student will present a mini lecture and provide 1-page summary. 84% of students scored 75% or higher Target: 80% to score 75% Save
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**M 2: Written critique about a Biological diagram (O: 2, 4)**
Critique and analyze claims of others in a scientific context Biol 2107 Summer 08 n=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: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Communication**
Will assess again in the future

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Will assess again in the future

**M 3: Group project (design outreach program) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)**
Students will be able to work effectively in group situations Biol 4930/6930 Summer 08 n=29 Students will work in groups on specific projects as outreach programs. 82% of students scored 80% or higher
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Content in Biology**
85% to answer correctly

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
87% answered correctly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will be able to present group data to a classroom full of peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All student in BIO3810 were capable of presenting group data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Analysis of scientific data (O: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO3900 - Genetics Students were asked to determine the mRNA sequence corresponding to a polypeptide sequence. Target was 85% to answer correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Content in Biology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will successfully answer question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% were successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of students will be able to answer question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% were successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Make a prediction based on science data (O: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO3900 - Genetics n=35 Question asked to predict DNA replication mechanism based on data 100% provided the correct answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Content in Biology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% to answer correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - Target: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% answered correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Content in Genetics question (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO 3900 - Genetics n=35 Question asking number of mRNA nucleotides corresponding to a protein of specific length. 100% provided the correct answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Mini lecture (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 3810 Spring 2010 n=50 Each student will present a mini lecture on their experiments 50 of 50 received at least an 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Ability to use Biological Instruments (O: 1, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO 3810 - Cell &amp; Mol Biology n=45 Students were asked to determine whether a sample had DNA or protein using a spectrophotometer 75% earned a 80% or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Written critique about a Biological diagram (O: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Revised Case Study BIO4428 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course: BIOL 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: &gt;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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: Pre-post test of knowledge BIO3800 (O: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO3800. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: Student Presentation BIO3880 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course: BIOL 3880 Assessment: Student Presentation Data: Students were required to research a specific bacterial species (or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students are required to complete a rigorous curriculum that emphasizes training in scientific literacy and critical thinking. This curriculum requires that students be evaluated on written (e.g. term papers and proposals, essay test questions) and oral communication skills (class presentations in topic and concept courses. O 3: Students have the opportunity to perform independent and collaborative research efforts within the Departments of Biology and Chemistry that explore a variety of scientific frontiers and/or participate in internships at off-campus sites such as the CDC. O 4: Research oriented students receive compliance training and take
on-line exams as an introduction to laboratory research (See Appendix 1) Related Measures: M 1: The non-thesis report 1) Students in the non-thesis track enroll in Biol 8888, their capstone course. Guidelines for the preparation of the paper as well as a grading rubric (Appendix 2) are made available to students enrolled in Biol 8888 and relevant faculty examiners. The rubric provides a uniform evaluation metric. Students submit a non-thesis report (either a critical review of a defined topic or a description of a research project) to their faculty mentor, who offers constructive criticism. After addressing comments from the mentor, students submit the final copy to their mentoring committee for review with a rubric reader. This document provides a vehicle for measuring objectives 1 and 2. Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: met 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 1) 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. Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: not met Related Measures: M 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 (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: met Related Measures: M 3:  Time for completion of MS degree Of the 58 students enrolled only as M. S. students, 56 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2008-2009) - 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 review, all three were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All proposal 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 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 (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: met Related Measures: M 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 (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: met Related Measures: M 2: Scientific Inquiry Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2008-2009) - 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 review, all three were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All proposal 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 Related Measures: M 3:  Time for completion of MS degree Of the 58 students enrolled only as M. S. students, 56 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Six 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 (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six 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 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 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 (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: met Related Measures: M 2: Scientific Inquiry Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2008-2009) - 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. 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 24 months, the median time was 22 months. Finally, our M.S. graduates were awarded to biology doctoral students as non-terminal degrees. Of the 65 students enrolled as M. S. students, 56 (86%) completed the program in 3 years or less. 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 bio-lology 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.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Scientific Content (M: 1, 2, 3)**

- **O 1:** Students receive compliance training and take on-line exams as they begin working in research laboratories (See Appendix 1)
- **Related Measures:** M 1: (O 1) Successful completion of Bio 8550 and the CITI exam (See Appendix 1) Achievment Target: Our goal is that 100% of the students complete the steps for compliance. Federal law mandates that all individuals working in research labs complete these requirements successfully. Findings: not met. A key component for success is attendance of students failed to meet the attendance policy and will be required to complete the steps for compliance. O 2: Students are required to complete a rigorous core curriculum that emphasizes training in scientific literacy, inquiry and critical thinking. O 3: This curriculum requires students to be evaluated both on written (e.g. term papers and proposals, essay test questions) and oral communication skills (class presentations in topic and concept courses). Related Measures: M 2 (O 2, & 3): 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 within 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. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students taking the exam during the Fa08 semester, the first three have left the program, the fourth has left the program, and the others have not yet taken the exam. 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 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. O:4: Students perform independent and collaborative research within the Departments of Biology and Chemistry that explore and integrate a variety of scientific frontiers and graduate in a timely manner. M:3 (O:4): 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 Seventeen 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. Of these, 15 (88%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Twenty-four students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 6.48 years, while the median time was 6.3 years. Fourteen of the 24 students (58%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. 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 Biology Department during the period from the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Scientific Inquiry (M: 1, 2, 3)

Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. [Preview Format] Students will be able to express their ideas in written and oral formats and to communicate the findings of their research. [Achieved Means] 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 within 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. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are taking the examination during the Fa08 semester, and the fourth has left the program. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Eighteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 12 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The student who received the Decision Pending has satisfied the conditions required for a Pass. The two students who received a Qualified Pass took their examinations in the Sp07 semester; therefore, six months have not yet elapsed since the date of their evaluation. 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 Seventeen 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 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Partially Met 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the period from the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.
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 2: Scientific Communication (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats.

**Priority: High**

**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 defend them before their Committee. 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 d) 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 within 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 received either a Qualified Pass on Decision Pending in 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. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are retaking the examination during the Fall semester, and the fourth has left the program. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 16 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. Two of the 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 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. 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 2006-2007 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 6.5 years, while the median time was 5.5 years. 15 of the 17 students (88%) completed their degree work within 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: 1, 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 (G. 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% competition 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 decrease in the need for students and faculty alike to adjust to the new examination format, or 2) 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: 1, 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 (G. 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% competition 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 decrease in the need for students and faculty alike to adjust to the new examination format, or 2) 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
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 exam 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 3: Ph.D. Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3)

O 1: Students receive compliance training and take on-line exams as they begin working in research laboratories (See Appendix 1) O 2: Students are required to complete a rigorous core curriculum that emphasizes training in scientific literacy and critical thinking. O 3: This curriculum requires students be evaluated both on written (e.g., term papers and proposals, essay test questions) and oral communication skills (class presentations in topic and concept courses). O 4: Students perform independent and collaborative research within the Departments of Biology and Chemistry that explore and integrate a variety of scientific frontiers and graduate in a timely manner. Related Measures: M 1: (O 1) Successful completion of Bio 8550 and the CITI exam (See Appendix 1) Achievement Target: Our goal is that 20% of the exams evaluated receive a score of 1. Findings: 30% of the exams receive a 2; 35% of the exams receive a score of 3 and less than 15% receive a score of 3 or lower. Achievement target met: Our goal is that 20% of the exams received a 4. The qualifying exam consists of 1: preparation of a pre-proposal and upon approval; 2: preparation of a proposal not to exceed 20 pages that follows either an NIH or an NSF proposal format. A faculty committee evaluates both written documents and an oral defense. Student assessment is on a scale from 1 (high) to 4 (low). An assessment of 1 is reserved for superior performances on both the written and oral components; 2 reflects a satisfactory performance in which deficiencies are recognized that typically require remedial coursework that is specified by the examination committee; 3 reflects a marginal performance in which students are required to prepare and submit additional material and often a second oral defense; 4: unsatisfactory requires that the examination be repeated within 12 months. Achievement Target: Our goal is that 20% of the exams evaluated receive a score of 1. 30% of the exams receive a 2; 35% of the exams receive a score of 3 and less than 15% receive a score of 3 or lower. Findings: Achievement target met: 14 students completed the qualifying exam. Three exams received a 1; 8 exams received a 2 or 3 and three exams received a 4. The average score was 2.14 M3: (O 1 - 4) Participation in regional, national and international meetings and collaborations as students begin establishing their own scientific networks.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Business Analysis MS
As of: 12/12/2016 02:57 PM 631
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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.

Goals

G 1: Goal of the MS in Business Analysis

The goal of the MS in Business Analysis program is to provide students seeking a degree with a singular focus on business analyses tools, techniques and frameworks with the theory, method, and rationale for understanding, selecting, and utilizing those tools, techniques, and frameworks over a wide range of applications used in for-profit and not-for-profit organizations in the 21st century.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (Mt: 1)

Normal 0 false 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)
Normal 0 false 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 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 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 situation 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
A. Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation i. Understanding of the business goal / issues 3.60 ii. Identifying Key variables that need to be analyzed 3.60 iii. Analysis potential relationships among variables 3.50 iv. Interpretation of results 3.75 in each instance over 80% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

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(s) and the appropriate metrics Can clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics Can identify the variables, but unsure about measurement 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

i. Identifying the dependent variables and appropriate metrics 3.60 ii. Identifying Key independent variables and their metrics 3.50 iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning, transformations 3.40 iv. Model Development and validation 3.50 On each measure over 80% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 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 O3: Understanding of Techniques**

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 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 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 understanding 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

i. Regression Analysis 3.60 ii. Time Series Forecasting 3.50 iii. Factor/Cluster Analysis 3.50 iv. Discriminant Analysis or Logistic Regression 3.60 On each component over 80% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M4: 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**


**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

i. Microsoft Excel 3.50 ii. SPSS Not scored iii. SAS 3.50 On the two programs scored over 80% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**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 past few years in keeping the course material current, updating cases and examples to reflect industry practices today. 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 others’ work. This strategy has over the years yielded very positive results.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Mission / Purpose

The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for productive careers in post-graduate studies and the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals, internships, graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with development of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level. Since critical thinking is so important to the discipline this is the measure that we will be addressing in the core.

Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking Assessment in the Core

Area D Critical Thinking Assessment for Chemistry Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. 1) 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. 2) A rubric was developed to assess critical thinking skills demonstrated in the laboratory reports required for these courses.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Using critical thinking skills to interpret data (G: 1) (M: 5)

Laboratory reports are used in order to assess students' ability to interpret data. A rubric was developed based on American Chemical Society Guidelines to assess the laboratory reports. The department goal is for 85% of students to receive an adequate or better. The rubric is in the document repository.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: ACS exam questions for 1151 (O: 1)**
- **Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**
  - Target goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 6.8 out of 8.

**M 2: ACS exam in 1152 (O: 1)**
- **Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**
  - Goal was 4/8 students averaged 6 out of 8.

**M 3: ACS Exit exam in 1211 (O: 1)**
- Students got 4/8 on 1211 ACS exit exam on critical thinking problems
- **Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**
  - Goal was 4/8 students averaged 3.8 out of 8.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
- Goal was 4/8 students averaged 3.8 out of 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
- **Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**
  - Goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 4.2 out of 8.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
- Goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 4.2 out of 8.

**M 5: Laboratory Reports in 1211 and 1212 (O: 2)**
- Assessment of Critical thinking in laboratory report for 1211 and 1212 students.
- **Target for O2: Using critical thinking skills to interpret data**
  - 85% of students should receive an adequate or better. 87% received this score.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
- 85% of students should receive an adequate or better. 87% received this score.
**Mission / Purpose**

The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for productive careers in post-graduate studies and the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals, internships, graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analysis and synthesis processes and concludes with devolement 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: Critical Thinking**

Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. Upon Graduation students will be able to take and analyze real world data to develop a knowledge base and the ability to draw conclusions from this knowledge base. Thought processes should be rational, logical and consequential. Conclusions should grow directly from the data and accepted fundamental chemical principles. In addition, students should not only arrive at conclusions, but be aware that they are expected to defend these conclusions. It is also important to realize that data may be interpreted in more than one way, and that science moves forward as these different data interpretations are discussed and the data is then tested. Students must therefore learn to deal with open ended questions, deciding which data and variables are important, and which can safely be ignored in creating a picture of the system under study. The ability to think critically about scientific content and processes is key to these students’ futures. Critical thinking over time should become an internal skill, transferable to the rest of the student’s life and career.

**G 2: Analytical Skills**

Analytical Skills center on mathematically analyzing information that relates to the chemical sciences. Students need a thorough mathematical background in calculus, statistics and algebra and be able to apply these skills to chemical problems.

**G 3: Instrumental Skills**

Students who graduate need to be familiar with many different instruments and proficient in understanding not only how to use basic techniques (GC, HPLC, IR, UV-Vis and NMR) but also what information these techniques would allow the user access to.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Oral and Written Communication Skills (M: 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 presentation or an oral presentation in class. 1d) Presentation of a poster or oral talk at a Georgia State, local, regional or national meeting.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
2. Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
3. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

**Relevant Associations:**

- American Chemical Society
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 2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry (M: 1, 2)**

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

**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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: ACS exit exams (O: 2, 4)**

Many chemistry courses have national exit exams. Specific questions from these exams will be used to target different outcomes.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**M 2: laboratory reports (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
The senior level analytical courses (4000, 4010 and 4190) use laboratory reports to assess different outcomes.

**Target for O1: Oral and Written Communication Skills**
Average of "Adequate" on Rubric

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
83% of students received an adequate or better based on the rubric.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry**
Adequate or better under critical thinking on the rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
80% of students received an adequate or better based on the rubric.

**Target for O3: Technology**
Students demonstrate competence of instrumentation based on lab reports from Chem 4000 (titration systems), 4010 (GC and HPLC) and 4190 (IR, UV-Vis and NMR). Being able to complete a report with data from these methods is adequate.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**
90% of students should be able to use quantitative skills from laboratory measurements.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
97% of students were able to use quantitative skills in the laboratory results.

**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 graduation. 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 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 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 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. 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 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 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 one 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. 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 36.7 %. 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 are 50% percentile or better. A ten year analysis of the 2400 course shows an increase from 391 students in 1998 to 645 students in 2008 (65% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 38.2 % to 31.9 %. A ten year analysis of the 3410 course shows an increase from 196 students in 1998 to 564 students in 2008 (188% increase). There has been a slight drop in ACS scores over this 10 year period. Upper Division Courses for Majors An analysis of all 4000 level courses required of majors indicates that all courses have less than a 15% DFW rate. The number of students taught in the past ten years has increased with the number of students taking four of the seven courses (4000, 4120, 4190 and 4600) was over double what was taught ten years ago. The ACS scores for the physical chemistry sequence have remained statistically the same as ten years ago and the number of sections offered has not changed. Freshman Retention Statistics In 2002 40 incoming freshman indicated that they were chemistry majors, of these 40 students 35 were still enrolled in the university in fall of 2003 (88%). After 6 years of the initial 40 students 18 (45%) had graduated with a degree (not necessarily in chemistry) and 7 (18%) were still enrolled in a program at Georgia State University. Unfortunately the university defines retention by completing a program which means there is no way to track what the students’ final major was. In fall 2007 a total of 65 students entered declaring as chemistry majors. As of Fall 2008 62 (95%) were still enrolled at Georgia State University. The 2007-2008 retention rate for Freshman was the highest of any program with 10 or more majors in the College of Arts and Sciences. Again there is no way to tell if these students are still declared as chemistry majors or if they have changed majors as the University tracks only students that are retained in the University. Much of the improved retention at the Freshman level can be attributed to three programs that have been implemented in the past three years; increased opportunities for advisement, direct dialogue between the university advisors and the department, and an increase in faculty and staff that advise. The most common complaint among students in 2006 was the difficulty to schedule advisement appointments. Since 2007 there are advisement sign-up sheets outside the Undergraduate Director’s door so that students will not have to e-mail or call to make appointments. One of the major problems that the department has attempted to deal with is the increased success is the misinformation that is given to students by university advisors. This group includes the student advisement center, the FLC advisors and the Honors program advisors. Most of the problems have been solved by asking each of these groups to have students register for math and science courses based on departmental recommendations found on the web. We are still dealing with a few issues with the Honors program advisors that will hopefully be corrected with the upcoming registration for Fall 2009. The addition of an Undergraduate Coordinator has not only given the department another person capable of advisement at the Freshman level but has increased the amount of time that the Undergraduate Director can spend on advisement and other issues by shifting some of the workload. Georgia State University Assessment Data by Section 2009-2010 Chemistry MS (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**

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.

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. 6. 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**

M 1: 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

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

Action Plan
The masters plan meets all our objectives. Our plan is to continue this excellence with continued growth.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Chemistry PhD**

As of: 12/13/2016 03:57 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 program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society 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: 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)**
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)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions. 2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems. 3. Understand and analyze experimental results. 4. Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry. 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)**
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)**
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)**
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 ie. Organic chemistry, biochemistry, physical chemistry. The exam is graded by the faculty on a pass fail basis. Once the written exam is complete a committee is formed consisting of two faculty members from the student’s major and 1 from outside the major. The student gives a brief presentation of research and the committee asks questions which may be general in nature or related to the student’s research.

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

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.

Action Plan
The PhD program meets all our objectives. Our plan is to continue this excellence with continued growth.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Communication Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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.

**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 17.50556 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 1226 students in fall 2009 and 899 students in spring 2010. 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.

**Target for O1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000**

The Competent Speaker measure is used to grade the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000. Its criteria measure a wide range of oral communication skills, and students' scores have consistently ranged between 2 [satisfactory] and 3 [outstanding].

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

PRCA-24: Discussion In fall 2009 and spring 2010, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the PRCA-24 measure, producing 1226 scores in fall 2009 and 899 scores in spring 2010. As indicated in the four tables above, the overall mean score showed a slight decrease in students' communication apprehension: from 60.57434 to 58.80204 in fall 2009; and from 61.95217 to 59.90656 in spring 2010. More specifically, these sections demonstrated a slight decrease in apprehension for the public communication scale: dropping from 18.52082 to 17.29227 in fall 2009; and from 18.75306 to 17.63737 in spring 2010. 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.

**M 3: Willingness to Communicate (O: 1)**

In fall 2008 and spring 2009, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data selection 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 to 232.4648 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Willingness to Communicate: Discussion In fall 2009 and spring 2010, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing 1226 scores in fall 2009 and 899 scores in spring 2010. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2008 mean score indicated an overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations, from 190.135 pre-test to 203.8688 post-test. In fall 2009, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased (from 22.80833 to 24.17928 and from 54.12688 to 60.37215 respectively) and logic suggests
that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2009, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2010 results showed an increase in the willingness to communicate measure, from 193.1598 in the pre-test to 204.1682 in the post-test, as well as slight increases in all other measures.

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?

Because the data has consistently evidenced the overall effectiveness of Speech 1000 over the past five years, and because the measures used reasonably indicate student improvement in oral communication and competency, we have maintained a similar assessment process for the 2009-2010 report. We anticipate making significant changes in the 2010-2011 assessment process because GSU will be modifying its Core Curriculum, placing Speech 1000 within the Critical Thinking area. This change will require a new set of assessment tools and measures that are appropriate to that change.

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.

At this time, we are maintaining the curriculum for Speech 1000, as the assessment data evidences its effectiveness in achieving the Mission for the Communication Department more generally, and the learning outcomes for the course more specifically.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Communication Disorders MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Communication Disorders (CD) Program is a unit of the Educational Psychology & Special Education Department. The mission of the CD Program is to offer a high quality master's degree program which educates students to implement evidence-based services across the scope of practice in speech-language pathology. The program will achieve this goal through the continual pursuit of excellence in academic and clinical education and by infusion of research and scholarly experiences appropriate to a master's degree program. We will utilize the unique strengths of our community's diverse population and our numerous affiliated sites to prepare fully-certified speech-language pathologists who are exceptionally well-qualified to work in schools, hospitals, private clinics, and rehabilitation programs throughout the state. During the 2009-10 academic year there were 56 students enrolled in the program and 19 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
SLO 1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 9)
The student can apply the basic principles of biological science, physical science, and the behavioral/social sciences to communication sciences and disorders.

SLO 2: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 10)
The student can describe normal communication and swallowing processes and behaviors including their biological, neurological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural bases.

SLO 3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 11)
The student can discuss the etiologies and characteristics of speech, language, hearing, and communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders including anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates.
SLO 4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12)
The student can discuss the principles and methods of prevention, assessment, and intervention for people with communication and swallowing disorders including consideration of anatomic/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, and linguistic and cultural correlates.

SLO 5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 8, 13)
The student can discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.

SLO 6: Evaluate Research Relevance (G: 1, 2) (M: 8, 14)
The student can critically evaluate published theory and research to determine its relevance and application to clinical practice in communication disorders.

SLO 7: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues (G: 1, 3) (M: 8, 15)
The student can describe and discuss contemporary professional issues related to clinical standards and practice guidelines, federal and state regulations, site-specific rules, service delivery models, and practice management.

SLO 8: Outline Professional Credentials (G: 1) (M: 16)
The student can outline the requirements for state and national certification, specialty recognition, and licensure.

SLO 9: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills (G: 1, 3) (M: 17)
The student demonstrates oral and written communication skills appropriate to professional practice in communication disorders.

SLO 10: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 18)
The student accurately assesses clients with communication disorders and differences and swallowing disorders using formal and informal assessment procedures (including screening, prevention, and evaluation).

SLO 11: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 19)
The student develops and implements intervention programs that are functional, logical in sequence, and effective in changing client behavior.

SLO 12: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities (G: 1, 3) (M: 20)
The student demonstrates appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and ethical behavior with clients, family members, and other professionals and is able to self-evaluate clinical performance.

SLO 13: Apply Technology (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 6, 7, 21)
The student uses appropriate technology for clinical assessment and intervention and for professional productivity.

SLO 14: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 22)
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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Praxis II Exam (Total Score) (O: 1)
All students take the Praxis II Exam in speech-language pathology for national certification and state licensure prior to graduation.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge**
90% of students will pass the Praxis II exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students graduating during this period passed the Praxis II exam on their first attempt. Scores ranged from 660-800 with an average score of 715.

M 2: Praxis II Exam Category I Score (Comm Process) (O: 2, 14)
Score for Category I Basic Human Communication Processes.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target for O2: Describe Communication & Swallowing Processes**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
95% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 12 within the average range; and 6 above average.

**Target for O14: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

95% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 12 within the average range; and 6 above average.

#### M 3: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) (O: 3, 4)

Score for Category II Phonological and Language Disorders.

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

**Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - 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 8 above average.

**Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Fourteen students scored within the average range and 5 above average.

#### M 4: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) (O: 3, 4)

Score for Category III Speech Disorders.

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

**Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Twelve students scored within the average range and 7 above average.

**Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Twelve students scored within the average range and 7 above average.

#### M 5: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) (O: 3, 4)

Score for Category IV Neurogenic Disorders.

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

**Target for O3: Discuss Communication & Swallowing Disorders**

90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Twelve students scored within the average range and 7 above average.

**Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention**

90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Twelve students scored within the average range and 7 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II exam was 87%.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II exam was 87%.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II exam was 87%.

### 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 range or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Thirteen students scored within the average range and 6 above average.

**Target for O13: Apply Technology**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Thirteen students scored within the average range and 6 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 range or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Fifteen students scored within the average range and 4 above average.

**Target for O6: Evaluate Research Relevance**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Fifteen students scored within the average range and 4 above average.

**Target for O7: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Fifteen students scored within the average range and 4 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.68 on this section of the portfolio; thirteen students rated 4 and six 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.58 on this section of the portfolio; thirteen students rated 4, four rated 3, and two rated 2.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.63 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, three 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.79 on this section of the portfolio; sixteen students rated 4, two rated 3, and one 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.68 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, four 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students achieved an average rating of 3.47 on this section of the portfolio; eleven students rated 4, six rated 3, and two rated 2.

#### 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
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.00 on this section of the portfolio; two students rated 4, fifteen rated 3, and two rated 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.63 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, four rated 3, and one rated 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.47 on this section of the portfolio; ten students rated 4, eight rated 3, and one rated 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 differences 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.68 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, four rated 3, and one rated 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.68 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, four rated 3, and one rated 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved an average rating of 3.68 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, four rated 3, and one rated 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.74 on this section of the portfolio; fourteen students rated 4, and five rated 3.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.84 on this section of the portfolio; seventeen students rated 4, one rated 3, and one rated 2.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.47 on this section of the portfolio; eleven students rated 4, six rated 3, and two 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
- **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
- **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
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CD Faculty

**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 Communication Disorders (CD) Program has maintained the same assessment plan for the past two evaluation cycles to ensure consistent, on-going evaluation of our Student Learning Outcomes across two cohorts of program graduates. This fall the CD Program faculty will be reviewing our Student Learning Outcomes to ensure that they continue to be aligned with state and national certification requirements. A few minor changes have been made in those requirements and we anticipate that there may be a few adjustments to our Student Learning Outcomes. In addition, we have used the same portfolio evaluation tool for several years and have identified some possible modifications that will make the portfolio evaluation more effective and less redundant. The CD Program faculty will be discussing those options this fall semester.

**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 assessment data for 2009-2010 demonstrate that we continue to graduate students who are knowledgeable and skilled in all areas of speech-language pathology. We continue to have 100% of our graduates pass the national Praxis II exam in speech-language pathology on their first attempt and all successfully completed their program portfolio. We improved significantly in two areas of the Praxis II exam: 1) neurogenic disorders (in 2008-2009, 79% of the graduates scored in national average range or above and for this assessment cycle, we improved to 100%); and 2) audiology/hearing (in 2008-2009, our graduates scored in an average of 75% on this section and for this assessment cycle, we improved to 87%). The CD Program faculty will continue to meet and review our curriculum during the 2010-2011 academic year to ensure we are providing opportunities for our students to gain knowledge and skills across the scope of practice for speech-language pathology. This curriculum review may result in minor changes in course content or in more significant changes to the curriculum (e.g., combination of courses, addition of courses, sequencing of courses, etc.).

---
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**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, 6)**
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

---

**SLO 2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6)**
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
SLO 3: Understanding of research methods (G: 1, 2) (M: 4, 6)
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

SLO 4: Engagement with New Media (G: 2) (M: 7)
Given that our department's mission is centrally connected to the scholarly study of media in all its forms, and is also engaged in the production of works of media art (film and video), we believe that all MA students should actively engage themselves at some point in their tenure as graduate students with new media. For creative MA students, this would entail engagement with new media as an exhibition/distribution venue, or with development of moving-image productions which mobilize new media in creative new ways. For scholarly MA students, this would entail some exposure to new, online modes of critical engagement with media and image-making cultures.

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
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.3 Graduate Experience

M 1: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense (O: 2)
After the defense of the thesis prospectus, the examining committee evaluates the project on a scale of 1 to 4, with 2 being a low pass and 4 representing excellence. 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
Ideally, all students should score a 3 (good) or higher score on this measure. However, given that the prospectus is by definition a roadmap toward a finished project rather than the project itself, it is to be expected that a certain percentage of students will score 2 (fair to barely passing) on some measures of the prospectus evaluation, with the idea that it is only through the process of the defense that some difficult issues can be sorted out to the point where the thesis can proceed. Thus, an acceptable target here would probably be more like 75% scoring good or higher.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 12 MA students who defended a prospectus in 2009-10, 40% scored a "2: Fair or barely passing" in theoretical underpinnings of project, and 50% scored a "Fair" on methodological soundness. While, as noted above, a certain number of "fair" evaluations is to be expected at this early stage of a thesis project, these percentages are no doubt too high. (Please see Findings for measure 2 for additional analysis and information.)

M 2: Quality of creative or research thesis (O: 2)
After the thesis defense, the committee members evaluate the thesis on a 1 to 4 scale, with 2 representing mediocre but passable work, and 4 representing excellence.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
Here, the target should be 100% of theses at level 3 or level 4.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Different evaluation forms are used for creative theses and scholarly (research) theses. For the 5 creative theses which were successfully defended in the period, 100% were evaluated good to excellent in aesthetics and originality of artistic voice, while 80% were evaluated good to excellent in technical mastery. For the 5 research theses successfully defended in the period, we have evaluation data for 4. Of these, 50% were evaluated only fair on articulation of research problem, and again 50% were evaluated only fair on methodological soundness. If we look back at the data for prospectus evaluations, we see a similar percentage of unacceptably low scores in theoretical grounding and methodological soundness. Together, this suggests that perhaps the recommendations of the thesis committee at the time of prospectus defense were not adequately understood by the student.

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
### M 4: Quality of final methods project (O: 3)
Generally, the final project in our required course Comm 6303, 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 6303, Research Methods, should fall between 84 and 100 (B or higher).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Only 64% of students taking research methods received a B or higher, with 36% receiving a score in the range 80-83.

### M 5: Festival Participation for Film/Video students (O: 2)
A good benchmark for evaluating the level of our Film/Video students' work is by measuring the extent of their participation in local, regional, national, and international festivals. As image-making has become more and more prolific in the past ten years, the competition for screening slots in film festivals has become more and more intense; thus, acceptance of a work by a film festival, even locally or regionally, is a good indicator of quality of creative work. (This is true whether or not the work wins an award.) Thus, we will begin asking all production students to submit an end-of-year list of festival participation for the academic year.

Source of Evidence: Honors and awards outside the institution

**Target for O2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies**

All second and third year production students should submit work to some distribution venue. Because of the intense competition for screening space at film festivals today, we will not have a target percentage for acceptances at festivals.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No findings for academic year 2009-10. This is a new measure we will begin tracking in the current academic year.

### M 6: Online course-by-course tracking (O: 1, 2, 3)

Similar to the system we put in place for the doctoral program in Fall 2009, beginning in Spring 2010 we initiated an online system by which instructors are required to indicate levels of MA student competences in a number of key areas [writing skills, oral advocacy, knowledge of the literature, etc.]. This data is anonymized and presented as aggregate numbers for the MA program as a whole. Eventually, the system will allow us to identify problem areas among the MA student body and to formulate action items related to curricular improvements to address the problems. This system is not designed to identify the one or two students who are floundering in the program and facing severe difficulties, as those students and the faculty are likely to know this from grades (and the student in such a case would likely be on academic probation); so that interventions to attempt to solve the problem, whether by remediation or other means, would be quick. Rather, the system is designed to identify more pervasive, underlying structural problems that might otherwise fly under the radar screen without semester-by-semester data.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions**

Because the faculty assessment questionnaire is still in the process of being revised, (because the statistics that were generated in the first implementation of the system were not as useful as they could be), it is impossible at this point to set an achievement target for this measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

At present, the data generated by the first round of implementation of the questionnaire indicates that a revision of the questions is necessary. In addition, the programming of the aggregation of data has not been fully completed, making it very difficult to interpret. This will be solved in the next round of adjustments to the evaluation system.

**Target for O2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies**

Because the faculty assessment questionnaire is still in the process of being revised, (because the statistics that were generated in the first implementation of the system were not as useful as they could be), it is impossible at this point to set an achievement target for this measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

At present, the data generated by the first round of implementation of the questionnaire indicates that a revision of the questions is necessary. In addition, the programming of the aggregation of data has not been fully completed, making it very difficult to interpret. This will be solved in the next round of adjustments to the evaluation system.

**Target for O3: Understanding of research methods**

Because the faculty assessment questionnaire is still in the process of being revised, (because the statistics that were generated in the first implementation of the system were not as useful as they could be), it is impossible at this point to set an achievement target for this measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
At present, the data generated by the first round of implementation of the questionnaire indicates that a revision of the questions is necessary. In addition, the programming of the aggregation of data has not been fully completed, making it very difficult to interpret. This will be solved in the next round of adjustments to the evaluation system.

**M 7: Student engagement with new media (O: 4)**

Starting in the academic year 2010-11, we will begin to track the extent of student engagement with new media. For students in the scholarly tracks of the MA, we will ask them to summarize such engagement annually. (The fact that our department has just taken over the editorship of the online journal In Media Res, which is devoted to making innovative interventions in the mediascape via combinations of moving images and text, might provide both MA and PhD students with opportunities to do scholarly new media work.) For creative students, we will look at the extent to which they use new media in innovative ways, whether in specifically interactive projects or in a more "trans-media" way.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O4: Engagement with New Media**

Since engagement with new media is not mandated by course requirements (except in certain production and new media courses), the target should not be set at 100% (even though, ideally, at some future point, we would want to get all students to engage with new media). It would seem reasonable to begin with a target of 50% for this measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

None. We have only just implemented this objective, and so will begin tracking in the current 2010-11 academic year.

**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Quality of final methods project  
  Outcome/Objective: Understanding of research methods  
- Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense  
  Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

### Develop Assessment Form for Research Thesis

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Angelo Restivo. Graduate Committee.

### 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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Quality of creative or research thesis  
  Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies  
- Measure: Quality of final theory papers  
  Outcome/Objective: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions  
- Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense  
  Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

**Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee, Graduate Faculty
Begin measuring film-video student presence at film festivals

Beginning in the current 2010-11 academic year, we will encourage 2nd and 3rd year MA film/video production students to submit work to festivals, and we will gather data on results at the end of the academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships: (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Festival Participation for Film/Video students | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

Responsible Person/Group: Restivo; production faculty

Measure student engagement with new media

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships: (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Student engagement with new media | Outcome/Objective: Engagement with New Media

Implementation Description: This would be done by required submission of end-of-year cv (or other list) detailing activities in this area, delivered to the graduate directors.

Responsible Person/Group: Restivo

Post-defense writing assignment for prospectuses rated "fair"

Since a prospectus which passes, even with fair evaluations by the committee, does not need to be rewritten, we should begin to encourage chairs of committees, in cases where the committee evaluation of the prospectus was 'fair' in any category, to assign the student the task of writing a several page summary of the issues raised by the committee and the steps the student will take to address those issues.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships: (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Quality of creative or research thesis | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
  Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Faculty

Reconfigure data collection system for semester-end assessments

The implementation of a complex, computer-driven system of data collection is obviously a complicated task which must proceed to a certain extent by trial and error. Sprint 2010 being the first semester of data collection for MA course performance, a number of glitches became evident which now must be addressed. For the MA data, the most pressing need is the development of a coherent method of aggregation and presentation of the collected data. Currently, the data has been presented in ways that are difficult to interpret. Also, a deadline for the production of the final report on Spring semester needs to be established, so that the data will be available by a given date, for reporting purposes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships: (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Online course-by-course tracking | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of research methods
  Measure: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions | Written, oral, and media-making competencies

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee, which will delegate to Fujikawa and Wilkin, both of whom do data-driven research and are thus conversant in the required programming skills.
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Research proficiency (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proven ability to engage in high quality independent research, evidencing competence in a broad range of methodologies (textual analysis, historical research, ethnographic data, etc., as appropriate to the context).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Proficiency in communication theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Competence in oral and written communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Teaching excellence (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated excellence in teaching courses in both the introductory courses in the field and in the student’s areas of specialization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience
6.3 Graduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Professional development (G: 3) (M: 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 organization in their area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Increase student engagement with new media (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now that the Communication Department has taken over editorship of the online journal In Media Res (under the editorship of Alisa Perren), the opportunities for doctoral student involvement in new media work has increased. [In Media Res is not simply an online journal which follows the template of conventional journals; rather, it is a site for curated interventions in the mediascape, incorporating moving images and text. As such, it exemplifies a different type of scholarship that is emerging, one more fully connected to the idea of “trans-media” that is currently gaining conceptual currency.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### In Media Res

[In Media Res is not simply an online journal which follows the template of conventional journals; rather, it is a site for curated interventions in the mediascape, incorporating moving images and text. As such, it exemplifies a different type of scholarship that is emerging, one more fully connected to the idea of “trans-media” that is currently gaining conceptual currency.]
Measures, Targets, and Findings

O1: Research proficiency

During the first year of implementation, we expected to get a set of baseline numbers with which to set an achievement target. However, the data gathered in this first year makes setting targets difficult (see findings section for details).

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

For the PhD program, end of semester assessments via the computerized data collection system were conducted in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. Data aggregation is the first issue that we encountered: and at present, we have data that is aggregated for Fall 2009, but the data for Spring 2010 is still in an unusable state. The data for Fall 2009 was parsed by "reporting event" rather than by student; ie, students who took three seminars in Fall represent 3 reported assessment instances for any given assessment item. This needs to be corrected: for now, I must report findings in terms of "student-course-events," of which there were 42 in Fall 2009. (This could translate to 14 graduate students if all were taking a full load of three seminars; likely, though, that part time students meant that there are more than 14 total students represented in the numbers.) For all of the 13 questions, the median score was 4 out of 5; while the mean score fell between ±0.18 of 4. Thus, the data spread here indicates that the questions should be reformulated to allow for wider variation in the results. When one looks at the spread of data for each individual question, one does find that in writing skills, for example, 3 to 6 "student-course-events" (ie, likely one or two students, but not clear) are writing well below average, while about 6 more "s-c-e"s (ie, probably 2 other students) are at only a fairly good level. With only slight variation (ie, one "student-course-event") this same distribution is repeated for assessment of ability to conduct high-level research, oral presentation skills, and mastery of content. Thus, to summarize, the statistics do not give us data yet that can produce clearly targeted action items, because of both the scale of the assessment questionnaire and the parsing of the results. (For example, we are not yet able to parse the data by semester-in-program: thus, for example, while it might be reasonable to expect one or two students to have below-average doctoral-level writing skills in the first semester, it would be much more serious if those evaluations applied to third-semester students.) See action plan.
**Target for O2: Proficiency in communication theory**

During the first year of implementation, we expected to get a set of baseline numbers with which to set an achievement target. However, the data gathered in this first year makes setting targets difficult (see findings section for details).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

For the PhD program, end of semester assessments via the computerized data collection system were conducted in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. Data aggregation is the first issue that we encountered: and at present, we have data that is aggregated for Fall 2009, but the data for Spring 2010 is still in an unusable state. The data for Fall 2009 was parsed by "reporting event" rather than by student; ie, students who took three seminars in Fall represent 3 reported assessment instances for any given assessment item. This needs to be corrected: for now, I must report findings in terms of "student-course-events," of which there were 42 in Fall 2009. (This could translate to 14 graduate students if all were taking a full load of three seminars; likely, though, that part time students meant that there are more than 14 total students represented in the numbers.) For all of the 13 questions, the median score was 4 out of 5; while the mean score fell between +/-0.18 of 4. Thus, the data spread here indicates that the questions should be reformulated to allow for wider variation in the results. When one looks at the spread of data for each individual question, one does find that in writing skills, for example, 3 to 6 "student-course-events" (ie, likely one or two students, but not clear) are writing well below average, while about 6 more "s-c-e"'s (ie, probably 2 other students) are at only a fairly good level. With only slight variation (ie, one "student-course-event") this same distribution is repeated for assessment of ability to conduct high-level research, oral presentation skills, and mastery of content. Thus, to summarize, the statistics do not give us data yet that can produce clearly targeted action items, because of both the scale of the assessment questionnaire and the parsing of the results. (For example, we are not yet able to parse the data by semester-in-program; thus, for example, while it might be reasonable to expect one or two students to have below-average doctoral-level writing skills in the first semester, it would be much more serious if those evaluations applied to third-semester students.) See action plan.

**Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication**

During the first year of implementation, we expected to get a set of baseline numbers with which to set an achievement target. However, the data gathered in this first year makes setting targets difficult (see findings section for details).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

For the PhD program, end of semester assessments via the computerized data collection system were conducted in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. Data aggregation is the first issue that we encountered: and at present, we have data that is aggregated for Fall 2009, but the data for Spring 2010 is still in an unusable state. The data for Fall 2009 was parsed by "reporting event" rather than by student; ie, students who took three seminars in Fall represent 3 reported assessment instances for any given assessment item. This needs to be corrected: for now, I must report findings in terms of "student-course-events," of which there were 42 in Fall 2009. (This could translate to 14 graduate students if all were taking a full load of three seminars; likely, though, that part time students meant that there are more than 14 total students represented in the numbers.) For all of the 13 questions, the median score was 4 out of 5; while the mean score fell between +/-0.18 of 4. Thus, the data spread here indicates that the questions should be reformulated to allow for wider variation in the results. When one looks at the spread of data for each individual question, one does find that in writing skills, for example, 3 to 6 "student-course-events" (ie, likely one or two students, but not clear) are writing well below average, while about 6 more "s-c-e"'s (ie, probably 2 other students) are at only a fairly good level. With only slight variation (ie, one "student-course-event") this same distribution is repeated for assessment of ability to conduct high-level research, oral presentation skills, and mastery of content. Thus, to summarize, the statistics do not give us data yet that can produce clearly targeted action items, because of both the scale of the assessment questionnaire and the parsing of the results. (For example, we are not yet able to parse the data by semester-in-program; thus, for example, while it might be reasonable to expect one or two students to have below-average doctoral-level writing skills in the first semester, it would be much more serious if those evaluations applied to third-semester students.) See action plan.

**M2: 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Our students again this year performed excellently in the classroom as graduate teaching assistants. Some of our advanced doctoral students had the opportunity to teach upper-level (4000-level) undergraduate courses on a variety of subjects related to their own research, in such courses as Gender and Film, Third Cinema, and topics courses on Kubrick and Bergman. The total number of sections taught by teaching assistants was 150; of these, 127 (or 85%) scored 4.0 or higher on question 17 of the student evaluations. Of the 49 students who taught, 46 of them scored at least 4.0 or higher on question 17 for at least one of the sections they taught.

**M3: 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
14 of our doctoral students took comprehensive exams this academic year. Of these, one received a high pass, 12 passed, and one student failed one area of the exam and was required to rewrite that area.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students taking doctoral comprehensive exams should pass, ideally on the first attempt.

14 of our doctoral students took comprehensive exams this academic year. Of these, one received a high pass, 12 passed, and one student failed one area of the exam and was required to rewrite that area.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In all, our doctoral students presented at 53 conferences this academic year. Our students are highly visible in the three national conferences that are aligned with our doctoral tracks: 14 students presented at NCA, 6 students presented at SCMS (with one of those having also organized an entire panel on Film Festival Studies), and 2 presented at AEJMC. Students presented 12 times at regional conferences, where one received a top paper, one a top student paper, and a third presented on a top paper panel. A large number of our students (a total of 19 papers) present at small but often prestigious "boutique" conferences, including such conferences as World Picture, Console-ing Passions, the National Council of Black Studies, and others.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In terms of actual publication, two of our doctoral students have essays forthcoming in peer-reviewed journals, three have essays accepted for publication in collections, and one has published in conference proceedings. In addition, four students coauthored with faculty, with one of those coauthored articles under review at a journal. Clearly, our doctoral students are not publishing at a level consistent with their high participation in conference presentation, and more needs to be done in this area.
### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

In terms of actual publication, two of our doctoral students have essays forthcoming in peer-reviewed journals, three have essays accepted for publication in collections, and one has published in conference proceedings. In addition, four students coauthored with faculty, with one of those coauthored articles under review at a journal. Clearly, our doctoral students are not publishing at a level consistent with their high participation in conference presentation, and more needs to be done in this area.

### M 6: Number of students engaged in new media (O: 6)

As part of the year-end evaluations of graduate student performance, we will begin to track the number of students who are actively involved in producing content for the online site In Media Res, or who are actively integrating new media with scholarly work and research, whether by creation of web content, innovative use of social media, or other.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O6: Increase student engagement with new media**

We will not set an achievement target until we gather data at the end of the first year of tracking.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

New measure: we will not having findings until end of academic year 2011.

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

#### Enhance recruitment of doctoral students

This has been moved from "Action item" to "Objective (not associated with learning outcome)".

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Presentation of work at conferences
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professional development

**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.

- **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
- **Proficiency in communication theory**
- **Measure:** Publication in peer reviewed journals
- **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in oral and written communication
- **Professional development**

#### 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Presentation of work at conferences
- **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in oral and written communication
- **Professional development**

#### 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Student teaching evaluations
- **Outcome/Objective:** Teaching excellence

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

#### More faculty observation of student teaching

---

**More faculty observation of student teaching**
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 students taking scheduled 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.

Revised doctoral proseminar curriculum
At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new prosemin format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosemin 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 prosemin will help bring the students more quickly up to speed in the theoretical foundations of the field, and in their oral and written proficiency.

Bring top doctoral applicants to department in mid February
Now that we have moved the application deadlines up to December 1, we are planning to bring to the department our top doctoral applicants in mid February; we believe that we can significantly improve our yield in doctoral student recruitment by exposing them to the faculty and grad students in the department.

Continue annual manuscript workshops with senior scholars
The first workshop with Dudley Andrew from Yale was a great success, and the upcoming workshop with Ernesto Laclau promises to be the same. By continuing the bring the highest-level scholars to our department, we expect to increase departmental visibility both nationally and internationally, and thus increase the quality of our doctoral applicant pool.

Continue the Moving Image Studies conference
Currently, the Moving Image Studies conference set for Feb 2011 promises to bring a highly visible group of scholars together under the theme of "Rendering the Visible." The area should consider continuing this conference, perhaps biennially given the vast time commitments a conference like this requires, rotating themes and principal faculty.
Institute earlier application deadlines for graduate application
Because the Grad Committee discovered that we were losing our best applicants to other programs in part because our application deadlines were so late in the cycle, we moved the doctoral application deadlines to Dec 1 (Feb 1 for no GTA consideration); and the MA deadlines to Feb 1/ Mar 15. This is in keeping with other, competitive departments’ deadlines.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee, in consultation with Graduate Admissions (Amber Amari, Chad Van Gorden)

Investigate option for non-thesis MA
The Graduate Committee has charged a subcommittee with investigating the possibility of a non-thesis MA, for those students coming out of a BA program who want to move quickly into the PhD track. We may be losing some of the best applicants to doctoral programs in our areas because of we cannot provide a faster track toward the doctorate. This policy (which is currently only under consideration, and would need to be approved by the Executive Committee and eventually the entire faculty) is in keeping with the practices of many graduate departments in our field (especially in the moving image studies area).

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Revamp end-of-semester online assessment of doctoral students
Given the described problems in the current set of data generated by the pilot assessment year, the following recommendations have been presented to the Graduate Committee: 1. Aggregate data by student for each semester; 2. Assign semester-in-program numbers to each student and generate data spreads under that variable. 3. Revise the evaluation questionnaire both to a/ eliminate redundancies; and b/ eliminate categories that will not lead to identification of actionable issues; and most important, c/ revise assessment rubrics to produce a wider spread in the results, to be accomplished by adopting standards of the profession and not expectations of a graduate student. 4. Establish coherent methods of reporting and presenting data, as well as a deadline for each semester's data.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Online end-of-semester assessments | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication
  Measure: Online end-of-semester assessments | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory | Research proficiency
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee; Fujioka and Wilkin for statistical design; Restivo, Stuckey, and committee members for assessment questions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Computer Information Systems MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(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
### 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)**

<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>4.43 Effective utilization of resources</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>

**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. Fails 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This objective and the related course will be assessed in next year's assessment.

### 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: Students will develop a work breakdown structure for a project, estimate normal activity durations, develop a project network, load and level resources, update the project plan, and use earned value analysis to assess the status of the project. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Develop a work breakdown structure for a project, estimate normal activity durations, develop a project network, load and level resources, update the project plan, and use earned value analysis to assess the status of the project. Students were able to accurately develop a work breakdown structure for a project, estimate normal activity durations, develop a project network, load and level resources, update the project plan, and use earned value analysis to assess the status of the project. Students were able to accurately develop a work breakdown structure for a project, estimate normal activity durations, develop a project network, load and level resources, update the project plan, and use earned value analysis to assess the status of the project.
**Mission / Purpose**

The application of information technology to organizational functions has shifted from supplanting basic operational tasks to the evolution of an intelligent information infrastructure which supports knowledge-workers within the organization as well as customers of the organization. Underlying these changes is an ever more rapidly developing technology with dramatically changing economics, pushing the envelope of what is possible and desirable. In this environment of dynamic and pervasive technology development and diffusion, the mission of the BBA-CIS program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business and technical knowledge with the latest software development tools and techniques to create information systems that will meet the needs of tomorrow's organizations. Number of graduates from this BBA CIS degree program this academic year: Summer 2009 9 Fall 2009 41 Spring 2010 38 The number of students in this program major: Summer 2009 241 Fall 2009 462 Spring 2010 488 Previous academic year graduates: Summer 2008 15 Fall 2008 24 Spring 2009 21 The number of students in this program major during previous academic year: Summer 2008 211 Fall 2008 399 Spring 2009 423 General approach As part of the ongoing assessment of our CIS BBA program, the CIS department has leveraged the CIS 4980 "Capstone" course project. 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 http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/RBC/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm. CIS has developed a survey to gain structured and free form feedback from individuals involved with CIS 4980 "Capstone" 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 http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/undergraduate/C__GSU_assessment_CISBBACapstoneSurveyForm05052008.pdf. 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

**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:** Finished
- **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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Written Assignments Score: 2.33/3.0 : 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 Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls Falls 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Midterm Paper Score: 2.66/3.0 : 100% of students at or above the 2.0 rating.

**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

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Computer Information Systems BBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The application of information technology to organizational functions has shifted from supplanting basic operational tasks to the evolution of an intelligent information infrastructure which supports knowledge-workers within the organization as well as customers of the organization. Underlying these changes is an ever more rapidly developing technology with dramatically changing economics, pushing the envelope of what is possible and desirable. In this environment of dynamic and pervasive technology development and diffusion, the mission of the BBA-CIS program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business and technical knowledge with the latest software development tools and techniques to create information systems that will meet the needs of tomorrow's organizations.

Number of graduates from this BBA CIS degree program this academic year: Summer 2009 9 Fall 2009 41 Spring 2010 38 The number of students in this program major: Summer 2009 241 Fall 2009 462 Spring 2010 488 Previous academic year graduates: Summer 2008 15 Fall 2008 24 Spring 2009 21 The number of students in this program major during previous academic year: Summer 2008 211 Fall 2008 399 Spring 2009 423 General approach As part of the ongoing assessment of our CIS BBA program, the CIS department has leveraged the CIS 4980 "Capstone" course project. 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 http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/RBC/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm. CIS has developed a survey to gain structured and free form feedback from individuals involved with CIS 4980 "Capstone" 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 http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/undergraduate/C__GSU_assessment_CISBBACapstoneSurveyForm05052008.pdf. 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 “open” 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).

### Goals

**G 1: CIS BBA Program Goals**

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.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 12)**

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 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 design current system 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 develop 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 write object-oriented programs will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to write object-oriented programs will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

| 7 Technology |

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

4.54

**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.
clients, observing faculty, and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Developed Program Specifications (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</td>
<td>4.39</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</td>
<td>4.31</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Developed Architecture (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture</td>
<td>4.0</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Designed programs (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed the programs according to specifications</td>
<td>4.32</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: Coded and Developed (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded/developed the specified &amp; designed programs</td>
<td>4.34</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language</td>
<td>4.14</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 for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
4.17

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
4.26

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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
3.94

M 12: Appropriately used business process modeling concepts (O: 1)
 Appropriately used Business Process Modeling Concepts
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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
3.83

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: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation | Outcome/Objective: Students will be proficient in systems analysis

Implementation Description: After Fall 2009 survey results are in.
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
Projected Completion Date: 01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC
**Mission / Purpose**

The effective deployment of information technology is one of the keys to business success. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete in an increasingly interconnected global economy. In many respects these applications and technologies are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The CIS Graduate Program aims to develop specialists and managers with the combination of business and technology skills needed to continue competitive advancement of American industry. The mission of the CIS major in the Master of Science program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business knowledge with the latest software engineering tools and techniques to create and manage information systems that allow organizations to compete in the global marketplace.

Number of graduates in the MS CIS/IS degree program: 
- Summer 2006: 3
- Fall 2006: 3
- Spring 2007: 5
- Summer 2007: 3
- Fall 2007: 4
- Spring 2008: 3
- Summer 2008: 3
- Fall 2008: 3
- Spring 2009: 3
- Summer 2009: 5
- Fall 2009: 3
- Spring 2010: 4

Note that this is very close to 4.0.

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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

We offer three examples as evidence of this:

1) The disciplinary core. Our discipline is at the nexus of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Social Organizations. The modern business, governmental and Nonprofit organization is increasingly dependent upon these technologies to compete in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. Both these technologies and the organizational settings in which they are embedded are highly dynamic, and emergent settings. As such our discipline, and our curricula, must necessarily address those principles and skills that are stable over time, but also to anticipate where changing technical and social/political realities may lead. 2) Economic necessity. The triple-whammy of the dot com implosion, the economic downturn of post 9/11 economy and the accelerated global sourcing of digital work have conspired to reverse a 15 year trend of enrollment growth to a period of contraction and rebuilding. The net result of these continuous and dramatic underlying technological and social changes is that the content of virtually all CIS courses and the curriculum itself is in constant flux. Thus, by technical and economic necessity, the CIS faculty are confronted with compelling reasons for continuous improvement of our programs, course offerings and course content. We offer three examples as evidence of this attention to continuous curricular improvement. The first is that in the past 5 years the curriculum has undergone two major revisions at each the undergraduate and graduate programs and is in the stages of yet another substantial revamping. Secondly, three times in the past five years faculty have engaged Chief Information Officers and other leaders from major Atlanta Metropolitan business and service industry organizations in group discussion covering the nature and content of our programs and course offerings. A fourth such process is in the offing for early 2007. And thirdly, CIS faculty hold leadership positions in the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) special interest group on computer personnel research (SIG CPR) and make a specific study of study the changing technical skill sets required of our graduates in the workforce. Our faculty are represented on Microsoft's academic advisory board and routinely engage with CIO and CTO level personnel in other industry and academic venues, which coupled with an active field research agenda provides a view of the changing skill-sets needed by our students. Thus, at both holistic and detailed levels of analysis, CIS faculty attempt to keep abreast of societal and technical changes requiring curricular adjustment. This document is, however, largely concerned with course-level assessment. It depends on direct measures of curricular competence, i.e., student exams, projects and presentations. Because it is an analysis of the artifacts of the curriculum and instructional activity, it is also an indirect assessment exercise. This assessment exercise addresses the fidelity by which the core course set in our CIS major meets a set of stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are represented below. Figure 1 (Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2008) Course-level Assessment method As is typical student performance was measured by sets of direct and indirect measures of exams, homework, projects and presentations, adjudicated by the principal instructor, and in many cases, with the participation of other faculty and industry representatives as outside adjudicators. The course level assessment provided herein was arrived at by indirect means; that is, via the evaluation of static artifacts. Those assessments were based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall learning objectives. For each of the core courses the departmental evaluation committee developed a survey instrument (c.f., Figure 1). The draft instrument was created from published course documents and then reviewed by instructional staff to access the efficacy of the instrument and the completeness of the courses learning objectives. At the conclusion of the Fall and Spring term instructional faculty were asked to provide a sampling representing 15% of the student's work, with the provision that there should be a minimal sub-set of work representing all the stated learning objectives. These materials were made available to the assessment team of faculty, and PhD students. Those evaluating review all documents and the course syllabi and relevant assignment materials then completed the assessment questionnaire. The summary results are reported herein and the overall summary of the graduate assessment may be found at: (To Be Completed for 2006-2007). A fuller description of the assessment process is represented by the diagram above (except figure 1 here) and may be found in Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2006 from which we excerpted this diagram.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Computer Information Systems MS**

As of: 12/12/2010 03:57 PM EST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
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 proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1:</strong> Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Create environments for programs and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Manage an information technology project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: III.2: Manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Manage an information technology project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: IV.1: Identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4:</strong> Build and renew business via technology &amp; process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: IV.2: Diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations enabled by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 target”), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve “level 3” (“exceeds the target”), according to the evaluation rubric.

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.

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.

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.
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.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 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

O/O 2: Word Processing Application Software (M: 3)
Students will learn the necessary components of word processing that will enable them to write term papers, reports, and research papers

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

O/O 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

O/O 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

O/O 5: Web Development (M: 5)
Students will learn how to use the language of the Internet (HTML) in order to create web pages. This includes creating links so that users can navigate from one page to another.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Technology

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Chart drawing (O: 3)
Students are to extract data from a spreadsheet and use this to draw charts for various functions. This includes formatting the charts as well.

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**

Proper curves should be generated for charts with appropriate labels

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

About 88% of the students were able to do this correctly.

**M 2: Formatting slides (O: 4)**

Students should create slides to demonstrate some functions. This includes labeling the slides appropriately

**Target for O4: Presentation Application Software**

The presentation should include multiple number of slides with appropriate titles. Each slide importing figures or text accordingly.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Most students could generate the slides accordingly. The imported figures were not always formatted as well as expected

**M 3: Generate documents (O: 2, 3)**

Students should generate a document that imports charts from a spreadsheet. The document should include comparisons as well as a variation in formats for headers and the text body.

**Target for O2: Word Processing Application Software**

The documents would not only include text, but also charts from a spreadsheet. The charts should be easy to read and the description/comparisons should be detailed and formatted nicely.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially 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.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

About 90% of the students did well with this objective. The main problem was that they were not able to justify their choices clearly. This could be tied back to critical thinking or writing objectives

**M 5: Website design (O: 5)**

Students are to design a website using HTML as the programming language. Their design has certain specifications required, such as linking pages, format, and headers.

**Target for O5: Web Development**

Students should be able to follow a flowchart for a website design. There should be multiple pages linked together including tags. The formats should adhere to specifications and include headers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - 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.
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

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Computer Science BS
As of 12/12/2016 03:57 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 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 problem-solvers; students will demonstrate clearer critical thinking, students will gain knowledge of the discipline; students will gain skills necessary to be successful in the discipline

### Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Computer Systems Development (G: 1) (M: 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

#### O/O 2: Programming Skills (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the current, best-practices programming paradigms 2) to apply high-level programming languages to implement the programming paradigms.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### O/O 3: Algorithm Design and Analysis (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles and methods of analyzing algorithms 2) to analyze complexity of problems and algorithms 3) to formulate optimization problems 4) to apply algorithmic techniques to optimization problems.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 3 Collaboration
- 5 Contemporary Issues
- 7 Technology

#### O/O 4: Discrete Mathematics (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)
Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles of discrete math 2) to formulate problems and theorems 3) to construct and evaluate the validity of proofs 4) to apply discrete structures for solving problems in computer science.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 1 Written Communication
- 7 Technology

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### O/O 5: Hardware Systems (G: 1) (M: 3)
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
- 4.3 Technology
- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Alumni Surveys
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

### M2: 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

### M3: 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 2009-2010 - 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. On average the writing skills of our seniors were slightly improved compared to the previous year.

**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 2009-2010 - 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. On average the writing skills of our seniors were slightly improved compared to the previous year.

### M4: 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

**Target for O2: Programming Skills**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**Target for O4: Discrete Mathematics**
Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department`s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.
**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**M 5: Examinations (O: 1, 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 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.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Computer Systems Development**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**Target for O2: Programming Skills**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding.

**Target for O4: Discrete Mathematics**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domain basics and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - 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.

**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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Written Assignments and Reports
  - Outcome/Objective: Programming Skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Computer Science MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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.

### 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

**O/O 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.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Research Publications (O: 2, 4)</td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 5)</td>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Communication</strong></td>
<td>Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 2, 5)</td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations</strong></td>
<td>The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Associations

- 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
- 6.3 Graduate Experience
### 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.

### 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.

**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.

### Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

### 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
 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)

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Computer Science PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Computer Science Foundations (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Students should be able to: 1. Describe the principles and methods of (a) discrete mathematics, (b) best-practices programming paradigms, parallel and distributed computing (c) algorithm analysis, theory of computation, and complexity analysis, (d) computer & hardware systems development, (e) advanced network-oriented software engineering, and (d) deductive databases and logic programming. 2. Develop models and corresponding optimization problem formulations, analyze computational complexity of problem formulations and applicable algorithmic approaches. 3. Apply (a) discrete structures for solving problems in computer science, (b) algorithmic techniques to optimization problems, (c) high-level programming languages, parallel and distributed computing to implement the programming paradigms, and (d) advanced software engineering and modeling techniques for specification of computer systems and implementing the phases of hardware development.
### Strategic Plan Associations

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.3 Graduate Experience

#### O/O 2: Teaching (G: 1) (M: 1)

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

#### O/O 3: Communication (G: 1) (M: 3, 4, 5)

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

#### 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

#### O/O 5: Collaboration (G: 1) (M: 4)

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

#### O/O 6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration) (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students should be able to: (a) analyze, correlate and extract information from biological and chemical databases with emphasis on the sequence and structure of proteins and nucleic acids, (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

### 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

#### 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.

**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.
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.

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 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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).

Target for O3: Communication
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned
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).

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).

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) |
| Computer Science Foundations

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alumni Surveys | Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations

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
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director and Graduate Faculty

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Concentration in Business Analysis MBA
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Goals

G 1: Goal of the MBA Concentration in Business Analysis
The goal of the Concentration in Business Analysis for students in the MBA program is to provide students seeking a degree a broader MBA education with a meaningful exposure to an array of tools, techniques and frameworks used in business analysis and with techniques for using those tools, techniques and frameworks effectively with other functional information to improve decision making in both profit and not-for-profit organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (M: 1)
Students should be able to qualitatively state the key issues clearly and accurately the issues in a business problem.

SLO 2: Model Building Ability (M: 2)
Students will be able to clearly identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics in a given business problem.

Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (O: 1)

Students will be measured on their ability to:
1. Understand the business goals.
2. Identify the key variables that need to be analyzed.
3. Analyze the potential relationships among the variables.
4. 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

Achievement Target: 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 Administration 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Excellent (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Competent (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- Understanding the business goal / issues
- Identifying Key variables that need to be analyzed
- Analysis potential relationships among variables
- Interpretation of results

Over 80% of the students scored above 3 on all elements of this measure.

#### M2: Model Building Ability (O: 2)

In developing a model students will be measured on their ability to:
1. Identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics.
2. Identify key independent variables and their metrics.
3. Manage data collection, cleaning, and transformation.
4. 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 Administration 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Excellent (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Competent (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Ineffective (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- Identifying the dependent variables and appropriate metrics
- Identifying Key independent variables and their metrics
- 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.

#### M3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 3)

Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

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

#### Target for O3: Understanding of Techniques
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
1.1 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
1.4 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
1.5 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.1 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.2 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. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.1 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.2 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. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.1 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.2 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. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.1 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.2 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. 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>

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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.

#### 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: 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.

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

#### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

#### 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.

#### Institutional Priority Associations

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

#### Strategic Plan Associations
### SLO 4: HR Law (M: 6, 7)
The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify and address potential legal issues, relevant laws, and appropriate policies to address.

### 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: 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 HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the MBA Concentration in HR Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Faculty rating of 1.7/3.0. 64% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Faculty rating of 1.7/3.0. 64% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

#### 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 HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 Rubric to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Faculty rating of 1.6/3.0. 52% 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Faculty rating of 1.75/3.0. 69% 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 HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to
randomly selected case analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 1.81/3.0. 69% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

**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 the role of legal constraints on HR activities and policies. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 7: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 1.61/3.0. 51% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** HR Faculty
- **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: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Resource Identification in HR | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues. | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving
Implementation Description: Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Added Lecture in MGS 8300
Add an additional 30 minute lecture in MGS 8300 on business strategies and appropriate HR strategies for each. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Links with Business Strategy | Outcome/Objective: Links with Business Strategy
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Change Lecture in MGS 8395
Add a 30-minute lecture in the MGS 8395 class on problem identification and problem statement. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues. | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Graduation Requirement Change and Multi-Course Law Additions
Require MBA students to take MGS 8390. Add an additional 30-minute lecture in each class (MGS 8320, MGS 8360, MGS 8390). Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Law and Issue Identification | Outcome/Objective: HR Law
Implementation Description: Action needed through Graduate Program Council
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Homework Review - Strategic HR Concept
Spend additional class time going over homework assignment to link strategies and HR policies. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: HR Formulation Techniques | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
HR Strategy and Communication
With respect to the third learning outcome, the student's ability to understand and effectively communicate how HR strategies support employer business strategies, two actions will be taken: Add a short reading about problem statement to the MGS 8300 class. Reevaluate after next offering. Spend an additional 30 minutes in MGS 8390 on business strategies and appropriate HR strategies for each. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Reading Changes in MGS 8360
Assign readings to MGS 8360 and require students to explain conclusions and implications in their own words. Discuss in class. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: General Understanding of HR in Organizations | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Concentration in the MBA program through continual revision and improvement of the curriculum.

**G 2: Attract Higher Performancing Students**
One goal of the MBA Concentration in Operations Management program is to attract a disproportionate percentage of students from the upper half of the MBA program in order to facilitate better learning through increased quality of classroom discussions.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: A Strategic view of OM (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
The courses in this concentration will develop in the student a strategic view of Operations Management. That means that students will not only know the particulars of a topic in Operations Management, but will also be able to understand how that topic integrates with other perspectives in larger organizational problems. Analysis conducted and recommendations made by a student completing this concentration with respect to larger organizational problems will include Operations Management insights, frameworks, and tools, along with those from other functional disciplines, in order formulating and implementing effective strategic actions.

### 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 and incorporate the operations management function into the decision process of the organization.

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Develop an Environmental Sustainability Viewpoint (M: 5)**
The student should become aware of the impact that OM and Supply Chain decisions have on the environment and industrial sustainability. They should be able to select the appropriate solutions to OM problems in the environmental/sustainability framework.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 4: Become a Strong Team Member (M: 6)**
The students 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

### 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: A Strategic view of OM**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2.5 on the Rubric for Measure One Learning 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Integrated recommendations: The feedback from the student teams showed a strong ability to complet a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application.

**M 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 1)**

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: 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 Learning 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 easily determines the effects that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Integrated recommendations: The feedback from the student teams showed a strong ability to form insights and plans that will result in integrated solutions.

M 3: Performance (O: 1)

This item 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: 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 Learning 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 to 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Identify 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)

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

Not yet set - this is a new measure being added in this cycle.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
No results this year - this is a new measure being added in this cycle.

M 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation Skills (O: 3)

Will develop a focus and will highlight the effects that OM decisions have on the environmental and aspects of industry.

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

Target for O3: Develop an Environmental Sustainability Viewpoint

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Rubric for Measurements of Learning Objective 3: Develop an Environmental/Sustainability 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
No findings were reported in the 09-10 cycle. This will be applied for the first time in the 10-11 cycle.

M 6: Team Skills (O: 4)

The students 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

Target for O4: Become a Strong Team Member

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Objective 4: Become a Strong Team Member: Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 6 Team Skills The student did not develop team skills by indicated by poor returns on peer evaluations. The student develops team skills by
found by average returns on peer evaluations. The student develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
None reported. This will be assessed for the first time next year.

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’s long term shareholder value. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

An Environment Sustainability Viewpoint
With respect to the third learning outcome, develop an environment/sustainability 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: 12/2010
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, three 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.
- Add a couple of quiz to make students to make better preparations and improve learning outcomes. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
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
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Critical Thinking
The Operations Management faculty members will develop a measurement mechanism, including targeted assignments and exams, as well as a measuring rubric, for the assessment of the use of critical thinking skills in the solving of problems in operations management.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Develop Decision Making Abilities
# Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

## SLO 1: Managerial Skill Set

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.

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

## 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 Members  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2009-2010 Concentration in Real Estate MBA**  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1:** Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems  
(M: 1)

Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems

**SLO 2:** Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm (M: 2, 3, 4)

Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Evaluate corporate real estate organizational and operational structures using material from both real estate & MBA core classes (O: 1)**

Evaluate corporate real estate organizational and operational structures using material from both real estate and MBA core classes.  
Criterion: Identify key criteria and evaluate alternative structures. (RE8100)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems**

2.0

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Average on measure 2.0. 62% students met standard.

**M 2: Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals (O: 2)**

Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals  
Criterion 1: Understand the process for estimating workplace demand. (RE8100)  
Criterion 2: Understand the changing intersection of workers, space, and technology in designing workplaces. (RE8100)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm**

2.0

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Average on criterion 1, 2.2. 77% students met standard. Average on criterion 2, 2.5. 93% students met standard.

**M 3: Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies (O: 2)**

Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies  
Criterion: Identify key criteria and evaluate alternative real estate strategies to support common business strategies (RE8100)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm**

2.0

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Average 2.2. 69% students met standard.
M 4: Evaluate alternative locations and sites (O: 2)
Evaluate alternative locations and sites Criterion: Identify key criteria and evaluate alternative locations and sites to support core business strategies.(RE8100)
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm**

2.0

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Average 2.2. 78% students met standard.

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

**New Action Plan**
Review achievement targets. At present target is expressed as an average. The Department will review whether this should be modified to encompass a minimum percentage of students attaining target. Although the average target is met on all measures, a not insignificant percentage of students fail to meet the target on some measures. This is considered due to student weakness in readings to support their understanding of organizational structure and general strategic management. Attempts will therefore be made to identify which courses (outside of Real Estate) best prepare students in these areas and to refer students to the materials in those courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011

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?

No changes. Changes planned in coming year depend on progress in pursuit of relevant issues in the Action 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.

No changes to program or curricular design arose from this year's assessment. The impact of the data is to confirm as appropriate the program outcomes.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Counseling Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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.
**O/O 4: Understands relevant theories (M: 8, 9)**
Understand theories of human development, psychopathology, counseling process, and behavior change.

**O/O 5: Use and conduct research (M: 10)**
Use and conduct research

**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**
90% of students meet evaluation target

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Target met.

**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**
100% of students receive grade of B or better.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grade of B or better.

**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**
90% of students score a 3 or above on evaluation items.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target goal.

**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**
90% of students receive grade of B or better in course.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grade of B or better.

**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**
80% of students receive passing grade on ethics comprehensive area.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
80% of students received passing grade.

**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**
90% of students received grades of B or better in didactic courses related to key areas of the profession (e.g., Assessment).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students students received grades of B or better.

**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**
90% of students will receive a score of 3 or higher on practicum evaluation items.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target goal of receiving scores of 3 or higher on practicum evaluation items.

**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**
90% of students will receive grade of B or higher in theories courses.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grade of B or higher in theories courses.

**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**
80% of students will receive passing grade on Theory Comprehensive Question.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students received passing grade on Theory Comprehensive Question.

**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**
90% of students will receive grade of B or better in research courses.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grades of B or higher in research courses.

### 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:** 05/2011
- **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.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive examination question on ethics | Outcome/Objective: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Director of the program

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?

Started faculty discussion of overall assessment processes and the possibility of adopting a portfolio.

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 changes currently planned.

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 improvements were planned.

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 suggest adequate accomplishment of stated goals and objectives.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Continued faculty discussion about goals and objectives and their alignment with accreditation by the American Psychological Association.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Counselor Education PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Counselor Education and Practice Ph. D. program is designed to prepare students to work as counselor educators, supervisors, and advanced practitioners in academic, public schools, and clinical settings. The program accepts as a primary obligation extending the knowledge base of the counseling profession in a climate of scholarly inquiry. The doctoral program subscribes to a scientist-practitioner model and as such is designed to prepare students to be both consumer and producer of research.

Goals

G 1: Teaching
Students will gain knowledge and skills in teaching at the university level.

G 2: Research
Students will understand and become proficient in research related to the counseling profession.

G 3: Clinical Skills
Students will enhance their clinical skills.

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 effectively teach a 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 teaching section of the portfolio. Students must receive 2 out of 3 points.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
10 students were enrolled in CPS 9963. 4 of the students were not assessed on this outcome since they currently were not teaching or serving as teaching assistants. All 6 that were assessed received a 2 out of 3 on this outcome.

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
On question 5 of the Teaching Evaluation Form, students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest) with 80% receiving a 4 or 5.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students received at least a 3 on the Teaching Evaluation Form with the average being 4.75.

M 3: Teaching (O: 1)
On the teaching effectiveness question of the teaching evaluation form (please note depending on the version this question is either 13 or 17), 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
On question 8 of the Teaching Evaluation Form students will receive at least a 3 out of 5 with 80% receiving either a 4 or 5.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students received at least a 3 on the question related to teaching effectiveness with an average of 4.9 out of 5 points.

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 and submit their predissertation study.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All students who submitted their predissertation study received a pass for their project.
**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**
Students will receive a pass on the research portion of their written comprehensive examination.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
100% of the students who took their written comprehensive examination passed the research portion of their comprehensive 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 knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds. 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**
Students will receive at least 3 out of 5 on the relevant questions on the Supervisee Evaluation Form.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
1. On the question, "demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts", students have a mean of 4.5 with a 100% receiving at least a 4 or 5. 2. On the question, "demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession", students received a mean of 4.5 with a 100% receiving at least a 4 or 5. 3. On the question,"demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various backgrounds", students received a mean of 5 with 100% receiving a 5. 4. On the question, "understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients", students received a mean of 5, with 100% receiving a 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**
Students will receive at least a 3 on the relevant questions of Supervisor in Training Evaluation Forms, with 80% receiving at least a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
1. On question, "demonstrates knowledge of supervision theory and concepts", students received a mean of 4.4 with 100% receiving a 4 or 5. 2. On 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. 3. On question, "demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling/supervision profession and utilizes supervision to clarify ethical challenges faced with supervisee", the mean was 4.8 with 100% receiving a 4 or 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

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2009-2010 Criminal Justice Assessment of Core**
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(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**

Two sections of CRJU 2200 were offered during the Fall 2009 semester and three sections of the class were offered in Spring
2010. The data below apply to the three Spring 2010 sections taught by Dr. Wendy P. Guastaferro, Dr. Tim Brezina, and Dr. Dean Dabney, all of whom are all full-time faculty members. Each instructor 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 who are homeless are: A. People recently released from prison. B. Families.* C. Mentally ill D. A & C E. None of the above. Dabney's Sections Q1. What is the central premise behind the criminogenic hypothesis of crime in the US? A. It argues that US society directly causes crime. B. It argues that US society doesn't cause crime but it's organization and functioning increase the likely that crime will occur* C. It argues that crime and violence are inherent features in the human psyche. D. It argues that the spread of crime in the indirectly causes the social institutions of US society to break down or erode. Q2. What do Messner and Rosenfeld mean when, in Chapter 1 of their book, they make the statement that “America is a society organized for crime?” A. They argue that the same core values that stimulate prosperity in the US also have the unfortunate consequence of producing high levels of crime* B. They argue that our fascination with punishing bad people outweighs our commitment to economic prosperity and societal growth C. They argue that we stress community goals over individual needs and alienate people across the board D. They argue that poor personal choices and greed is to blame for our crime problem

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
There was a combined total of 145 students (N=45 for Guastaferro, 7 for Brezina, and 93 for Dabney) in the three CrJu 2200 courses assessed during the evaluation 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 84% ; Q2 Pass Rate was 96%. Dr. Brezina's sections Q1 Pass Rate was 100%; Q2 Pass Rate was 71%. Dr. Dabney's sections Q1 Pass Rate was 87%; Q2 Pass Rate was 95%.

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
There was a combined total of 145 students (N=45 for Guastaferro, 7 for Brezina, and 93 for Dabney) in the three CrJu 2200 courses assessed during the evaluation 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 88%; Q2 Pass Rate was 81%. Dr. Brezina's sections Q1 Pass Rate was 86%; Q2 Pass Rate was 86%. Dr. Dabney's sections Q1 Pass Rate was 90%; Q2 Pass Rate was 88%.

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
There was a combined total of 145 students (N=45 for Guastaferro, 7 for Brezina, and 93 for Dabney) in the three CrJu 2200 courses assessed during the evaluation 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 100%; Q2 Pass Rate was 90%. Dr. Brezina's sections Q1 Pass Rate was 100%; Q2 Pass Rate was 90%. Dr. Dabney's sections Q1 Pass Rate was 80%; Q2 Pass Rate was 86%.

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

#### 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
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
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

Review new core and course requirements
Review course learning outcomes and measure to ensure that new core outcome is appropriately reflected and assessed and to streamline reporting in the coming year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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 continues to discuss and refine its teaching and assessment practices for CRJU 2200. We are currently examining the university descriptions of and discussions about the new core missions and will work in the coming year to ensure that our core course is reflective of this mission. We also are collaborating at the department level about core content and assessment practices to ensure that we are prepared for the coming assessment window.

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 changes regarding the core are currently planned with regard to the educational program. Significant program changes were implemented in the fall of 2010 and are described elsewhere in the document (in the WEAVE discussion of the program). The Department is currently planning to gather data over the next three years to determine if changes enhanced programmatic outcomes.
Mission / Purpose
The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes the development of understanding about issues of crime and justice, particularly within urban environments using multicultural, interdisciplinary perspectives that inform science, policy, and practice. The educational mission of the Department of Criminal Justice is to disseminate knowledge and encourage critical analysis of information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant within the fields of criminal justice and criminology. We aim to produce students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for criminal justice positions in public and private agencies through education, training and research experiences.

Goals
G 1: Demonstrate understanding of the justice system
Students will develop knowledge about the functions and structures of the criminal justice system and issues related to crime and justice responses.

G 2: Develop/enhance critical thinking skills
Students will develop and enhance critical thinking skills, specifically concerning crime and justice issues.

G 4: Prepare for positions in the field
Students will develop the knowledge and skills, in particular oral and written communication skills, necessary to excel in public and private sector criminal justice positions.

G 3: Apply ethical frameworks
Students will develop knowledge about and learn to utilize ethical frameworks when considering issues in criminal justice decision-making.

G 5: Develop/enhance communication skills
Students will develop and enhance their communication skills, particularly through written and oral communication.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses (G: 2, 4) (M: 1, 3)
Students will demonstrate their ability to generate a thesis/hypothesis/statement of the problem in the generation of a critical analysis paper on a salient issue in the field of criminal justice.

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

SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their retention of knowledge about the criminal justice system and salient topical issues in the field in written form. Students will effectively communicate facts about an issue and apply theoretical frameworks to demonstrate the depth of both their knowledge and their ability to critically synthesize relevant information about that specific topic in this paper.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will develop and/or enhance skills in applying theoretical frameworks to contemporary issues in criminal justice. Students will be able to not only synthesize and interpret extant information, but also identify patterns within extant information, be able to compare and contrast different sides of a problem, and/or generate new predictions through their presentation in a written form.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 4: Generation of conclusions (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 1, 3)
Students will be able to develop meaningful conclusions from literature reviews and/or data analyses and/or be able to identify policy
implication given the evidence available.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 5: Written communication skills (G: 4, 5) (M: 1)
Students will be able to effectively communicate their knowledge and analytical skills in written form (paper). Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively identify issues, develop and organize subtopics, and generate streamlined presentations of information. In addition, students will utilize appropriate grammar and syntax, as well as the ability to adhere to APA style guidelines.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 6: Oral communication skills (G: 4, 5) (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively through oral presentations about criminal justice issues and processes using the spoken word. Students should be able to orally develop and present material that is organized, flows smoothly, and is engaging in a manner that is smooth and uses good grammar.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 7: Identification of ethical frameworks (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students should be able to identify and evaluate ethical issues that arise within the criminal justice system.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
CRJU 4930: Seminar in Criminal Justice is a key assessment course for the department. It is a capstone and the second of a two bookend courses designated as CTW. The CTW assignment, referenced as the Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay, is designed to test student's ability to critically evaluate an issue in criminology or criminal justice. The assignment, included as an attached document, requires students to identify a single issue from the internship experience, identify a relevant theory (criminological, sociological, psychological, organizational, or legal) that can be utilized to enhance 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: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses
80% of student papers will be rated as a 2, 3, or 4 on an assessment rubric at the end of the senior seminar. Please see attached rubric for achievement meanings associated with each category.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Two sections of the capstone seminar provided assessment data for this report, with the goal of ensuring that learning occurs in the course regardless of instructor. Section A of the capstone had 22 students. Of the 22 students only one demonstrated an early ability to identify (scored an 4), while 21 students were rated as a 0/1 (the instructor noted that some of these students failed to turn in a first draft). At the end of the semester, the following percentages for identification of an issue were reported: 4 - 23%; 3 – 31%; 2 – 23%; 0/1 – 23%. While in this class we fell slightly below our goal, it is notable that significant advances through the semester were apparent (from beginning score to end scores); only six students did not improve their scores (27%); one of these earned a 4 both drafts, while the other five earned a 0/1 on both drafts. Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted a 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).
Instructor notes indicated that slight to moderate improvements were seen across the drafts submitted in the semester, and that three final drafts (18%) were significantly or one scale unit higher on the final draft compared to the first draft of the essay overall.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 2, 3, or 4 on an assessment rubric at the end of the senior seminar. Please see attached rubric for achievement meanings associated with each category.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: One student (5%) earned an 4 rating; 7 students were rated as a 3 (31%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 0/1 (the instructor noted that some of these students failed to turn in a first draft). At the end of the semester 27% (n=6) student essays were rated as an 4; 41% (n=9) were rated as a 3; 27% (n=6) were rated as a 2; and 5% (n=1) was rated as a 0/1. Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester. Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 2, 3, or 4 on an assessment rubric at the end of the senior seminar. Please see attached rubric for achievement meanings associated with each category.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: One student (5%) earned an 4 rating; 7 students were rated as a 3 (31%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 0/1. At the end of the semester 31% (n=7) of the student essays were rated as an 4; 23% (n=5) were rated as a 3; 41% (n=9) were rated as a 2; and 5% (n=1) was rated as a 0/1. Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester, while 4 students maintained their skill levels. Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**Target for O4: Generation of conclusions**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 2, 3, or 4 on an assessment rubric at the end of the senior seminar. Please see attached rubric for achievement meanings associated with each category.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: One student (5%) earned a rating of 4; 5 students were rated as a 3 (23%) and 16 students (73%) were rated as a 0/1. At the end of the semester 9% (n=2) of the student essays were rated as an 4; 50% (n=11) were rated as a 3; 36% (n=8) were rated as a 2, and one was rated as a 0/1 (5%). Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester, while 3 students (14%) maintained their skill levels. Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**Target for O5: Written communication skills**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 2, 3, or 4 on an assessment rubric at the end of the senior seminar. Please see attached rubric for achievement meanings associated with each category.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: Four students (18%) earned an 3 rating; 4 students were rated as a 2 (18%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 0/1. At the end of the semester 23% (n=5) of the student essays were rated as an 4; 50% (n=11) were rated as a 3; and 27% (n=6) were rated as a 2. Overall, 19 students (86%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester, while 3 students (14%) maintained their skill levels. Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**M 2: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment (O: 3, 6)**

CRUJ 4930: Seminar in Criminal Justice is a key assessment course for the department. In this course, students are required to provide an oral presentation, utilizing PowerPoint based on their Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay, which evaluates an issue in criminology or criminal justice. The assignment, included in the syllabus, requires students to identify a single issue from the internship experience, identify a relevant theory (criminological, sociological, psychological, organizational, or legal) that can be utilized to enhance understanding of the issue, and prepare a presentation based on their position paper that addresses policy implications and recommendations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

80% of student presentations will be rated as a 4 or 5 on a five point assessment scale utilized on a rubric (with 1 representing a poorly identified topic, lack of linkage between course/program content and internship experiences and 5 representing an achievement of excellence, with a timely and important topic relevant to internship agency functioning identified and analyzed using appropriate course and program materials and information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone seminar reported working with students both inside the classroom and individually to ensure student understanding of the requirements and what they needed to accomplish in this assignment. This faculty member reported that
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**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:** Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written communication skills

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and CTW teaching faculty

---

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone seminar reported working with students both inside the classroom and individually to ensure student understanding of the requirements and what they needed to accomplish in this assignment. This faculty member reported that all students were rated as a 15 on oral communication skills.

---

**M 3: Ethics in Criminal Justice: Ethical Issues on Television Assignment (O: 1, 3, 4)**

CRJU 4060: Ethics in Criminal Justice is the new early bookend CTW course for the department. In this course, students are presented with a variety of ethical frameworks and strategies and in a series of assignments are expected to select and apply these frameworks. The specific assignment for which random student papers were selected for this year’s assessment is as follows: Students view an hour-long fictional television show of their choice that depicts an ethical issue or dilemma regarding the criminal justice system and write a 3 to 5 page paper. The following criteria and questions should be addressed in this paper: 1. Take notes about the characters, the topic of the show, the plot and resolution of the show, what the ethical issue/dilemma is, and how the dilemma is resolved. Hand-written notes must be submitted along with the assignment. 3. The paper should identify the show selected, what branch(es) of the criminal justice system are depicted in the show, and the general plot. The following questions should then be addressed: d. What ethical dilemma or issue is depicted in this show? e. What options do the actors have in resolving this ethical dilemma? f. What do the actors decide? g. Identify the ethical guidelines (i.e. rules/policies/code of ethics) that the actors should be following in making their decision. Think about what we have discussed in class and also reference your text. Identify and explain, h. With what ethical system is their decision in accordance? Explain. i. Do you think the dilemma is resolved correctly? Why or why not? j. Do you think the way this show depicts the criminal justice system is accurate? Why or why not? k. Do you think the way the characters act is in accordance with the formal and informal policies of the criminal justice system? l. Do you think that the way the criminal justice is portrayed hurts the public’s view, perception, or attitude regarding the CJ system?

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

---

**Target for O1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses**

80% of a random sample of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on this, the third, assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

A random sample of 10 of the graded final assignments were provided for review to the CTW Ambassador. Of these 10, 10% (n=1) were rated as a 4 and 80% (n=8) were rated as a 3. (Only 10% were rated as a 2 – work in progress).

---

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on this, the third assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

A random sample of 10 of the graded final assignments were provided for review to the CTW Ambassador. Of these 10, 10% (n=1) were rated as a 4 and 80% (n=8) were rated as a 3. (Only 10% were rated as a 2 – work in progress).

---

**Target for O4: Generation of conclusions**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the third assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

A random sample of 10 of the graded final assignments were provided for review to the CTW Ambassador. Of these 10, 40% (n=1) were rated as a 4 and 60% (n=8) were rated as a 3.

---

**Review all learning outcomes**

Review syllabi and curriculums to ensure that all basic learning outcomes are relevant, measurable and achievable.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

---

**Target for O6: Oral communication skills**

80% of student presentations will be rated as a between a 10 and 15 on a fifteen point assessment scale (with 1 representing a poorly developed and organized presentation, without a logical flow, that is not engaging and uses poor grammar and a 15 representing excellence – well organized, logical flow, engaging with excellent grammatical skills).
**Improve data collection efforts**
The Department will make a concerted to improve data collection efforts.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador

**Continued data collection**
As a discipline, we believe that cross sectional data may yield findings that are not accurate, particularly given that contextual factors may enter into any particular course during any particular semester. Because we value examining a greater breadth of data, we will continue to monitor results over the next two years to determine whether our goals are being consistently met before we move on to address another question.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay
  - Outcome/Objective: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses
- Implementation Description: Continued data collection
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** UG committee and program faculty.

**Expanded gathering of data**
We will work to expand collection of data across sections of the capstone seminar next semester to collect a wider range of data relevant to assessment of oral presentation requirements and outcomes in the coming two years.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment
  - Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate coordinator/committee.

**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?

Our program has primarily changed in the way that we regard the assessment process. When assessment started a few years ago, only one or two people were actively engaged in the process, and these were those who were charged with preparing reports. At this point, more faculty are involved in the process and greater decisions are made about student learning outcomes and how to assess outcomes. This is largely due to the implementation of assessment practices, the CTW initiative, and discussions that these to requirements have yielded. Faculty take greater integrative approaches when teaching multiple sections of the same courses, talk more about strategies that work and how to improve strategies that do not, and generally are becoming increasingly involved in the development, evolution, and assessment of learning outcomes. This is a significant change. In the coming academic year, the key focus of the department will be to begin to identify ways to assess whether (and how) programmatic changes are having an impact on student achievement. In addition, with a shift of CTW to a new course, the faculty teaching the new course will work together to identify the best approaches for assignments and assessment strategies for assement in this crucial 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 department of criminal justice likely will not make any significant changes in teh coming year based on current data. At this point, programmatic changes that will go into effect in the fall, 2010 semester are the primary focus of assessment outcomes. Specifically, higher than desired DWF rates in Methods of Criminal Justice, Criminological Theory, and Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice are the source of current review at the department level. While we recognize that DWF rates are not an acceptable source of focus for learning outcomes, per se, the programmatic changes that are to be implemented in an effort to better prepare students for learning in upper division classes are presumed to also impact learning outcomes not only at a “grade level” (pass, fail) by course, but also in terms of specific learning outcomes. The changes that we are making specifically geared to improve student acheivements involve the ultimate move to pre-requisites of core “tools” courses for the major. Students frequently wait to take these courses until they are seniors, yielding highly stressful experiences that frequently delay graduation. Our goal is to streamline the curriculum so that
students will take these courses early in their involvement in the major. These courses (Methods of Criminal Justice, Criminological Theory, Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice, and Ethics in Criminal Justice) are viewed as involving key concepts necessary for students to master prior to entry into upper division classes so that the latter can be increasing rigorous and challenging. Programatically, the decision was made to require these courses as co-requisites in the coming year (2010-2011), with a goal of monitoring not only DWF rates for the courses, but also, by the spring semester, developing assessment strategies for specific learning outcomes to be assessed through these courses. The specific strategy has not been identified, but faculty have discussed the use of pre-post exams in the Statistical Analysis course, and use of rubrics for assignments in the methods course. Notably, because the Ethics course is a new CTW requirement, improved assessment strategies within this course also are a key focus for the coming year. The impact of the assessment findings in this report is primarily found in the fact that these data provide us with a baseline with which to compare future data. With changes forthcoming, we are hoping to continue gathering information on these key indicators, predicting that within two years our outcomes should yield higher performance results, at which time we can redirect efforts to new program issues.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Criminal Justice is to generate and disseminate knowledge and information that is theoretically driven and policy relevant for the fields of criminal justice and criminology. This is accomplished by (1) engaging in research and scholarly activities to address issues of crime and justice affecting diverse populations in urban settings; (2) producing students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for leadership positions in public and private sector agencies that address crime and justice problems; and (3) collaborating with public and private agencies through education, training, and research ventures that enhance our understanding of, and response to, issues associated with crime and the administration of justice. Through these activities, the Department strives to promote basic principles of justice that enhance the criminal justice profession and benefit the community at large.

Goals
G 1: Develop knowledge
Students will develop knowledge about crime and criminal justice systems and processes

G 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.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 2: Apply research and statistical skills (G: 0) (M: 2)
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.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

SLO 3: Understand criminological theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues
Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Understand theory of criminal justice responses (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base of criminal justice responses to crime and criminality.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Understand how systems & processes interact (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
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.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 6: Apply theory and terminology (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**
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.

Strategic Plan Associations
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Communicate effectively (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**
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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Knowledge assessment survey of Non-thesis students (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data**
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Six non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2010. All 6 students were evaluated on 3 of the 5 items that measure this objective. No information was available for any of the students on two of the five items. One hundred percent of the students met the desired target performance level 4.0 or higher across these items, and the overall average across the six students was a 4.2.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Six non-thesis students completed the capstone seminar during the Spring semester 2010. All six students were evaluated on the one item that measures this objective. Five of the six students (83%) met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher, with the average score across all six students being a 4.3.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Six non-thesis students completed the capstone seminar during the Spring semester 2010. All six students were evaluated on at least one of the items that measures this objective. Five of the six students (83%) met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher, with the average score across all six students being a 4.1.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Six non-thesis students completed the capstone seminar during the Spring semester 2010. All six students were evaluated on the two items that measures this objective. Five of the six students (83%) met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher, with the average score across all six students being a 4.25.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Six non-thesis students completed the capstone seminar during the Spring semester 2010. All six students were evaluated on the two items that measures this objective. One hundred percent of the students met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher, with the average score across all six students being a 4.6.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Six non-thesis students completed the capstone seminar during the Spring semester 2010. All six students were evaluated on the three items that measures this objective. The student averages across these items ranged from 3.67 to 5.0, with the overall average being 4.3. Only 67% of the students met the desired target performance level of 4.0 or higher.

**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 an average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Two students completed a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. Both students were assessed on only 3 of the 5 items measuring this outcome. The average scores across these 3 items for the two students were 4.3 and 5, giving an overall average of 4.67. With only two students writing a thesis, and one falling below a 4.5, only 50% met the desired target performance level of 4.5.

**Target for O2: Apply research and statistical skills**

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 three items measuring this learning outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. Both students were assessed on on each of the 3 items measuring this outcome. The average scores across these 3 items for each of the two students was a 4.33, giving an overall average also of 4.33. Neither student met the desired target performance level of 4.5.

**Target for O3: Understand criminological theory**

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 measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. Both students were assessed on on the 1 item measuring this outcome. Only 1 of the 2 students (50% ) met the desired target performance level of 4.5. One student received a 4 on this item while the other student received a 5, with the overall average being a 4.5.

**Target for O4: Understand thoery of criminal justice responses**

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 measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. One student was assessed on all 5 items measuring this outcome, while the other student was assessed on only 1. Both students met the desired target performance level of 4.5. The average scores for each of the two students were 4.6 and 5, giving an overall average of 4.8.

**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)
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. Only 1 of the 2 students was assessed on on the 2 items measuring this outcome. The student that was assessed had an average of 4.0 on the two items. The targeted performance level was not met.

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 measuring this outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. Both students were assessed on at least 1 of the two items measuring this outcome. Only 1 of the 2 students (50%) met the desired target performance level of 4.5. One student received a 4 on the one item on which they were assessed, while the other student received an average score of 4.25 across the items; the overall average was a 4.25.

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2009-2010 academic year. Both students were assessed on all three items measuring this outcome. Both students (100%) met the desired target performance level of 4.5. One student had an average score of 4.67 and the other student had an average score of 5, with the overall average being a 4.84.

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

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. Data on thesis students will be collected as well.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: end of Fall semester 2010
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee and faculty who teach statistics, methods and theory

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

Re-design the instrument used for assessing thesis students

Faculty have noted that the current instrument used to evaluate the thesis students does not seem to work well, leading to several items that cannot be rated, and consequently low reliabilities for outcome measures. Further, with the low numbers of students that we have completing thesis, and the low number of items that are being answered by faculty, also make it difficult to reach our very high performance targets (80% attaining score of 4.5 on scale of 5). We will have to discuss whether these performance targets are still appropriate.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Apply research and statistical skills | Apply theory and terminology | Critically analyze crime & justice issues/data | Understand criminological theory | Understand how systems & processes interact
Implementation Description: We will begin having the discussion of how better to evaluate thesis students this year along with the appropriate performance targets. Next year we will develop measures consistent with the outcomes of this year's discussion.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee

Students are now writing a literature review in their first year in the program

This is the first time in several years that we have not met our achievement target for this outcome. The analysis shows that the
students were weakest on the item "The student is comfortable with his or her ability to write about crime and justice issues. Last year our required course "Crime and the Criminal Justice System" was re-vamped to require students to work extensively on writing a literature review on a criminal justice topic and I believe that this will strengthen their writing skills in this area. The two students that did not perform well on this outcome took the course before the changes were made.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Knowledge assessment survey of Non-thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Communicate effectively
Implementation Description: Changes were made to the course and implemented in Fall 2010 for last year's cohort.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty teaching CRJU 7010

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?

During this year we have developed a new assessment rubric to be used for our non-thesis students. We developed the new rubric because our current assessment instrument was not in rubric form and was providing minimal discrimination among students completing the degree, therefore we had little variance and consequently little valuable information for assessment purposes. Currently we are pilot testing the new rubric and examining its reliability. We will continue work on this during the current academic year. The graduate committee will also begin to discuss how to more effectively evaluate our students that complete a thesis. Currently the thesis chair fills out an assessment form, but faculty have noted that the form does not seem particularly relevant, and we are therefore getting a large amount of missing data using the current form.

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 several of our target performance levels were not met for thesis students, as stated above, we currently believe this is due to the small number of students being assessed (N=2), and the number of items on which there is missing data not problems with the current program. Only one outcome was not met for the majority of our students (non-thesis students), the goal of communicating effectively their understanding and analysis of crime and justice issues. We believe that changes made to the CRJU 7010 class last year (the graduating students that were assessed took this course the previous year), should impact this next year. Nonetheless, the M.S. program coordinator will discuss the findings from this year with the faculty and discuss whether faculty are continuing to see a weakness in this area. If so we will begin to discuss where else in the curriculum we can further strengthen these communication 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?

No operational changes have been 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?

For the most part, the findings mean that our program is meeting its goals. For our non-thesis students, all put one of our performance targets was met. While we fell short on meeting our performance targets for thesis students, these targets are set quite high (score of 4.5 out 5 for 80% of students) and with so few thesis students (n=2) our targets are essentially equivalent to 100% of students attaining a 4.5 out of 5, as if even one student does not meet the goal we will not meet the 80% goal. We do, however, realize that to be more useful we will need to implement a better assessment tool. We will discuss this this year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

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

Next year we will use our new rubric to assess non-thesis students. We expect to get a clearer picture of our strengths and weaknesses with that instrument.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

Our definition of critical thinking has remained relatively stable over the last two years.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Unlike prior years all AC 4610 classes implemented the CTW teaching approach and assignments. In the audit class (AC 4610), Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) projects were assigned to groups that the professor had established during the first week of classes. AC 4610 is designed to simulate the real environment of an audit practice, where audits are conducted by teams. Additionally, becoming an effective auditor requires learning to operate successfully as a team member. Finally, the course emphasizes the judgment required of the auditor as a professional, by understanding why and how audits are performed. CTW has been established in the Audit class because it is believed to stimulate the accounting student to identify and solve unstructured problems; and to effectively communicate the thinking, solution process and conclusions. Students demonstrating critical thinking skills must be able to locate, obtain, organize, and analyze information and to exercise judgment based on comprehension of a set of facts and available evidence. They must be able to present, discuss and defend their views through written and spoken language. Conclusions or recommendations must be complete, plausible, and compelling, and demonstrate an understanding the accounting problem.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

We had two formal training sessions and several informal sessions. All consultants attended the joint training session held for RCB International Business consultants. The session included presentations by the CTW Associate Director. Consultants learnt about resources available to GSU students to improve their writing skills (such as the writing lab.), how to provide constructive feedback, and effective strategies for motivating students to improve their CTW skills. A second training session was held with the two primary faculty members who teach AC 4610 and all CTW consultants. This session focused on familiarizing consultants with their responsibilities, the CTW assignments, the rubric, and common issues that arise in connection with the AC 4610 CTW assignments. There were also informal training sessions held by the Ambassador for the two other professors who teach AC 4610. Overall all the sessions were very effective in communicating the goals and objectives of CTW implementation in AC 4610 and obtaining feedback from all participants.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

CTW quizzes This year we added two CTW quizzes that required students to first select the appropriate answer to an objective
question requiring critical analysis and then provide a written explanation to support their conclusions. Many students did not perform well on these quizzes. We found that some students excelled while others performed very poorly. We did not provide any specific instruction on how the CTW quizzes should be approached, other than general instruction on the course material and explaining that there should be logical consistencies in the objective response and the supporting statements. In the future we will post a sample CTW quiz along with examples of excellent vs. inferior responses to the course website to help students to effectively prepare for the CTW quizzes.

CTW Case Evaluation and Report
We will make the following changes to improve our implementation of the Audit Alchemy and case analysis assignments: During the first day of class the instructor will present the rubric and explain how it will be used on the CTW assignments. All groups will be required to submit an outline to the CTW consultant before working on the paper. This will allow students to better organize their thoughts and structure their written reports. All student groups will be required to meet with the CTW consultant before submitting any assignments. The entire group must be present. Enforce the requirement that group members participate in the peer evaluation and peer editing aspect of the Alchemy assignment. We observed that many mistakes that can be prevented if students invested the time to read and critique each other's work.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as the students and faculty involved in the initiative? This was the first year of full implementation of the CTW assignments. The CTW program forces students to organize and focus their thinking on the important aspects of auditing practice. Additionally, it gives them practice in establishing benchmark and helps to prepare them to complete realistic tasks in their chosen profession. As a result of CTW students have become more proactive in self-assessment and editing their written communication. They have become more critical in evaluating information presented to them and are learning to ask relevant questions regarding their assignments. The peer review requirement in the Alchemy assignment forced students to be objective evaluators of audit evidence. Additionally, knowing that their performance would be rated by their peers motivated students to participate in group efforts and served as a control mechanism empowering students to penalize group members who shirk group responsibilities.

Annual Report Section Responses
Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Our most important accomplishment this year was involving the students in peer reviews of their writing assignments and requiring the submission of draft reports. The long writing assignment was completed in teams. To ensure that all students were active and contributing participants in the team product we required each team member to submit a draft of a portion of the project. The other team members had to prepare a written evaluation of the draft submitted by their teammate. The peer evaluation encouraged the students to critically assess the claims made by their teammates. We found that the peer evaluations led to an improved quality in the initial drafts submitted by the team.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Afr Am Studies
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
AAS CTW courses will require students to engage, through writing, a “wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, page 1.) While critical thinking will be valued throughout the course of the semester, specific assignments will most directly fulfill the CTW designation. CTW-designated assignments will be assessed using the rubric included in the appendix (50%) and the grading rubric included in the syllabus (50%).

Goals
G 1: AAS CTW Goal 1 (Annotations)
Students in AAS will demonstrate improved CTW in the following domains: Analyzing information: data, ideas, or concepts (Interprets information (data, ideas, or concepts) accurately, appropriately and in-depth in new contexts); Assessing strengths and weaknesses of novel material; and Assessing relevance of novel material to research interests.

G 2: AAS CTW Goal 2 (Research Paper)
Students in AAS will demonstrate improved CTW in the following domains: Analyzing information: data, ideas, or concepts (Interprets information (data, ideas, or concepts) accurately, appropriately and in-depth in new contexts). Drawing well-supported conclusions (Creates a detailed conclusion or complex solution that is well-supported, logically consistent, complete and often unique) Synthesizing ideas into a coherent whole (Integrates ideas or develops solutions that are exceptionally clear, coherent, and cohesive)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: CTW Objective 1 (G. 1) (M: 1)
ASSIGNMENT TWO Article Annotation and Critique (20%, CTW Component) Each student will submit an annotation and critique of six peer-reviewed journal articles. Each article will be identified by the instructor as important to the discipline and/or identified by the student as particularly pertinent to their research project. These submissions will provide entry into the more extensive literature review of your research paper. The grading criteria for your annotation and critique are as follows: Annotation (20%): 1. Is the bibliographic information provided in APA format (5%) 2. Is the purpose of the work identified (thesis/research question, (4%)? 3. Is the methodology clearly described? (3%) 4. Are the results adequately described? (3%) 5. Was a hardcopy of article submitted? (5%) Critique (80%) 1. Does the author assess the strength and weakness of the degree to which the article’s a. literature review; b.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Revise Research Paper Rubric

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 3: CTW Objective 2 (G: 2) (M: 2)
AAS 4980 Seminar and Practicum in African American Studies Completion of the research paper (50%) The primary products of this class are (1) completion of a coherent research project and (2) a well-written research paper that describes this project fully. During the course of the semester, the students will submit a series of revisions in response to instructor comments toward the completion of their research papers. As with the assignments for 3980, this assignment will require students to “evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do” as it relates to the specific requirements of each assignment(Bassham, Irwin, Nerdone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, page 1). More specifically, this activity will center the students' own truth claims in critical thinking. While the assignments for 3980 encourage students to critically engage (1) the general biases they bring to the class and (2) pre-existing research that is relevant to their chosen area of interest, 4980 will require them to critically reflect on THEIR OWN truth claims about THEIR research as they pursue a final paper that is accurate, coherent, thoughtful and critical. Further, resubmissions provide students with additional opportunities to more fully reflect on and engage their research.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Article Annotation (O: 2)
AVERAGE IMPROVEMENT FROM FIRST ANNOTATION SUBMISSION TO FINAL ANNOTATION SUBMISSION Does the student assess the strength and weakness of the degree to which the article's conclusions are supported? Does the student provide specific support from the article for a decision to include or exclude each article from the literature review? (30%) Overall CTW Average Improvement 0.044 0.067 0.056 0.211 0.400 0.306 0.189 0.189 0.189 0.222 -0.478 -0.128 0.311 0.289 0.300 0.011 0.133 0.072 0.356 0.433 0.394 0.200 -0.178 0.011 0.378 -0.044 0.167 0.000 0.067 0.033 0.356 0.089 0.222 0.078 0.000 0.039 0.400 0.033 0.217 0.644 -0.267 0.189 To assess and demonstrate CTW performance on the article annotations, scores on each of the two CTW units of measurement were converted to percentages. The table above represents comparisons between the first submission and the final submission. For rubric item “Does the student assess the strength and weakness of the degree to which the article’s conclusions are supported?” each student's performance improved with a maximum improvement of 64% and an average improvement of 24.3%. 10 of the 14 students exhibited improvement on “Does the student provide specific support from the article for a decision to include or exclude each article from the literature review?” with a maximum improvement of 43% and an average improvement of 5.2%. Of those students that demonstrated a poorer performance, the average reduction was 24.2%. Taking the CTW component of the annotation in sum, all but one student demonstrated improved performance with a maximum improvement of 39.4% and an average increase in performance of 14.8%.

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

M 2: Research Paper CTW Assessment (O: 3)
As indicated in Table 2 (I have attached a document with a bar graph - I could NOT import it here), the performances on the research paper were oriented towards CTW mastery rather than emerging CTW skills as defined by the modified rubric included below. Table 1 Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately. Summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over. Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue. Table 2: Research Paper CTW Results Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the problem, question, or issue. Identifies and considers the influence of the researcher Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence. Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences. 4.5 4 0.90909 4.681818 4.636364 4.454545 Specifically, an average of 4 represents a high developing score, just below mastery. Furthermore, the average performance across units of measurement is fairly consistent with no average dropping below 4. This performance will serve as a baseline for assessing 2010-2011 CTW performance. Finally, in an attempt to measure the relationship between improvement on the article annotations and CTW performance on the research paper, a Spearman correlation was conducted (nonparametric correlation). There was no statistically significant relationship between the two measures (Rs=.07, dF=11, p=.83).

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

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

Revise Research Paper Rubric
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
AAS' definition of CT has not changed over the last two years. The assessment of CTW has changed and is addressed elsewhere.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
Students generally demonstrated an improved performance on the article annotations and the research papers were strong as well with average ratings no less than 4 on a 6-point scale with 6 representing CTW mastery. For the 2010-2011 academic year, I will continue to provide students with opportunities to submit multiple annotations as it appears that this was a critical component in their improvement on this assignment. Also, I will offer additional attention to CTW during the Spring term so that the students’ CTW will improve as compared to the 2009-2010 academic year.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
Since the beginning of the initiative, our CTW efforts have become a little less ambitious considering our limited “human resources.” Our CTW assignments are now limited to article annotations and the research paper which is assessed with a separate CTW rubric. For the 2010-2011, I will revise the research paper rubric to include a CTW component to clarify the importance of CTW for the students and, less importantly, to streamline assessment and reporting.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
Our CTW offerings are now AAS 3980 and AAS 4980. These two courses represent our two-course research methods sequence and are taught by the same professor (me!). Our CTW assignments are now article annotations and the research paper which is assessed with a separate CTW rubric. Impact on the major is difficult to assess but I can say that this year’s research papers are much improved as compared to last year’s papers. I would like to believe that our CTW efforts are responsible for this - especially CTW strategies such as repeated submissions with critical feedback prior to final 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?
Both of our rubrics have changed. The rubric for the article annotation now includes a two-item CTW component that represents 60% of the grade. This change was made to center CTW in students’ efforts to complete the assignment. Additionally, Washington State University’s CTW rubric was adapted to the specific requirements of the research paper. This change was made because I was impressed with the presentation made last summer and in reviewing the rubric, it represented the kind of accessible, clear and descriptive rubric that my students need.

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 significant changes will be made to our “educational program” considering the fact that this two-course sequence represents our undergraduate research methods core. However, the performance of the students provides the department with important information that may influence other instructors to consider more CTW-oriented assignments and strategies and perhaps the department will adopt additional CTW courses. I will present information pertinent to our CTW efforts at our pre-Fall term retreat. Prior to this, any statements regarding changes to our degree program will be little more than conjecture.

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 such changes were made.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
I think that our most important accomplishment is the general quality of the research papers. This is especially significant when one considers the quality of the first annotations submitted in the Fall term. I also believe that the continued development of course and assignment-specific rubrics that are descriptive without being overwhelming is an important accomplishment as well.

Challenges for Next Year
The research course sequence will be a challenge because more students are enrolled for some reason. Further, an ongoing challenge is time management as I continue to manage a number of roles in the department. Still, none of these challenges are insurmountable.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
I also removed the "reflexive researcher paper." The annotations were challenging for the students and the addition of this paper, in conjunction with the other demands of the class, is simply too ambitious. Furthermore, the notion of researcher reflexivity remained a central point of reference during the course of the two-semester sequence. Finally, a portion of their final research paper includes "researcher as context" as a graded component.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
Following one of the CTW sessions (and a comment by Marti), I realized that there were simply too many rubrics in my plan in the pilot year. During the 2009-2010 academic year, I "streamlined" my approach a bit and included specific CTW domains in the grading rubric for the assignment. More specifically, I included the following two assessment units under the heading "Critical Thinking Critique:" (1) Does the student assess the strength and weakness of the degree to which the article's conclusions are supported (30%); (2) Does the student provide specific support from the article for a decision to include or exclude each article from the literature review (30%). I believe that adding these two CTW-specific units to the grading rubric accomplished three things in AAS' CTW efforts: (1) it clarified the relationship between CTW and scholarly work for our students; (2) it simplified grading and the understanding of grading for myself and the students and (3) it provided me with a direct "snapshot" of student CTW performance on this assignment.

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
In anthropology, critical thinking entails examining and contextualizing the multiple perspectives that inform complex social, cultural, and biological realities pertaining to the human condition in its past and present dimensions.

Goals
G 1: Goals for Anthropology majors CTW
Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities; they will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions that engage current perspectives in the discipline; they will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand, and to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical thinking in Anthropology (M: 1)
In Anth 3033, students were asked to submit 3 versions each of 4 papers--one for each course module. The third version of the fourth paper was selected for CTW score measuring. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In ANTH 4970, students were assigned 6 papers, 3 of which required multiple revisions. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In both courses, all of the assignment reflected all of the following goals: a. Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities. b. Draw Conclusions: students will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions
that engage current perspectives in the discipline. c. Contextualize: students will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand. d. Critique: students will demonstrate an ability to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

**SLO 2: Critical thinking**

In ANTH 3033, students were asked to submit 3 versions of papers—one on each course module. The third version of the fourth paper was selected for CTW score measuring. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. All of the students received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4. In our two sections of ANTH 4970, students had 6 assignments, 3 of which required multiple revisions. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. For the Monday section, 76% of the students scored a 4 or 5, 12% scored a 3, 8% scored a 2. For the Wednesday section, 68.4% scored a 4 or a 5, 31.5% scored a 3. a. Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities. b. Draw Conclusions: students will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions that engage current perspectives in the discipline. c. Contextualize: students will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand. d. Critique: students will demonstrate an ability to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Course projects (O: 1)**

In ANTH 3033, students were asked to write papers where they reflected critically on course readings and discussions. The measure chosen for this assessment was paper # 4, in which they reflected on a variety of topics drawing on discussions conducted during the whole semester. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In ANTH 4970, the measure was a critical and self-reflexive paper about students’ experiences as anthropology majors, for which students were required to critically draw on relevant literature in the discipline. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Critical thinking in Anthropology**

In ANTH 3033, papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In ANTH 4970, papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

In ANTH 3033, all of the students received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4. In the Monday section of ANTH 4970, 76% of the students scored a 4 or 5, 12% scored a 3, 8% scored a 2. For the Wednesday section, 68.4% scored a 4 or a 5, 31.5% scored a 3.

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

**Improvement plans**

ANTH 4970: In the future I will break down the assignments into parts, rather than requiring one or two revisions of a lengthy assignment, which was very challenging for grading purposes. ANTH 3033 Drafts will be graded; peer-reviewing will be replaced with classroom discussions and presentations.

**planned course improvements**

ANTH 3033: peer reviews did not turn out to be useful, and will be dropped from the 2010 syllabus. They will be replaced by group discussions during which students will be able to explore ideas critically before they express them in writing. Overall, the anthropology department turned out to be severely understaffed for the CTW program. Dr. Cassandra White had to teach two CTW sections in Spring 2010. At the time of writing, ANTH 3033 is already showing an unmet demand.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

Since this was the first year the CTW program was implemented, it is too early to assess a change in the definition of critical thinking in our major.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Having students submit multiple versions of their paper is very helpful in improving their critical thinking as well as writing skills. For
many students, this was the first time ever they even proofread their papers before submitting them. Students learned how to structure an argument; they realized the difference between formal academic writing versus other writing styles.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

The workshops were useful, but the weave on line workshop was understaffed and very short. All of the participants had specific questions, but there were only 2-3 CTW instructors available to help out. Those of us who are not familiar with the process (myself included) are utterly confused about what exactly it is that we are expected to do, both in terms of contents and in terms of how to use weaveonline (which is hardly user-friendly, I am afraid). This said, the CTW staff are extremely helpful and are doing a great job of supporting us.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

ANTH 3033 Peer reviews should be replaced with class discussions and presentations. Drafts will be graded, and points will be taken off for failing to submit them or for submitting incomplete drafts. ANTH 4970 assignments will be broken into parts, rather than requiring one or two revisions of a lengthy assignment.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Students who have taken the CTW courses are considerably better at making persuasive arguments in writing and critiquing existing anthropological knowledge; they have also become adept at engaging in self-reflection. Several of them remarked that, before the CTW, they had never proofread their papers. Rubrics have been implemented in other ANTH 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?

not applicable. This is the first CTW assessment we submit.

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.

With a growing number of majors, we will need to increase CTW offerings. This will require new faculty lines.

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?

not applicable

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 from this year mean that, overall, the department is effective at teaching critical thinking. More emphasis needs to be placed on thinking critically through writing. More resources (faculty lines) are needed to support the CTW program in anthropology.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We hope to expand the number of CTW offerings. This will support a considerable improvement in the quality of critical thinking through writing for anthropology majors.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
CTW students showed considerable improvement in their critical thinking through writing skills--most importantly, several of them commented on this improvement during feedback and informal evaluation sessions.

Challenges for Next Year
The ANTH department just lost one faculty member, and one more is on leave for a year. The number of majors and graduate students, however, is growing at a steady pace. With a shrinking faculty body, it is going to be extremely difficult to offer all the CTW courses without cutting into course offerings for the major and the graduate program.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
Intended outcomes will remain the same.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
None foreseen at this time.

University-wide Committee Participation
CTW Ambassador will continue participating in university-wide CTW workshops and events.
**Mission / Purpose**
Critical thinking in Applied Linguistics always involves evaluating arguments and presenting the rationale behind the conclusions drawn. The CTW-specific courses additionally address personal prejudices, for example as relating to language-trait-focused discrimination, and making reasonable, intelligent decisions about how to address real-world language-oriented controversies.

**Goals**

**G 1: evaluate arguments**
Students will learn to evaluate arguments and present the rationale behind the conclusions drawn.

**G 2: address personal prejudices**
Students will learn to address personal prejudices, for example as relating to language-trait-focused discrimination.

**G 3: write clearly**
Students will learn to present an argument clearly in writing.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: final paper (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

**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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives (O: 1)**
Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: final paper**
The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "fails to identify underlying values and assumptions of different perspectives", 2 is "Does not identify many underlying values and assumptions of different perspectives or addresses only one perspective", 3 is "Identifies many underlying values and assumptions of more than one perspective" and 4 is "Clearly identifies most underlying values and assumptions of more than one perspective". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 92% of students received at least a 3 and 45% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem (O: 1)**

Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Fails to show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem", 2 is "Partially acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem", 3 is "Fully acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem; may attempt some steps to address them" and 4 is "Fully acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem and takes reasonable steps to address them". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 89% of students received at least a 3 and 46% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: presents convincing arguments based on linguistic principles (O: 1)**

Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Arguments are not based on linguistic principles", 2 is "Arguments are loosely based on linguistic principles", 3 is "Arguments are mostly based on linguistic principles" and 4 is "Arguments are clearly and consistently based on linguistic principles". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 94% of students received at least a 3 and 40% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: draws reasonable conclusions (O: 1)**

Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Conclusions are based on misconceptions of linguistic principles, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented", 2 is "Conclusions are somewhat or vaguely based on linguistic arguments presented", 3 is "Conclusions are largely supported by linguistically informed arguments" and 4 is "Conclusions are clearly supported by linguistically informed arguments". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 9% of students received at least a 3 and 36% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion (O: 1)**

Students will write a final paper on a sociolinguistic topic of their choice, drawing on both popular sources and academic sources, or on academic sources presenting more than one viewpoint. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to identify values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives, show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem, present convincing arguments based on linguistic principles, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: final paper**

The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Writing is incoherent and ideas are illogically arranged", 2 is "Few ideas are logically arranged. Writing is often unclear", 3 is "Most ideas are logically arranged. Writing is generally clear" and 4 is "Ideas are logically arranged. Writing is clear and precise". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 86% of students received at least a 3 and 60% received a 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
It has remained the same.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Last year's Action Plan focused on the difficulty of offering sufficient CTW courses for our students. We were able to add an additional section of AL3031 Language in Society to meet student need. We also dropped AL4161 EFL Practicum as a CTW course and added a more appropriate course, AL 4151 Communication across Cultures. Also from last year’s Action Plan, we changed the rubric used in AL3031 to the one designed for the class based on the departmental definition of CTW.

**Mission / Purpose**
In conversations among the art education faculty since the initiation of CTW, we arrived at two operational definitions for critical thinking that are particularly relevant to students in our area. One centers upon the ability to critically analyze and interpret artworks, which is fundamental to teaching about art. The other promotes students’ capacities to think critically about pedagogy, relate educational theory to classroom practice, and become reflective practitioners. Students have opportunities to develop both aspects of critical thinking in our program. In AE 4200, the first course in the major, students conduct classroom observations and examine aspects of teaching such as: adapting curricula for students with special needs, managing space and materials, integrating technology and other subjects, utilizing diverse visual communication strategies, planning lesson content, and creating a productive learning environment. In their modules and final field experience reflection, students analyze, compare, and evaluate what they have observed and relate it both to course readings and to their own emerging teaching philosophies. They also critically analyze various popular resources available to art teachers in journal and digital formats in a new CTW assignment piloted during Spring, 2010. In AE 8900, students engage in learning activities related to art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, and acquire familiarity with several different critical frameworks for deriving meaning from artworks. They also explore strategies for actively engaging young learners in these disciplines. CTW assignments in this course focus upon analysis of artworks and developing instructional plans.

**National Art Education Association**

As a national collaborator on the Arts Map for the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and as a signatory to the Partnership for 21st Century Skills’ National Action Agenda, NAEA recognizes the importance of having all students leave school prepared with the skills and knowledge to address the challenges that await them. To that end, we support the following PRINCIPLES:

• That the arts, including the visual arts, dance, music, and theatre, are recognized as core subjects in the framework of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills’ Framework for 21st Century Learning.

• That the visual arts provide opportunities for all students to build their skills and capacity in what the Partnership for 21st Century Skills calls “Learning and Innovation Skills,” specifically Creativity and Innovation; Critical Thinking and Problem Solving; and Communication and Collaboration.

• That the visual arts provide opportunities for all students to build their skills and capacity in what the Partnership for 21st Century Skills calls “Information, Media and Technology Skills,” specifically Information Literacy, Media Literacy, and ICT (Information, Communications, and Technology) Literacy.

**Goals**

**G 1: Analysis of Artworks**
Art Education majors should be able to 1) formulate pertinent questions and compose valid interpretations of works of art or art historical problems; 2) assess and synthesize interpretations of art and art historical claims made by others; 3) understand and evaluate the creative and cultural significance of art on both micro and macro levels.

**G 2: Synthesize skills and understandings**
Art Education majors are expected to relate course readings to real-life situations and demonstrate the ability to develop and defend their own ideas about appropriate strategies and content for teaching art.

**G 3: Interpretation of Artworks**
Art Education majors are expected to develop and defend interpretations of art works informed by analytical processes such as the Feldman method.
G 4: Compare/Contrast Pedagogical Strategies
Art Education majors should demonstrate critical awareness of classroom management strategies, including effective communication as well as management of materials, behavior, and time.

G 5: Critical Reflection
Art Education majors are expected to become reflexive practitioners, demonstrated through personal, critical responses to course readings and activities.

G 6: Evidence-based Evaluation
Art Education majors are expected to develop and defend evaluative responses to course readings and activities.

G 7: Contextualize Information from Course Materials
Art Education majors should be able to demonstrate deep understanding of course materials and assignments and relate them to real teaching contexts through reflections, planning, and field work.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Critical Analysis of Artwork (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In AE 4900, students selected a well-known work of art and analyzed it using the Feldman method or other applicable strategies covered in class. This year, students were asked to analyze an artwork as part of their midterm exam. The attached documents illustrate this assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- Written Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Final Field Experience Reflection (G: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After students completed their field experiences for AE 4200, they reflected upon the significance of these experiences and what they observed, relating their insights to course readings and lectures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- Written Communication
- Critical Thinking

#### Standard Associations
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Resource Review (G: 2, 5, 6, 7) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After learning the fundamentals of lesson planning, students investigated popular resources in journal or digital form and wrote a critical analysis of the resource identifying strengths and weaknesses of the resource and its usefulness for art teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- Written Communication
- Critical Thinking

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Rubric for Field Experience Reflection (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The associated Rubric provides descriptors of competent performance in addressing the CTW objectives of this assignment. I have revised it slightly this year and intend to streamline the criteria and expand upon the descriptors for different levels of performance for next year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Target for O2: Final Field Experience Reflection
Of the students in class 75% will score competency on all or almost all of the criteria in the rubric.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
80% were competent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Art Criticism midterm (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% were competent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

#### Target for O1: Critical Analysis of Artwork
75% of students will demonstrate competency based upon the rubric for art criticism.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
80% of students demonstrated competence on this assignment.
Students were asked to select an art educational resource from print or online source and answer questions through critical analysis. Graduate students in this course were given a more challenging version of this piloted assignment. Attached are the different assignments and examples showing one undergraduate and one graduate response.

Target for O3: Resource Review
This was a pilot of an assignment I plan to revise and implement next year. Achievement targets were for 75% of students to demonstrate competency.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
90% of students demonstrated competence, but upon reflection, I intend to raise the bar, revising the undergraduate assignment for next year to include more questions from the graduate assignment.

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

Implement Rubrics and define definitions
Next fall we will be fully implementing rubrics for the CTW content in both courses, as well as refining our operational definitions of critical thinking in art education.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
Our fundamental definition of critical thinking in the major has remained unchanged, but we have piloted additional assignments to assess the defining characteristics more fully.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
In AE 4200, the Final Field Experience Reflection assignment was refined and the rubric adjusted to provide more detail for students to self-assess. An additional CTW assignment was also developed and piloted, a critical resource review, which will be refined and implemented again in Fall 2011. Students also write a Teaching Philosophy statement, as outlined in previous year’s plans, but I chose not to utilize this as a CTW assignment, but rather encouraged students to focus on self-reflection as they enter their chosen field. In AE 4900, at least one of the proposed CTW assignments, Analysis of Artwork, was implemented this year, with plans for implementation of other assignments in Fall 2010.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
Although the scheduling of workshops often conflicted with my teaching or conference schedule, I was able to attend at least two sessions and receive one-on-one training to make up for missed information. These sessions were very informative and also inspiring, because it is helpful to hear how other departments and ambassadors are addressing CTW goals, and learn from their examples.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
In AE 4200, the Final Field Experience Reflection paper was refined and a more detailed rubric was provided to students to encourage better self-assessment. I piloted a Critical Resource Review assignment, revised from a previously implemented assignment to conform to CTW expectations. Based upon the results obtained in this first trial of this assignment, I intend to add more detailed questions and raise the grading expectations for this assignment when I next implement it. In AE 4900, I will encourage instructor to implement more CTW assignments and collect complete documentation for reporting purposes.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
In AE 4200, CTW has become a significant part of students’ learning outcomes and instructor expectations. I intend to continue fostering critical thinking through writing in this course through the development of other relevant assignments in the coming year. I think that students tend to take the assignments more seriously and devote more effort to writing well when the assignment is presented as CTW, and I believe as the faculty recognize this benefit there will be more enthusiasm for the CTW initiative.
Mission / Purpose

Written assignments that require critical thinking in Art History provide students with the skills to 1) formulate pertinent questions and compose valid interpretations of works of art or art historical problems; 2) assess and synthesize interpretations of art and art historical claims made by others; and 3) understand and evaluate the creative and cultural significance of art on both micro and macro levels. All of the above match the University’s stated policy that CTW develops a student’s ability “to identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.”

Goals

G 1: Inquiry
Students will formulate pertinent questions about works of art or art historical problems.

G 2: Synthesis
Students will synthesize interpretations of art and art historical claims made by others.

G 3: Evaluation
Students will evaluate the creative and cultural significance of art and/or evaluate claims made by others about art.

G 4: Interpretation
Students will compose valid interpretations of works of art or art historical problems.

G 5: Reflection
Students will reflect critically on the discipline.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: AH4990 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1)
Students will reflect critically on the discipline and their place within it through a paper. This assignment asked students to compose a paper that reflected critically on the following: some people would argue that appreciating art is innate--anyone can appreciate a great work of art because it transcends time periods. Others would argue that art is often made within a specific context and its value is related only to that context. Drawing on the art history courses you have taken, what is your position on this debate, and why?

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 2: AH3000 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 2)
Students were asked to write a research paper on a well-known or canonical work of Western art. The project was designed to develop their skills in conducting research and analyzing different methodologies used by art historians. Students were expected to identify and think critically about the questions art historians ask and the kinds of evidence they use in answering those questions. The main portion of the paper involved synthesizing and assessing the methodologies art historians have used in analyzing the work, with a concluding section explaining which interpretation seemed most compelling or successful and why.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: AH 4990 (O: 1)
see rubric in repository.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: AH4990
70% of students will score a 4 or better (out of 6) on the critical thinking component of the assignment.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
80% of students achieved a score of 4 or better on this outcome.

M 2: AH 3000 (O: 2)
see rubric in repository.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: AH3000
70% of students will score a 4 or better (out of 6) on the critical thinking component of this assignment.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
76% achieved a 4 or higher. The average score for this outcome was 4.4 out of total of 6.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Course sequence**

One issue we continue to run up against is that many of our students end up taking the CTW courses simultaneously.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** We have decided to offer the courses in different semesters next year to address this problem. This is a short term solution, however. We need to determine how we can catch our majors earlier on in their academic career. Most do not seek proper advisement, nor do they read through the college catalogue.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** AH faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1:** Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The definition itself has not evolved in any significant way. We developed a set of definitions from the beginning that we continue to work for us.

**CTW Reflection 2:** Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

We were finally able to offer both CTW courses this year. Assignments for AH3000 were streamlined so that students were not having to tackle difficult reading materials and work simultaneously with weaknesses in their own CT and writing. We saw a significant improvement in the students' abilities to translate complex ideas into their own words. AH4990 gave students an opportunity to reflect critically on their academic experience and gain more experience with editing and revising their own written work. This is the first time this course has been offered so we will continue to discuss the assignments.

**CTW Reflection 3:** Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

We did not hold a workshop. The faculty agreed that one-on-one training made more sense giving that we only offer 2 CTW courses per year. The Ambassador currently teaches one of them, and the faculty member who will be teaching one next year was on medical leave and will participate in training with the ambassador in fall 2010, in consultation with the professor who taught the course this past year.

**CTW Reflection 4:** Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

It has been difficult finding a balance between course content and CTW assignments. This year the balance was better in AH 3000. Reading assignments were scaled back. The final research paper assignment did not change significantly, however there was marked improvement in the clarity of the students’ topics and writing because of the broader shifts made to the course content. The balance between content and CTW is less of a problem with AH 4990 since this is a capstone course and the content naturally emphasizes assignments that focus on students’ critical thinking and writing. I will suggest to faculty that we need to discuss the nature of the assignments, and better determine how they can be matched up with specific CTW learning outcomes for the major.

**CTW Reflection 5:** Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

I still feel as though we are in the pilot stage, given the small number of CTW courses we have offered so far. Faculty involvement has been minimal and on a need-to-know basis. However, the CTW initiative coincides with a decision we made several years ago to give the major more structure by requiring a methodology class and a capstone course. These courses now allow us to track our majors in a ways that we have been unable to do in the past. The majority of the students seem to appreciate the CTW initiative. Unfortunately many of them ended up taking the two courses simultaneously; faculty need to figure out how to get students into AH 3000 earlier on in their degree.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Art Studio**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design defines critical thinking through writing as: “wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, page 1.)

**Goals**
G 1: Technical Skills
Students will demonstrate competent technical and formal skills.

G 3: Professional Portfolio
Graduating BFA students will have professional quality portfolio that includes digital documentation of artwork, video documentation of artwork (if appropriate), current resume/cv, and artist statement.

G 2: Unified Body of Artwork
Students will complete the BFA program with a mature studio practice that includes a unified body of artwork.

G 4: Critical Writing Skills
Students completing the BFA program will have the critical writing skills necessary for a career in the fine arts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art (G: 4)
ART 3910 ARTIST INTERVIEW (100pts)
Choose an artist who you would like to interview. You should choose an artist with significant career accomplishment--regionally, nationally, internationally, or all three. Initiate contact with your chosen artist via email, phone, or through their gallery. Your interviews may be conducted in person, through email, or over the phone. Consider in advance what questions you would like to ask your artist, but be ready to adjust as your interaction with the artist develops. (Feel free to use the questions you compiled for the earlier writing assignment as part of this assignment.) Turn in a typed version of your final interview on the last day of class, during finals week. For interview formatting suggestions, please refer to the following: Interview magazine http://www.interviewmagazine.com/art/ The Brooklyn Rail http://www.brooklynrail.org/ BOMB magazine http://www.bombsite.com/issues/current Your interview will be graded on 1) ambitiion of artist choice, 2) rigor of questions, 3) appropriate formatting, and 4) accurate grammar & spelling. There is no minimum or maximum length requirement. DUE DATE: last day of class

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
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 Educational centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

SLO 3: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art (G: 4)
Pam Longobardi/ Critical Thinking Through Writing ART 3910 Fall 2010 Writing Assignment #4: DUE Tues Sept 28
Belief Systems: Go to beliefnet.com and do the Belief-O-matic test: http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Quizzes/BeliefOMatic.aspx Based on your results, Write up a description of your own work as it represents some aspect of your belief system. Do you depict these beliefs narratively? Illustrationally? Metaphorically? Symbolically? Is it didactic? Or layered, allowing for discovery and persuasion? In Class: group together according to highest belief percentage (at least 90% or higher) -Find out what each of you have in common and present to class Next class- view film 'Religilous'-Bill Maher and discuss

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 4: ART 4950 / Portfolio II (3D) (G: 3, 4) (M: 4)
Assignment Description: Write an artist statement that summarizes the work, ideas, and interests you have discovered so far in your art-making process this year. Usually an artist's most recent work is most important to the artist, but your statement should reflect upon the many experiences you've had in general, so you may refer to your strongest works from previous semesters as well. Your artist statement is a working document because it will not have one final form. Instead, the artist statement will take many forms as you update and adapt it for various purposes over the coming year(s): graduate school applications, scholarships, future exhibitions, and grant applications. DUE DATE: last day of class

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 5: Ceramics 3DS 4945 & 4955/ Portfolio I & II (G: 3, 4) (M: 5)
Assignment: ARTIST STATEMENT 15% of final grade An artist statement will be due at mid-term and at the final critique. It will be assessed according to the CTW rubric (see below). Your artist statement must use clear language with proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. It should convey the essential ideas of your work and how those ideas are embodied in the work. A good artist statement will provide insight into the work and further the viewers' understanding of the artist's connection to the work. There is a collection of sample artist statements in the Ceramic Department Office (aka, Mark's office). You may be required to visit the writing center prior to
The University defines critical thinking through writing as:

This means that a component of the course requires students to engage, through writing, in critical thinking in relation to their studio work. The assignment description exactly as the students received it:

ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION

- 20 points = A; 13 - 16 points = B; 8 - 12 points = C; 5 - 7 points = D, 0 - 4 points = F. Criteria for evaluation are thesis, complexity, well supported.

~ Research goes beyond merely stating facts and general knowledge. Research may involve consulting other design critics besides Barnard or reading historical accounts of design. Modernism, even though it has justified paragraphs and capital letters, is not a simple checklist of criteria but evolved authentically in response to very complex forces.

~ Synthesis: conclusions leave the reader feeling satisfied. Synthesis will be reported to the university and can result in remarks on your permanent record and expulsion from GSU. Attribute all ideas and information not your own, including information from the internet. Provide full information about where the image came from. Format Turn in a color reproduction of the piece you write about with your paper. Papers should be typed, double-spaced, with footnotes or endnotes. Sheets should be numbered and stapled together.

~ Thesis is clearly stated and selected design is appropriate for the paper, allowing you to make observations about when and why it was made and how it communicates. Otherwise you may be committing plagiarism, a serious offense. Plagiarism will be reported to the university and can result in remarks on your permanent record and expulsion from GSU. Attribute all ideas and information not your own, including information from the internet. Provide full information about where the image came from. Format Turn in a color reproduction of the piece you write about with your paper. Papers should be typed, double-spaced, with footnotes or endnotes. Sheets should be numbered and stapled together.

~ Paper follows directions regarding length, format, and timeframe, cited sources, etc. ~ Thesis is clearly stated and selected design is appropriate for the paper, allowing you to make observations about when and why it was made and how it communicates. Complexity: your ideas are defended in a way that takes into account the complexity of cultural and aesthetic issues. Modernism is not a simple checklist of criteria but evolved authentically in response to very complex forces.

~ Bradbury Thompson's Westvaco Inspirations used victorian-era engravings, but in a style consistent with modernism. Imagine another student asked you whether a design were modern or not, and you had the opportunity to share what you had just learned from Barnard: write a 1000-word essay describing why your piece is, or isn't, a modernist work. Turn in a hard copy of your paper Tuesday October 21. Your example will probably conform to Barnard's descriptions in some ways but not all ways – and this will form your most of your discussion. Remember that even Barnard does not have a simple, single formula that applies to all modernist work. You may need to research the designer or the client for your piece, in order to infer the creator's intent. You don't have to defend the piece you write about. Visual description (the lettering is blue, the figure is wearing a brown suit, etc.) is only necessary if it explains how the piece is, or isn't, a modernist work. Guidelines Be sure that all quoted text and all images are attributed. Quotes must be in quotation marks and sources must be cited as footnotes or endnotes. Otherwise you may be committing plagiarism, a serious offense. Plagiarism will be reported to the university and can result in remarks on your permanent record and expulsion from GSU. Attribute all ideas and information not your own, including information from the internet. Provide full information about where the image came from. Format Turn in a color reproduction of the piece you write about with your paper. Papers should be typed, double-spaced, with footnotes or endnotes. Sheets should be numbered and stapled together. Grading Criteria: ~ Thesis: clearly states the problem. ~ Organization: follows directions regarding length, format, and timeframe, cited sources, etc. ~ Thesis is clearly stated and selected design is appropriate for the paper, allowing you to make observations about when and why it was made and how it communicates. ~ Complexity: your ideas are defended in a way that takes into account the complexity of cultural and aesthetic issues. Modernism is not a simple checklist of criteria but evolved authentically in response to very complex forces.

~ Bradbury Thompson's Westvaco Inspirations used victorian-era engravings, but in a style consistent with modernism. Imagine another student asked you whether a design were modern or not, and you had the opportunity to share what you had just learned from Barnard: write a 1000-word essay describing why your piece is, or isn't, a modernist work. Turn in a hard copy of your paper Tuesday October 21. Your example will probably conform to Barnard's descriptions in some ways but not all ways – and this will form your most of your discussion. Remember that even Barnard does not have a simple, single formula that applies to all modernist work. You may need to research the designer or the client for your piece, in order to infer the creator's intent. You don't have to defend the piece you write about. Visual description (the lettering is blue, the figure is wearing a brown suit, etc.) is only necessary if it explains how the piece is, or isn't, a modernist work. Guidelines Be sure that all quoted text and all images are attributed. Quotes must be in quotation marks and sources must be cited as footnotes or endnotes. Otherwise you may be committing plagiarism, a serious offense. Plagiarism will be reported to the university and can result in remarks on your permanent record and expulsion from GSU. Attribute all ideas and information not your own, including information from the internet. Provide full information about where the image came from. Format Turn in a color reproduction of the piece you write about with your paper. Papers should be typed, double-spaced, with footnotes or endnotes. Sheets should be numbered and stapled together. Grading Criteria: ~ Thesis: clearly states the problem. ~ Organization: follows directions regarding length, format, and timeframe, cited sources, etc. ~ Thesis is clearly stated and selected design is appropriate for the paper, allowing you to make observations about when and why it was made and how it communicates. ~ Complexity: your ideas are defended in a way that takes into account the complexity of cultural and aesthetic issues. Modernism is not a simple checklist of criteria but evolved authentically in response to very complex forces.
Other Outcomes/Objectives

M 6: DP Portfolio II (Dongoski) (O: 6)

M 4: ART 4950 / Portfolio II (3D) (Wsol) (O: 4)

M 3: ART 3910 (Longobardi) (O: 1)

M 2: ART 3910-Artist Interview (C.Drennen) (O: 1)

M 1: rubric (O: 1)

O/O 1: Assignment (M: 1, 2, 3)

Assignment Description

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: rubric (O: 1)

rubric

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

M 2: ART 3910-Artist Interview (C.Drennen) (O: 1)

ART 3910- Fall 2010 Craig Drennen Student # Criteria#1 Criteria#2 Criteria#3 Criteria#4 1 2 2 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 3 2 3 3 5 1 1 1 1 6 3 2 3 3 7 2 2 3 2 8 1 1 2 2 9 3 2 3 10 3 2 2 3 1 1 3 3 3 3 3 12 3 3 3 3 13 3 2 2 3 14 2 2 3 15 3 3 3 3 16 2 2 2 2 17 2 1 2 2 18 3 2 2 3 19 1 1 1 1 2 1 3 3 3 3 2 1 4 3 3 3

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 3: ART 3910 (Longobardi) (O: 1)

Pam Longobardi/ Critical Thinking Through Writing ART 3910 Fall 2010 Writing Assignment #4: DUE Tues Sept 28 Belief Systems: Go to beliefnet.com and do the Belief-O-matic test: http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Quizzes/BeliefOMatic.aspx Based on your results, Write up a description of your own work as it represents some aspect of your belief system. Do you depict these beliefs narratively? Illustrationally? Metaphorically? Symbolically? Is it didactic? Or layered, allowing for discovery and persuasion? In Class: group together according to highest belief percentage (at least 90% or higher) -Find out what each of you have in common and present to class Next class- view film 'Religilous'-Bill Maher and discuss

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 4: ART 4950 / Portfolio II (3D) (Wsol) (O: 4)

Grading Rubric: Rubric for ART 4950 / Portfolio II STEP 4: Completed grading rubric for each student: Student# Goal 1 Goal 2 Goal 3 Goal 4 Goal 5 Goal 6 Goal 7 Goal 8 Goal 9 001779808 6 5 4 4 4 5 5 001173251 5 5 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 4 4

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 5: Ceramics 3DS 4945 & 4955/ Portfolio I & II (West) (O: 5)

Douglas Allen Criteria Assessment (1-4) 1 3 2 3 4 4 4 3 Nicholas Howson Criteria Assessment (1-4) 1 4 2 3 3 4 4 4 Kurt Raschke Criteria Assessment (1-4) 1 3 2 3 4 4 4 Paige Thompson Criteria Assessment (1-4) 1 3 2 3 3 4 4 4

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 6: DP Portfolio II (Dongoski) (O: 6)

Alexander, Chloe C. •Identification of the Main Issues/ Problems (3) •Analysis of the Issues (3) •Links to Course Readings and Additional Research (4) •Comments on effective solutions/strategies (4) Brennan, Kathleen W. •Identification of the Main Issues/ Problems (4) •Analysis of the Issues (4) •Links to Course Readings and Additional Research (4) •Comments on effective solutions/strategies (4)

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 7: GRD 3910 History of GD (Throp) (O: 7)**
Rubric for each student who completed the assignment

**THESIS COMPLEXITY/RESEARCH CRAFT SYNTHESIS ADAKO 3 3 2 3 2**
**ALAM 4 3 4 3 2 BARGA 4 3 4 3 4 BAILE 4 2 3 4 3 CHEN 4 3 3 4 4 DELORME 4 4 4 4 4 DOUGHERTY 4 4 2 3 3 ELLER 4 4 4 4 4 ETIENNE 3 2 4 3 3 GARDNER * GONZALEZ 3 2 1 4 2 HARVILL 4 4 3 4 3 HERRINGTON 4 3 2 4 3 LO 4 4 2 4 2 MOORE 2 1 2 3 1 NUNEZ-INFANTE * POTTS 1 2 2 1 1 PRIMROSE 4 2 3 2 2 ROWE 3 2 4 3 3 SJOBLOM 4 3 2 4 3 STACHEWICZ 4 4 4 3 4 TRAN 4 2 3 1 4 WILLIS 4 3 2 4 3 * Student did not complete this assignment because they successfully completed other CTW assignments, or because they are failing the course.

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

**M 8: PHOT 4950 Portfolio II (Floyd) (O: 8)**

**GRADING RUBRIC STUDENT RUBRIC**

**STUDENT RUBRIC BFA Studio Art Majors—4950 Portfolio II Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW)**
Assessment: Rubric Statement (Art I - II) By the end of the semester, add the totals from each rubric for each student. Divide the total by 3 and enter average score. 20% of Final Grade --- Possible final average scores: A = 16 – 13, B = 12 – 9, C = 8 – 5, D = 4, 0 = F

**Student Name Rubric #1 Rubric #2 Rubric #3**

**AVERAGE for course Criterias Scores #1 #2 #3 #4**

**Total Criteria Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Criteria Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Add Only the 3 totals for each student. Then divide amount by 3 for student's final average score.**

**Amanda Locke 2 2 2 3 9 3 3 3 12 4 4 4 16 12 Student Name Rubric #1 Rubric #2 Rubric #3**

**Average for course Criterias Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Criteria Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Add Only the 3 totals for each student. Then divide amount by 3 for student's final average score.**

**Emily Pidgeon 3 4 4 15 4 4 4 16 4 4 4 16 15 6**

**A Student Name Rubric #1 Rubric #2 Rubric #3 Average for course Criterias Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Criteria Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Add Only the 3 totals for each student. Then divide amount by 3 for student's final average score.**

**Jessica Rocco 4 3 3 5 15 4 4 4 16 4 4 4 16 15 6**

**A Student Name Rubric #1 Rubric #2 Rubric #3 Average for course Criterias Scores #1 #2 #3 #4 Total Add Only the 3 totals for each student. Then divide amount by 3 for student's final average score.**

**Rob Chamberlin 2 2 2 3 12 3 3 3 14 4 4 4 16 14**

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 9: Textiles 4940 & 4950/ Portfolio I & II (Pollock) (O: 9)**

**Portfolio I and II covers are for advanced Textiles students who have completed all requirements in Textiles and are preparing to graduate. The courses may be taken sequentially – Text 4940 during the quarter before graduation and Text 4950 during the quarter of graduation, and may be combined with Text 4500 Directed Study to conduct focused research toward development of professional quality portfolio and exhibition work. Recommendation for graduation with a BFA degree in Studio Art with concentration in Textiles requires the presentation of a selection of artwork in a Senior Exhibition that takes place at the end of second semester. Senior student develop a body of work (5-6 works) during Portfolio I and II, and a selection of work (3-4 pieces) approved by the faculty advisors will be submitted for consideration for BFA Student Exhibition in the School of Art and Design Galleries. The exhibition is considered by the School of Art and Design to be the capstone experience in the educational profile of each BFA degree recipient. Assessment: Rubric for CTW Assessment of Artist Statement (Portfolio I & II) Criteria 1 2 3 4 Criterions #1 Descriptive language that effectively communicates the basic theme of the work and how the theme is embodied in the work. None of the language describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work. Some of the language describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work. Most of the language describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work. All of the language clearly describes the themes of the work and how the themes are embodied in the work.**

**Criterions #2 Individual perspective that provides personal insight into and understanding of the work. Individual perspective is absent. Statement is generic and offers no insights into the work. Individual perspective lacks specificity and offers little insight into and understanding of the work. Good articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides some insight into and understanding of the work. Strong articulation of an individual perspective that is informative and provides greater insight into and understanding of the work. Criterions #3 Clear language, void of “artspeak”, that is easily understood by a wide audience. The language is not clear and ineffectively communicates. Some of the language is clear and easily understood but a significant is confusing or vague. Most of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. All of the language is clear, easily understood and effectively communicates to a wide audience. Criterions #4 Proper grammar, spelling and punctuation. A (statement) statement is free of grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with no evidence of proofreading. Several distracting grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors with little evidence of proofreading. One or two grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that are not overall distracting. No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.**

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

**Target for O9: Textiles 4940 & 4950/ Portfolio I & II**
The area of Art Studio expects that 75% of its students will score a 5 or better out of 6 on the technical skills rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Type numbers in here. average student scores on the rubric. Discuss how many did well, how many did poorly, and what that might show.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
Critical thinking is the human mental process of developing conclusions that proceed logically from the study of evidence. Specifically in the biological sciences, critical thinkers analyze the quality and relevance of experimental results to determine whether they meet the goals of scientific studies on life processes. Critical thinkers in biology also use conclusions drawn from empirical evidence to formulate new scientific questions and ultimately, they design and implement new experiments to answer such questions. Thus, biologists with critical thinking skills apply various forms of the scientific method appropriately. To enable students to communicate their analysis of original data in written form. Writing about scientific analysis forces students to organize their thoughts into a logical argument.

**Goals**

G 1: Improve writing skills  
Students will become better writers by organizing complex biological concepts into written form.

G 2: Improve reading skills  
Students will become better critical readers as a result of improving their writing skills.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Lab Report (M: 1)  
Students will organize a written report communicating their experimental findings. The reports parallel the structure that is conventionally used in professional journals.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M 1: Written lab report rubric (O: 1)  
The following rubric will be used to grade reports. For every concept that is not included in the report, 0.1-0.5 points will be deducted (for a 10 point report).  
I. Introduction (2 points)  
a. Includes background  
b. Citations were appropriate  
c. Is not a summary of methods  
d. Does not read like a summary of methods  
e. Relevance of study  
f. Does not read like protocol intro  
g. Moves from a broad to specific  
h. Includes a hypothesis II. Methods (2 points)  
a. Passive past tone  
b. Appropriate detail  
c. Only mentions own experiments  
d. Does not read like a protocol or recipe  
e. No numbered lists  
f. Organized into sections III. Results (2 points)  
a. Should include text which highlight important trends/observations and are NOT a part of the captions or legends!!  
b. Figures/Tables are cited (i.e. Table 1)  
c. Considers all data sets  
d. No interpretations or conclusion IV. Discussion (2 points)  
a. Uses data to draw conclusions  
b. Each analysis states expected results  
c. Includes work cited at the end with appropriate literature  
d. All interpretations are merged into a set of overall conclusions  
e. Scientific premise to all conclusions V. Figures/Tables (2 points)  
a. Appropriate labeling (axes, descriptive titles, column headings, gel lanes)  
b. Should include original captions (communicates methodology used to generate data. Concise, not as detailed as methods)  
c. Size should be big enough to read, but not awkwardly large  
d. Should function to simplify interpretation of data  
e. Appropriate numbering scheme (i.e. Table 1, Figure 1, etc.)  
f. Contains number, title and caption  
g. Shows only relevant data that is discussed in discussion VI. General a. Grammatical issues GRADING (points deducted/section deducted from)  
Intro: Methods: Results: Discussion:

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Mission / Purpose
The Birth to Five program in the Department of Early Childhood Education considers critical thinking to be an important aspect of teacher education. We consider critical thinking to be a disposition toward thoughtful consideration of detail, evaluation of evidence, analysis of broad perspectives, and synthesis determined by a careful mix of cited and subjective conclusions. In teaching (birth to kindergarten), critical thinking is essential for understanding children's development and learning, evaluating teaching methods, advocating for "best practices," considering student assessment data, and expanding theory and practice to account for a variety of socio-cultural influences on children's development and learning.

Goals
G 1: Analysis
Students will analyze academic articles by examining the arguments and evidence put forth by the author(s).

G 2: Application of Academic Knowledge
Application Students will critically think and apply the readings and in-class experiences to new situations that require thoughtful analysis, evaluation and application.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 3: Critical Thinking and Application of Material (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students will critically reflect on course material (i.e., readings, lectures, and in class experiences) and apply this knowledge to new situations that require thoughtful analysis, evaluation and application. Professional Reflection/Quick Writes provide the opportunity to use critical thinking and apply the readings and in-class experiences to new situations that require thoughtful analysis, evaluation and application. Each Quick Write will ask you to take informed and supported stance on a current issue, professional dilemma or new situation that you will encounter as an early care and education professional. You will receive a “writing prompt or scenario” for each Quick Write. For example, a prompt may ask you to write a letter to your legislator supporting a childcare funding bill. The first draft of each Quick Write will be completed in class over 20-30 minutes. You may use a laptop computer to create a word processed document in class or you may submit a neatly handwritten draft. The draft will be turned in to the instructor who will use the rubric below to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement directly on the draft with the aim of deepening your thinking about the topic. Feedback may include suggestions about how/where to add examples, use citations, more directly address the prompt, evaluate and acknowledge your biases and subjectivities, as well as edits for spelling, grammar, etc. You will resubmit the second draft to the instructor by an assigned due date (see syllabus). A final grade will be awarded to the second, resubmitted draft. Each Final resubmitted draft of the original Quick Write should be a minimum of 1 double-spaced page (12 font) and will be worth 10 points.

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
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 3: Professional/Ethical Quick Write Rubric (O: 3)
Criteria Excellent (2 points) Satisfactory (1 points) Unsatisfactory (0-.5 points) Purpose Fully reflects on the issue/generally discusses the dilemma posed Reasonably reflects on the issue/generally discusses the dilemma posed Surface treatment of the issue at hand and/or failure to address dilemma/problems posed Support & Citations Strong use of course-related texts to support stance; uses citations appropriately Statements drawn from readings are over generalized or under analyzed; uses citations haphazardly Unjustified assumptions and/or opinions; little evidence that class topics/texts are understood; lack of citations or incorrect citations Evidence Uses specific examples and/or strategies to support stance An example or strategy was provided in support of stance No examples or strategies used to support stance Communication & Reader Engagement Easy to read; avoids meaningless jargon; writer clearly wants to engage reader Some errors make it harder to read; writer sometimes shows awareness of reader Errors make reading difficult; writer shows no awareness of reader and makes no attempt to engage reader’s interest Inquiry & Flexibility Considers complex alternatives; creatively applies ideas to new situations Differing views are considered; some evidence ideas are applied to new situations Other views are not understood or considered; does not apply ideas to new situations Total Score: /10

Target for O3: Critical Thinking and Application of Material
Students will apply their in class knowledge in generating a convincing argument. By the end of the semester, students will consistently perform in the excellent range on assignments, achieving a score of 8/10 (80%) or higher.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Students participated in 4 quickwriting assignments throughout the semester. Students showed consistent improvements throughout the semester on the quality of their quickwrites and, in particular, on the quality of their revisions. For example, the average score on for quickwrite 1 was 6.63/10 (range = 5-8), and for quickwrite revision 1 was 8.2/10 (range = 7-9) . For the final quickwrite, the average score for the first draft was 8/10 (range = 7-10). On the revision of quickwrite 3, the average was
8.9 (range = 8-10). This progress demonstrates that students met the achievement target of this objective and demonstrates that students are able to apply their knowledge in generating a convincing argument around early childhood professional development issues.

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

Constrained/Unconstrained Action Plan

Student performance on this objective was high. The utilization of class time and the opportunity to receive feedback on drafts assisted students in demonstrating strong analysis skills. For future assignments, the opportunities to receive feedback on their drafts will be continued. However, as currently implemented, the provision of faculty feedback on multiple drafts presents a significant time and resource challenge to the course instructor. To help alleviate some of these challenges, opportunities for peer feedback and discussion will be offered to allow students opportunities to interact with and learn from peers through the writing process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Professional Development opportunities will be offered to the course instructor around the use of collaborative feedback groups to supply comments and critical analysis of student drafts.
Responsible Person/Group: B-5 CTW consultant.
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

Our definition of critical thinking continues to mature as we engage with our students in critical thinking through writing tasks. As a new degree program, we are committed to preparing teacher educators who are able to critically think about the challenges, issues, and opportunities that very young children and their families experience. We consider critical thinking to include the following practices: *the thoughtful consideration of detail and evaluation of evidence *the willingness to analyze broad perspectives, question assumptions, and explore and evaluate personal subjectivities *the ability to consider the multiple influences of environmental and cultural factors on children's development *the ability to defend a position or argue for a course of action based on the synthesis of cited sources and personal experiences *the ability to craft a comprehensible message for a particular audience using appropriately selected modes and genres of communication

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

The CTW Birth to Five program implemented one new CTW course offering, Language, Literacy and Cognition, this past academic year, as well as a CTW course offering, Professional and Ethical Practice. The Birth to Five program in the Department of Early Childhood Education considers critical thinking to be an important aspect of teacher education. The CTW work undertaken this year by the Birth to Five faculty has evidenced considerable success. Our efforts in both CTW courses reflect that all students, through considerable feedback and mentoring provided by their faculty mentors, were able to achieve academic objectives outlined in our CTW program. As a new degree program, that was still experimenting and rolling out its CTW course offerings, our action plans centered around encouraging our CTW instructors to obtain WAC training to ensure that their implementation of CTW assignments and assessment align with CTW goals and objectives. In addition, we have begun to invest in the development of new CTW instructors through meetings focused on exploring the critical thinking skills of our students. Finally, we have begun to implement opportunities for ongoing support from the ECE and BRFV CTW ambassadors to CTW instructors. Now that both of our CTW courses have been successfully taught, we have identified a few action plans that we would like to continue implementing. First, it is quite evident that our work with students to promote their critical thinking through writing requires allowing students time to reflect on and apply knowledge to their writing. Allowing them sufficient time to work on their writing appears central to ensuring their ability to critically think about issues. Second, our students have required frequent and considerable feedback on their writing drafts in order to improve the quality of their writing. This feedback has allowed our students to become stronger in their ability to effectively communicate knowledge through writing by strengthening both their ability to communicate content and their ability to become stronger writers. Finally, it is evident that giving students their “voices” is an important part of allowing them to critically think through writing. Creating writing prompts that are meaningful to students’ experiences and that allow them to apply course content to their professional lives increases their ability to express their critical thinking through writing.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Workshops and training have been a foundational support for allowing us to effectively complete our CTW work. The Birth to Five CTW consultant, Gary Bingham, participated in CTW meetings that strengthened his understanding of the CTW work. Information gleaned from these meetings was shared with course instructors through information sessions that occurred every semester. Information meetings with the Birth to Five program director, Ruth Saxton, and the other CTW consultant in the department of Early Childhood Education, Teri Holbrook, allowed all CTW participants to take part and have a voice in the implementation of our CTW work.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

As outlined earlier, the assignments in these two CTW courses experienced significant success this past year. Despite such success, some revision of these assignments was necessary to improve the critical thinking skills of students. Specifically, changes have been made to the Professional Reflection/Quick Writes in our Professional and Ethical Practice course to allow students more time to reflect and share ideas with peers. In regards to assignments in the Language, Literacy, and Cognition course, changes will be implemented to ensure additional reflection around expanding students understanding of theories and practices to account for a variety of socio-cultural influences on children’s language and literacy development and learning. In addition, additional opportunities will be offered for students to share their work with their classmates and provide feedback.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW
initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Our Birth to Five degree program has implemented two CTW courses this year, one for the first time. As a new initiative, very few changes have been made to our Birth to Five CTW program this year. Most changes relate to the tightening of assignments and professional development and support of faculty implementing our CTW initiative. In general, we have felt particularly successful in our CTW initiative and have embraced the notion that critical thinking is a disposition toward thoughtful consideration of detail, evaluation of evidence, analysis of broad perspectives, and synthesis that is extremely important to the effectiveness of teachers of young children. Specifically, critical thinking is essential for evaluating teaching methods, advocating for "best practices," considering student assessment data, and expanding theory and practice to account for a variety of socio-cultural influences on children's development and learning.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year

The CTW Birth to Five program implemented one new CTW course offering, Language, Literacy and Cognition, this past academic year, as well as a CTW course offering, Professional and Ethical Practice. The Birth to Five program in the Department of Early Childhood Education considers critical thinking to be an important aspect of teacher education. The CTW work undertaken this year by the Birth to Five faculty has evidenced considerable success. Our efforts in both CTW courses reflect that all students, through considerable feedback and mentoring provided by their faculty mentors, were able to achieve academic objectives outlined in our CTW program. As a new initiative, very few changes have been made to our Birth to Five CTW program this year. Most changes relate to the tightening of assignments and professional development and support of faculty implementing our CTW initiative. In general, we have felt particularly successful in our CTW initiative and have embraced the notion that critical thinking is a disposition toward thoughtful consideration of detail, evaluation of evidence, analysis of broad perspectives, and synthesis that is extremely important to the effectiveness of teachers of young children. Specifically, critical thinking is essential for evaluating teaching methods, advocating for "best practices," considering student assessment data, and expanding theory and practice to account for a variety of socio-cultural influences on children's development and learning. As a new degree program, that was still experimenting and rolling out its CTW course offerings, our action plans centered around encouraging our CTW instructors to obtain WAC training to ensure that their implementation of CTW assignments and assessment align with CTW goals and objectives. In addition, we have begun to invest in the development of new CTW instructors through meetings focused on exploring the critical thinking skills of our students. Finally, we have begun to implement opportunities for ongoing support from the ECE and BRFV CTW ambassadors to CTW instructors.

Challenges for Next Year

Now that both of our CTW courses have been successfully taught, we have identified a few action plans that we would like to continue implementing. First, it is quite evident that our work with students to promote their critical thinking through writing requires allowing students time to reflect on and apply knowledge to their writing. Allowing them sufficient time to work on their writing appears central to ensuring their ability to critically think about issues. Second, our students have required frequent and considerable feedback on their writing drafts in order to improve the quality of their writing. This feedback has allowed our students to become stronger in their ability to effectively communicate knowledge through writing by strengthening both their ability to communicate content and their ability to become stronger writers. Finally, it is evident that giving students their "voices" is an important part of allowing them to critically think through writing. Creating writing prompts that are meaningful to students' experiences and that allow them to apply course content to their professional lives increases their ability to express their critical thinking through writing.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes

As outlined earlier, the assignments in these two CTW courses experienced significant success this past year. Despite such success, some revision of these assignments was necessary to improve the critical thinking skills of students. Specifically, changes have been made to the Professional Reflection/Quick Writes in our Professional and Ethical Practice course to allow students more time to reflect and share ideas with peers. In regards to assignments in the Language, Literacy, and Cognition course, changes will be implemented to ensure additional reflection around expanding students understanding of theories and practices to account for a variety of socio-cultural influences on children's language and literacy development and learning. In addition, additional opportunities will be offered for students to share their work with their classmates and provide feedback.

Modifications in Measurement Methods

Few modifications have been made to our measurement methods. Detailed rubrics will continue to be used to evaluate student learning and progress toward our CTW goals and objectives.

University-wide Committee Participation

Workshops and training have been a foundational support for allowing us to effectively complete our CTW work. The Birth to Five CTW consultant, Gary Bingham, participated in CTW meetings that strengthened his understanding of the CTW work. Information gleaned from these meetings was shared with course instructors through information sessions that occurred every semester. Information meetings with the Birth to Five program director, Ruth Saxton, and the other CTW consultant in the department of Early Childhood Education, Teri Holbrook, allowed all CTW participants to take part and have a voice in the implementation of our CTW work.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies (BIS) degree provides educational opportunities not available through the existing, traditional degree programs. The purpose of the program is to offer students an avenue by which they may focus on a central academic issue, topic, or area of inquiry and study it from the perspective of two or more academic disciplines (i.e., it by taking courses on it from several departments in the College of Arts & Sciences or other colleges in the university). Thus, BIS students do not graduate with "major" in one academic department; instead they graduate with an "area of concentration" (issue or topic of interest) comprised of courses offered by several GSU departments. Students may apply for admission to one of the 10 BIS programs.
that have already been created by College of Arts & Sciences faculty: Arts Administration-Speech/Theatre, Asian Studies, Classical Studies, Community Studies, Environmental Science, International Studies, Italian Studies, Law and Society, Middle East Studies, and Theatre. Alternatively, an individual student, in consultation with a faculty adviser, may tailor an interdisciplinary program of study that meets his or her particular educational needs, desires, and interests. With respect to CTW assessment and review, it is not feasible to evaluate every BIS student's effort and progress, mainly because they are enrolled in many different CTW courses and often comprise a tiny fraction of those classes' students. In other words, other than in the Theatre program and BIS-4995 courses, there are few CTW classes that enroll only BIS students, instead BIS students usually are mingled in various departments' CTW courses along with the regular BA and BS degree students. Therefore, the descriptions and evaluations in this CTW report are based on a sample of BIS students enrolled in several different BIS programs, who have taken several different CTW courses, offered by several different academic departments. In other words, it's truly a mixed batch of students -- with diverse interests, talents, and classroom experiences. Our purpose, in this CTW report, mainly lies in seeing how well they are accomplishing the "interdisciplinary" component of their critical thinking development, and not in judging it on the basis of the disciplinary criteria used in the particular CTW courses they have taken (the latter is more the responsibility of their CTW course instructor). The one exception to this is the Theatre program, which maintains its own CTW courses filled primarily with BIS Theatre majors. Those students' interdisciplinary competencies are included in the overall report, but the program also has attached an individual report on how its students meet specific CTW needs within the discipline. The Bachelors of Interdisciplinary Studies program acknowledges and respects the definitions of critical thinking affirmed by the University and its individual departments. A common thread in these definitions presents critical thinking as an ability to effectively identify, formulate, analyze, and evaluate arguments, hypotheses, evidence, and truth claims or to use these skills to solve problems. Beyond that, the BIS program seeks to imbue its students with two other elements of critical thinking. These are: (a) to understand the logic, perspectives, terminology, and analytic methods of more than one academic discipline, and see how they complement, or overlap with, each other; and (b) to be able to apply the "tools" of more than one discipline (i.e., their logic, perspectives, terminologies, and methods) to draw reasonable conclusions and make sound judgments based on available information and/or empirical evidence.

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical Thinking in Theatre**
Students completing the CTW courses in theatre will be able to: Analyze play scripts in terms of the meanings created by their authors, exercising a sophisticated ability to distinguish between what is in the script and their own unfounded assumptions. Evaluate critical and historical source materials in order to determine their relevance to scripts and productions. Synthesize materials from a variety of disciplines to determine their relevance to theatrical theory, history and practice. Formulate research questions related to the study of scripts for production. Solve specific research and production problems related to play scripts. Evaluate productions and production plans based on clear critical and historical criteria. Develop a personal aesthetic with which to approach their work as theatre artists. Apply critical thinking skills in reporting their research findings in oral and written form. Apply critical thinking skills in writing their research and analysis on stage as actors, directors and designers.

**G 3: Analysis**
Students in BIS courses will analyze theories, concepts, facts or other information from the perspective of multiple disciplines.

**G 4: Application and Evaluation**
Students in BIS courses will apply the ideas presented in their courses to new contexts in two ways: (a) by experiencing and judging how applicable and/or relevant the concepts, theories, and data from one discipline are in or for another discipline (i.e., seeing the compatibility, or lack thereof, of concepts across such fields as history, cultural anthropology, sociology, cultural geography, environmental studies, political science and law); (b) by observing or testing the "fit" between the explanations, accounts, theories, and information gained in their classes and reading assignments and what they experience in their lives or in the research projects they engage in as part of their class.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: THEA 4070 Research Paper (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper based on their research into a specific literary or historical topic. The paper will be organized around a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner and with an appropriate level of detail and draw logical conclusions based on the synthesis of materials from a variety of sources and disciplines. Students will demonstrate organizational skills of presentation without distracting grammatical errors or lapses in academic language or citation mechanics.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.1 Faculty
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: In Class Writing Exercise (M: 6)**
In History 3000, BIS students demonstrated analysis through an in class writing assignment: In class writing exercise on The Return of Martin Guerre Consider the differences between the film and book versions of this story. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each? What can you learn from one that you could not learn from the other? [Preview Formatting]

**O/O 3: Museum Exhibit Critique (M: 5)**
In Geog 4768-Hist 4320-Soci 4279 (Metropolitan Atlanta) students demonstrate ability to analyze, apply, and evaluate in museum exhibit critique assignment: Go to Atlanta History Center and view the "Metropolitan Frontiers" exhibit. Then write a 4-5 page paper in which you discuss and critique the content, design, and effectiveness of this exhibit, being sure to view it in light of class discussions and the book "Atlanta: An Illustrated History."

**O/O 4: Demographic Assignment**
Students in Metropolitan Atlanta class demonstrate ability to analyze data by completing a demographic assignment. The assignment requires them to obtain population, social, and economic data on Atlanta and several other metropolitan areas, and/or several counties in metropolitan Atlanta to compare/contrast them, to see how they compare to data from 20 or 30 years ago, and to draw conclusions about these changes and contrasts.

**O/O 5: Analytical Reaction Essay (M: 4)**

In Speech 3250, BIS students demonstrate analysis by completing an analytical reaction essay. Analytical Essay assignment description: Write an essay in which you demonstrate what you have learned from the textbook and apply those things elsewhere. You must make reference to the outside text (video or article) and explain its point. You must incorporate an issue or concept from the course (i.e., show how it relates to topics). You must show how it connects to other things (examples from your world, something you've seen, studied, etc.). Questions to ask yourself: a. What is the author trying to say? b. What is the main idea? c. Why do you think the article or video was assigned? d. What is the connection to the course? e. What other connections can I make? f. Do I agree or disagree with the argument? g. Is this generalizable? A strong paper will include solid analysis, will go beyond summary to demonstrate learning, and express a real ownership of the ideas.

**O/O 6: Oral Presentation**

In Political Science 3800, students demonstrated application in a paper and oral presentations. Assignment description: Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper and oral presentation of conclusions of research by providing clearly stated conclusions with examination of implications or consequences of conclusions. Students will also integrate other perspectives thoughtfully and respectfully.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: THEA 4070 Research Paper (O: 1)**

Each student will write a 10 to 12 page research paper on an historical or literary topic related to theatre. The paper will be built around a central thesis/question requiring the critical consideration of research data from at least 20 sources, no more than five of them created exclusively for the internet (you may NOT use Wikipedia as a source). Resources may include, but are not necessarily limited to: Primary historical sources Play scripts Literary, historical or theoretical commentaries (journal articles, book chapters or complete books) Video and audio recordings Photographs and drawings You are to devote a significant portion of the semester to this assignment and will document your work in four stages: A detailed thesis that must be approved for you to continue with the project An annotated bibliography in MLA format A draft consisting of at least 2/3 of the paper, including complete and consistent notations for all citations A final draft consisting of the complete paper and accompanied by a portfolio containing your thesis statement, printed annotated bibliography and printed first draft (all of these are to be printed with my notes)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**M 2: Findings for THEA 4070 (O: 1)**

We would consider four of the eight rubrics the most relevant to critical thinking through writing: Argumentation/Critical Thinking, Development, Knowledge and Structure. Of those Knowledge was consistently the strong point in the research papers, with an average of 4.79 (only 1 student out of 14 who handed in research papers scored less than a 5 in this area). Development came in second, with an average score of 4 and 9 out of 14 students scoring 5. Third was Argumentation/Critical Thinking, with an average of 3.5 and only 4 students earning a perfect 5. Structure came in the lowest, with a 2.786 average. Only 1 student had a perfect score in this field, and this was the only rubric in which a student scored just 1. In the four key areas, the overall average for this assignment is 3.768, with 1 student scoring an average of 5, 7 scoring 4 to 4.99, 4 in the 3-3.99 range and 2 scoring less than 3. Our target should be an average of 4.1 in the four key rubrics, 4 in Argumentation/Critical Thinking, 4.2 in Development, 4.75 in Knowledge and 3.5 in Structure. It is much harder to discern trends in the key areas for the 18 microthemes. One objective in crafting these assignments was to make students exercise writing and critical thinking skills through in a variety of different disciplines -- historical, theoretical and cultural among them. Because of this, there is no real point in tracking trends in specific rubrics or in students' individual performances. This is complicated by the fact that only two students did all 18 microthemes. Some performed the assignment sporadically their scores provide no truly useful measure. However, tracking scores provides some information on two logistical problems with the assignment. Average scores per microtheme in certain rubrics outside the purview of CTW -- most notably Audience/Rhetoric, Citation and Grammar -- suggest that students are not reading the comments on their work. Before the class is taught again, I will try to add an element to the assignment requiring students to re-write or respond to individual comments. The conjunction of averages for Appropriateness and Argumentation/Critical Thinking will help evaluate individual prompts and determine which need to be re-written. The 1.5 average in appropriateness for microtheme 11, on Pirandello's "Six Characters in Search of an Author," for example, is a clear indication that the assignment or its phrasing was rather difficult for most students to comprehend.

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

**M 3: Rubric**

History Rubric

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

**M 4: CTW for BIS students: Speech 3250 (O: 5)**

BIS students' progress in this CTW class was assessed through their written analytical essays and application of the evaluation rubric shown here: Speech's Definition of Critical Thinking In Speech, "critical thinking" is the art of actively producing and analyzing arguments for particular audiences in specific cultural and historical contexts. Critical thinkers are able to construct and assess arguments in their cultural situatedness; evaluate stated or unstated claims and their supporting forms; recognize the creation of knowledge through symbol systems; and converse and pose questions about the production of knowledge through the communicative process. Rubric to Use for CTW Assessment: Not at All Excellent Recognizes the cultural context 1 2 3 4 5 Arguments clearly constructed 1 2 3 4 5 Arguments adapted to that cultural context 1 2 3 4 5 Evaluates data/supporting materials effectively 1 2 3 4 5 Evaluates claims/conclusions effectively 1 2 3 4 5

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

**Target for O5: Analytical Reaction Essay**

The expected achievement target for BIS students is that at least 80% of the students in a CTW class will obtain a grade in the two highest evaluation levels used in the course's last CTW written (and/or oral, in some cases) project. Given the way many CTW rubrics are designed, this means, quite often, scoring a 4 or 5 on the evaluation rubric used for a particular project or assignment.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan for Theatre 2010-11
DEPARTMENTAL 1-Revise the definition of critical thinking in theatre to include an interdisciplinary element in keeping with our position as one of the B.I.S. programs. 2-Provide basic CTW training for all non-visiting faculty so that they will have sufficient awareness of the program and CTW procedures to step into CTW classes when necessary. 3-Set up a twice-yearly review of student written work using CTW rubrics to evaluate the overall progress of theatre majors as they go through the program. THEA 3100--A specific action plan for this course is difficult at present as we are changing the faculty assignment, which will lead to a general overhaul of the class. The goal will be to do this within the parameters of a CTW course, which means using rubrics for the evaluation of student work and the use of at least once written assignment submitted in both draft and final form. I will also attempt to use this class to instill in the students a definition of critical thinking in theatre that both includes its interdisciplinary nature and allows for a consideration of the different ways in which writing informs our work as both scholars and artists. THEA 4070--The main action plan for this class is to make the microtheme assignment more effective in improving students' CTW skills. This will include: 1-Incorporating microtheme prompts within classes on the plays covered so that we can discuss issues related specifically to the CTW rubrics. 2-Designating specific microtheme topics as revisable, with students required to use the teacher's comments and rubric rankings to rewrite their microthemes. 3-Revising or completely changing microtheme prompts for which students consistently score poorly on. To accommodate this, the peer review assignment may have to be cut back or dropped.

Add Metropolitan Atlanta course
We will work to add the Metropolitan Atlanta course to the list of BIS available courses. This class has been piloted as BIS for the last year, and we will add it officially starting in the fall.
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The main change to our definition of critical thinking is the realization that for theatre, as a B.I.S. program, critical thinking possesses a strong interdisciplinary component. Our definition of critical thinking will be amended to included the need for theatre artists and scholars to learn how to synthesize thinking from a variety of academic disciplines to arrive at conclusions related specifically to theatre as an art form and a field of scholarship. Beyond the Theatre BIS program, we developed a definition of critical thinking for the program in general (see draft of the GSU definition adapted it to suit the needs of an interdisciplinary degree program). This definition appears in the Mission/Purpose section of this report.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Since THEA 4070 Western Theatre History was a CTW pilot class in 2008-09, the basic assignments -- microthemes and a research paper submitted in draft and final forms -- were already in place."
in their CTW courses. This seemed like an attainable goal and a simple plan and it worked quite well for students in the Theatre program; however, it was not successful for students in the other BIS programs. For an account of why it failed, see the "Academic Question #2" section.

**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 noted in the "Academic Question 1" section, we had a successful evaluation for Theatre BIS students, did not succeed in evaluating CTW performance of BIS students in the other programs. There were several reasons for this. 1. Difficulty in accurately identifying the CTW classes for which the students in these other BIS programs (especially Environmental Studies, Law & Society, Community Studies) were enrolled. 2. Lack of response from most of the instructors of the CTW classes (although they initially indicated a willingness to forward the requested CTW material on these students, ultimately they did not do so). End result -- Jaret received CTW material from only one course (Speech 3250), and this material was for only 4 students. Of these 4 students, it appears that none are in the three BIS programs for which Jaret requested information (according to the Fall 2009 BIS student list, two have no area of concentration, one is in Arts Admin/Theatre, and one is not even on the BIS student list). For what it's worth, in this particular CTW Speech class the students seem to have made progress, as the information provided by the instructor indicates that each student did better on most rubric items on their second essay than on their first essay (and none showed a decline in performance). Given the lack of good quality CTW assessment for most of the BIS programs this year, we can not propose changes or improvements in the CTW course curriculum or the instructors' roles. We have, however, discussed changes and improvements in the CTW assessment process for BIS students that we hope to implement next year.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The purpose of the CTW component of Business Analysis is to help students develop the "wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome ill-founded presuppositions"["personal prejudices" in the original]; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do." (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005) page 1.) "Personal prejudices" in the original document has been changed to "ill-founded presuppositions" since I doubt many of the students have "personal prejudices" in the usual sense of the phrase about the subject matter of this course, but there will be times that initial guesses about things may need to be discarded as students delve deeper.

**Goals**

**G 1: Identify structure**

Students should learn to recognize the logical structure of a problem in terms of one or more objectives, constraints, and extraneous information. Building on this, they should learn to recognize the mathematical structure of the problem and identify management science tools appropriate to the problem

**G 2: Relative Importance of Problem Components**

Students should learn to apply formal and informal seeestments of which components of a mathematical model repay precision in estimation and effort is relaxing constraints more so than others. They should also learn to describe the results of analysis at a level of detail appropriate to the intended audience, with appropriate attention to inherent uncertainties

**G 3: Correct Problem Setup**

Students should learn to develop correct and clear mathematical models of increasingly complex problem situations as the semester progresses.

**G 4: Sensitivity Analysis**

Students should use formal sensitivity analysis as a tool of thought to develop conceptual descriptions of what matters most in a problem situation

**G 5: Cogent, Reader-oriented Presentation**

Students should develop the ability to present the results of an analysis in a way appropriate to various technical and non-technical audiences and an appropriate level of detail and vocabulary.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Three Phase Project (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1)**

Project The project for MgS 4120 is a part of the University's "Critical Thinking Through Writing" initiative. Your project, based on parts a through e of the Virulence project at the end of the Whalen & Churchill textbook available online, is in three parts. I have provided a cover sheet for each part, which you should turn in as the first page of each submission; it has a place for your name and the details of how I will grade the work. (In education jargon, this is called a "rubric.") I will use it to show you how your particular grade was assessed. In part 1 of the project you will answer question a of the exercise and write a first draft of an executive summary. In part 2 you will correct the errors, if any, in part a, do parts b through e, and write a second draft of the executive summary. In Part 3,

---
all you turn in is the third cover sheet and the final version of the executive summary. (You don't have to do parts f and g, and won't get any extra credit if you do.) By the University's definition, assignments that focus on critical thinking as demonstrated through writing are assignments that use writing to help students develop the "wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome ill-founded presuppositions ["personal prejudices" in the original]; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do." (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005) page 1.) I have changed "personal prejudices" to "ill-founded presuppositions" since I doubt many of you have "personal prejudices" in the usual sense of the phrase about the subject matter of this course, but there will be times that your initial way of thinking about a situation may need to be discarded as you delve deeper. The project must be submitted on standard letter-size PAPER; it is your responsibility to get it properly formatted and printed out. When printing spreadsheets, use landscape or portrait printing, fonts, page break control, and whatever else is needed to produce something that is very easy to read. It will probably take more than one attempt.

The most important component of the project report is the executive summary. This should be in the form of a memo to the management of the enterprise in question presenting a recommendation for action based on all the analysis you have done, together with a clear, cogent, concise, and non-technical summary of the justification for this recommendation. If you are not familiar with the word "cogent," look it up in a couple of different good dictionaries.

Relevant Associations: AACSB

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubrics for Three Phase Project (O: 1)
See rubrics in the document repository
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Three Phase Project
We anticipate that 70% of scores on the rubric items for the three project phases, summed across students and across items, will be 2 or higher out of 3 i.e. Developing or Developed.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
One of the two students had a majority 3 Developed with nearly all the rest 2 Developing The other student had a majority 2 Developing with the remainder split between 1 Developed and 3 Emerging. Her performance improved as the semester went on.

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

Ensure staffing for the course
Since I am retiring, someone else should be the ambassador, whether I teach the course next year on a part time basis.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Ensure staffing for the course
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Bill Bogner
Additional Resources: Full time faculty time or adjunct faculty funding.
Budget Amount Requested: $10,000.00 (recurring)

Improve record keeping with respect to rubrics
I gave the first two filled out rubrics back to the students without making detailed records of scores at the rubric level. Next year photocopies need to be made to facilitate assessment at the end of the year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Rubrics for Three Phase Project | Outcome/Objective: Three Phase Project
Implementation Description: Just do it
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor(s)
Additional Resources: A few cents per student for photocopying
Budget Amount Requested: $25.00 (recurring)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
Sensitivity analysis is the mathematical measurement of the degree to which small variations in initial constraints, estimates, and assumptions affect final conclusions. Tying this in with the whole CTW initiative helps students to keep the math in perspective.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this
academy year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? I taught the course as an "official" CTW course for the first time. After the first week, two students remained to complete the semester. How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? N/A. No action plan for Business Analysis was specified last year. What worked this year that you want to continue doing? Emphasizing sensitivity analysis as one of many types of critical thinking, and writing cogently about it as such.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A. There was only one section, which I taught. I did not organize any formal workshops for myself :-)

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

I have given the students rubrics for the three phases of the project for many years. This year I changed the column headings from letter grades to "developed, developing, emerging" and started using the word "rubric" when discussing them with students.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? We taught the course as an “official” CTW course for the first time. What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative? Tying in the process of doing mathematical sensitivity analysis and writing it up in a fashion readable to the intended audience with the broader CTW perspective has been the primary effect or "impact."

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Chemistry
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The chemistry department has long supported the University mission. We work to create an environment that provides for the education of students from all walks of life, traditional, non-traditional and people of all races, creeds and genders without bias. We adhere to the principle of liberal arts education with our faculty interacting with our students both inside and outside the classroom on a routine basis. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program both at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare our students for productive careers in post-graduate studies and the job market. We endeavor to have both our faculty and our students participate actively in scholarly pursuits, including oral presentations, submission of grant proposals, internships, graduate and undergraduate stipends, and fellowships. A unique characteristic of the chemistry department is our affiliation with the American Chemical Society (ACS). The ACS affiliation provides national standards of learning outcomes and assessment for the professional training of chemists for real life work in the chemical sciences. This includes industrial settings, government work, and academic areas. The intent is to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by practitioners in the field, what is currently taught to undergraduates, and how successful our teaching is. The ACS endeavors to encourage national improvements in curriculum and instruction through the various activities of its Division of Chemical Education and through its certification program. Faculty members are encouraged to attend seminars given by this division at the two national society meetings and at regional meetings each year. The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of our association with the ACS are the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge, we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with devolvement of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams, we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.

Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason.

Upon Graduation students will be able to take and analyze real world data to develop a knowledge base and the ability to draw conclusions from this knowledge base. Thought processes should be rational, logical and consequential. Conclusions should grow
directly from the data and accepted fundamental chemical principles. In addition, students should not only arrive at conclusions, but be aware that they are expected to defend these conclusions. It is also important to realize that data may be interpreted in more than one way, and that science moves forward as these difference data interpretations clash with one another, and are then resolved. Students must therefore learn to deal with open ended questions, deciding which data and variables are important, and which can safely be ignored in creating a picture of the system under study. The ability to think critically about scientific content and processes is key to these students’ futures. Critical thinking over time should become an internal skill, transferable to the rest of the student’s life and career.

**Goals**

G1: Students who pass the introductory course (C or better) should score adequate on critical thinking skills by semester end

Using the established rubric for critical thinking. Students who progress to the next course in the analytical sequence should receive a score of adequate on all sections of report 3 by the final rewrite. On papers one and two students should demonstrate an emergence of critical thinking skills as they rewrite and resubmit papers.

G2: Capstone Course

Using the established rubric for critical thinking. Students who finish the capstone course a score of adequate on all sections of report 3 by the final rewrite.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

O/O 1: Appropriate Title that represents actual work done in lab (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)

Students must be demonstrate the ability to think critically by choosing a title which reflects the actual experiment performed in lab based on the following from the rubric. Title. Excellent. The title should accurately, clearly, and concisely reflect the emphasis and content of the paper. The title must be brief and grammatically correct. Adequate: Missing one key component. Not yet adequate: Title misses more than one of the key components. Poor: Not descriptive of the experiment. N/A is not an option all papers must have titles.

O/O 2: Appropriate Introduction (M: 1, 2)

The introduction should be judged adequate based on the rubric section below. Introduction: Excellent: Includes a full statement of the problem, any background theory that will be used to answer the problem and the basic experimental design that will be used to answer the problem. Adequate: Minor errors in either experimental design, theory or unclear statement of the problem. Not yet adequate: A major error in one of the above categories or several minor errors. Poor: Major errors the experimental design, or a lack of understanding of the theory or misstatement of the problem. N/A is not an option.

O/O 3: Appropriate Materials and methods (M: 1, 2)

The paper contains a materials and methods section which would allow a competent chemist to repeat the experiment. Based on the rubric section below. Experimental: Excellent: Includes the details of the experimental procedure (section titled Materials and Methods). A competent chemist should be able to reproduce the experiment using this section of the paper. Adequate: Minor details omitted that would hamper reproduction of the experiment. Not yet adequate: A competent chemist would have difficulty reproducing the experiment. Major components of experiment not described or omitted. Poor: Lack of experimental detail

O/O 4: Appropriate Results section (M: 1, 2)

The paper contains a results section which is logical and incorporates all data in a readable format. Based on Rubric section below. Results: To think critically about data, it must be presented accurately, clearly and in a logical order. Excellent: Data presented fully including appropriate significant figures. Data are presented in logical order. Data format is readily available (in appropriate Tables, Figures and text) for facile assessment by the authors and readers. Adequate: One of significant figures, logical order, and efforts to make data readily accessible missing. Not yet adequate: Two of the above missing. Poor: Confusing organization of the data and/or major errors in presenting significant figures.

O/O 5: Appropriate Discussion/Conclusion (M: 1, 2)

The paper contains a Discussion/Conclusion section which demonstrates the connection between the laboratory experiment and the theory. Based on Rubric Below. Discussion/Conclusions. Excellent: In depth analysis of data including any error analysis which cumulates in the answer to the question or problem stated in the introduction. Adequate: Error analysis not complete, minor questions about interpretation of data, improper, but minor problems applying theory. Not yet adequate: No error analysis or many errors in interpretation of data or theory. Poor: No understanding of theory, major errors in data interpretation.

O/O 6: Figures and Tables (M: 1, 2)

Figures and tables are added at logical places that enhance the readability of the paper and summarize data in a logical manner. Excellent: Use tables and figures when the data cannot be presented clearly as narrative, when many precise numbers must be presented, or when more meaningful relationships can be conveyed by the tabular format. Tables should supplement, not duplicate, text and figures. Tables should be simple and concise. It is preferable to use the Table Tool in your word-processing package, placing one entry per cell, to generate tables. Adequate: Most tables or figures have descriptive narrative (captions or titles) with minor errors which either have a lack of clarity or are not needed. Not yet adequate: Tables and figures do not add to the clarity of the paper. Poor: Tables and figures take away from the readability or clarity of the paper.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M1: Reports 1 through 3 in Chemistry 4000 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

There were a total of 55 students which were enrolled in chemistry 4000 in the academic year 2009 - 2010, 50 of these students went on to the next analytical course. Title: Many students had difficulty on paper one determining an appropriate title on the first submission of paper 1. (Aver 2.7/4.0). All 50 completers and 2 of the non-completers were at 3 (adequate) of higher by the final submission of the final paper. (3.7/4.0) Introduction: Most students had difficulty with the introduction on the first submission of paper
Goals

M 2: Final Paper of Capstone Course (Q: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Six students have turned in the final paper from the capstone course (Chem 4160). All 6 have been adequate or better in all areas.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

We have not had a definition change. Our original definition is appropriate.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

We decided to eliminate one paper in the introductory course so that students would be able to concentrate on the 3 remaining assignments. We had to limit the number of submissions. Students did not take the first draft seriously in the past because "my teacher will grade it and give it back to me to correct." (actual student comment)

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Workshops went very well with over 1/2 of the faculty receiving training in the CTW course 4160.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

They are the same.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The degree major has not changed. Students are thinking more about the theory as they are doing the experiment and not treating the experiment as a "Cookbook" style procedure.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Computer Information Systems
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking through writing is defined in Computer Information Systems by behavioral (typically written), or other evidence, of certain skills and/or traits. These skills and/or traits include the abilities to: Identify problems (and in some cases, opportunities) before they become critically important or demanding of immediate attention to ameliorate and address; typically these problems relate to organizational work processes and workflows that could best be addressed through computer-based solutions; Identify multiple, innovative, and creative solutions to these problems; typically these solutions are formulated as multiple alternative designs for computer-based solutions to the problem(s); Evaluate the possible solutions to these problems in such a way to rank order them, from best to worst, in terms of their relative efficacies and inherent costs in brokering the "best" solution; Exhibit a concern for, and appreciation of, pursuing solutions that are characterized by ethical and social responsibility; Propose an effective approach to implement the "best" solution. This definition applies the University's CTW policy in the context of our discipline in the following ways: The CIS definition of CTW in consistent with the University's definition for the following reasons: (1) a wide range of cognitive skills are required to perform the CIS behaviors. This includes identifying, analyzing, and evaluating arguments and truth claims (points 1-3); (2) the need to recognize ethical and social responsibilities is addressed in point 4; (3) identifying problems, solutions, and evaluating solutions requires the formulation and expression of convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and (4) the exhibition of reasonable, intelligent decisions is also embedded in points 1-2 and point 5 of the CIS definition.

Goals

G 1: Improve Critical Thinking with a focus on Information Systems

Improve Critical Thinking with a focus on Information Systems
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Consider Ethical and Social Issues (M: 1)**
Consider Ethical and Social Issues within potential solutions

**SLO 4: Select Best Solution with Justification (M: 1)**
Select Best Solution with Justification

Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Articulate Requirements and Constraints (M: 1)**
Articulate Requirements and Constraints

**O/O 2: Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions (M: 1)**
Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: CIS 4980 System Development Project Capstone (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
The CTW assignment captures either as a Wiki or, if non-disclosure is required, a Word document the student's analysis of the project's goal, potential solutions, ethical and social issue issues, and the selection of the best solution. Students also analyze and give suggested improvements to at least one team member on their draft of this assignment. Here are the directions: Spring 2010 Instructions Please create a wikispaces at Wikispaces and invite CTW ambassador to your account. Make this a formal informational webpage rather than an informal blog. Complete your lessons early and the CTW ambassador will provide recommendations. Due Dates: February 17: Phase 1 (Lesson 1, 2, and 3) March 17: Phase 2 (Lesson 4, 5) March 31: Phase 3 (Lesson 6) Between Mar. 31- Apr. 14: Phase 4 (Draft Paper Consultation / Paper Exchange) April 21: Phase 5 (Lesson 7 and Final Paper) A. For the homepage, you can write anything and add anything you like to show a little bit of your style and flavor. Keep in mind that this needs to be school appropriate. If you want, you may summarize any major points from the Outline attachment, but do not just copy and paste. B. Please create seven pages with the following master titles: o Lesson 1 An Introduction o Lesson 2 The Problem o Lesson 3 The Solutions Identified o Lesson 4 The Solutions Evaluated o Lesson 5 The Ethical and Social Issues o Lesson 6 The Best Solution o Lesson 7 A Conclusion C. Subtitle each page with a news article title hotlinked to the original website. Cite this title at the bottom of your page. Add wikispaces ProjectHelp to your account list. Use this site for all wikispaces help. If you have any other questions or concerns, let me know by creating a Discussion on your wikispaces page. After creating the discussion send me an email on wikispaces to check your discussion. D. Make sure that each page flows from one to the next. The information provided here is basically going to form your proposal paper. I have created the sample wikispaces that you can use as a guide for formatting. Refer to Expert Writing Tips for writing tips. Fall 2009 Student Samples were provided.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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

Integrate CTW into CIS 4970
CIS 4970 is our CIS internship course. CIS majors must either complete CIS 4980 (our current CTW course) or CIS 4970. To cover all students, CTW should be integrated into CIS 4970.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

Integrate CTW into CIS 4980 System Development Project Capstone course

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2009

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition of critical thinking has not changed in the CIS BBA during these last two years.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The development of a CTW assignment for CIS 4980 was completed. The CTW designation and assignment were removed from CIS 3300. One additional member of the CIS faculty is now positioned to assess CTW within CIS 4980. These are precisely the previous year’s action plans less the involvement of CIS 3300 in CTW.

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general
Measures, Targets, and Findings

Currently, the CIS CTW course CIS 4980 only has one section each semester. This section is taught by our CIS CTW ambassador. For this reason, CIS did not hold workshops and training.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

With the move to CIS 4980 System Development Project becoming the CIS CTW course, that course’s capstone project is now the focus of the CTW work and assignment. A CTW assignment was created and refined during this academic year. The major refinement was to provide a confidential means for the student to submit the CTW work in order to comply with required non-disclosure agreements with some external project sponsors. This also required that the instructor and the CTW consultant execute the non-disclosure agreements.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The CTW initiative within CIS 4980 has assisted in providing structure to these students’ analysis and decision making required for completing the capstone projects. This has also required that students be fully engaged in all aspects of the project rather than playing a more focused role. This is both excellent outcomes.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2009-2010 CTW Computer Science

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EDT

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

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the computer science department is to educate students in fundamental topics like programming languages, data structures, algorithms, computer architecture, communications, and software engineering. For Computer Science, critical thinking is defined as documentation, clearly stating assumptions, explaining logic (through in-code comments), and testing solutions for correctness.

The computer science CTW plans are to have students evaluate and choose between alternate solution strategies. In this major, there are multiple ways to solve a given assignment. Often, there are several equally correct methods, however, there will also be methods that are not as good due to inefficiency (in time, space, cost, or other resource), over-complexity, fragility (non-robustness), scalability, etc.

Thus, for our majors, we interpret the statement “identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims” to mean our students should clearly state their assumptions, explain (through in-code comments) their logic, and test their solutions for correctness. Testing (debugging) will allow them to “formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions”, i.e., they present a series of test cases and demonstrate that their solution (most likely computer code) functions as expected. Grading can include different test cases, defined by the instructor, that reveal faults in the students’ assumptions. In other words, the test cases will allow the students to “discover and overcome personal prejudices” in the sense of their preconceived assumptions.

Goals

G 1: critical thinking for Computer Science

For Computer Science, critical thinking is defined as documentation, clearly stating assumptions, explaining logic (through in-code comments), and testing solutions for correctness.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Assignments to introduce CTW to our students (M: 1, 2, 3)

We use assignments to educate our students about writing and critical thinking. Included are a couple of example student project reports. From these reports we see the level of documentation expected for students in a capstone class. Two of the attachments are project directions, and the other two are examples of students’ work. The computer science CTW plans are to have students evaluate and choose between alternate solution strategies. In this major, there are multiple ways to solve a given assignment. Often, there are several equally correct methods, however, there will also be methods that are not as good due to inefficiency (in time, space, cost, or other resource), over-complexity, fragility (non-robustness), scalability, etc.

Thus, for our majors, we interpret the statement “identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims” to mean our students should clearly state their assumptions, explain (through in-code comments) their logic, and test their solutions for correctness. Testing (debugging) will allow them to “formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions”, i.e., they present a series of test cases and demonstrate that their solution (most likely computer code) functions as expected. Grading can include different test cases, defined by the instructor, that reveal faults in the students’ assumptions. In other words, the test cases will allow the students to “discover and overcome personal prejudices” in the sense of their preconceived assumptions.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: example projects (O: 1)

Example projects, both assignments as well as students’ work, are provided in the attached files.
M 2: Students make projects for the CTW class. (O: 1)

In the first computer science CTW class, students work on assignments throughout the semester. In the second class, they must prepare a project over the course of the semester. Example homeworks and final projects are attached. We surveyed the students both at the beginning and ending of the semester to get their opinions on CTW. We looked for progression in their comments showing increased understanding about CTW. In general, the students in the first class initially gave us responses indicating that they did not understand CTW. But the second survey indicated that they understood it better at the end of the semester. The second class was similar in that their end-of-semester understanding of CTW was better than in the beginning, however, their understanding in the beginning was much better than the first CTW class. It's unlikely that most students in the capstone class took the first CTW class last year, though it is possible since students have considerable freedom to schedule their non-prerequisite classes when they want. We also looked at students' success in class.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 3: Software Engineering measures (O: 1)

This is the grading criteria used in the CSc 4350 class. The achievement target is as follows. We expect a large number (around 30%) to perform excellently, then another 40% to meet these criteria better than average, though below excellent. Some (about 20%) will do an adequate job, while the remaining 10% will not complete the assignment. Student deficiencies included the normal missing deadlines and not fulfilling early expectations. They were able to adjust to do a better job as the semester progressed. Our findings were somewhat consistent with this prediction, and are reflected in the grades for this class. 14 out of 21 (67%) completed the course with an excellent grade, 6 out of 21 (29%) received a very good grade, and only 1 student (i.e., 5%) received an average grade. Obviously, we need to adjust the criteria to make it more like a real-world project. An actual software engineering project is not going to have everything spelled out initially; it is likely to change to have feature-creep (management requiring more features), bloating (features added to features), under-estimation of the time-line and budget, poor testing, and finally staff are required to cut corners to complete the project within a marketing-imposed deadline. For example, Microsoft's Windows Vista had many of these problems. Allowing the students a greater degree of freedom to determine their own project specifications would be a good way to teach them about what they can expect on the job. Grading Criteria Each team member will be required to submit a confidential evaluation on all other members of the project team on the day the final report is due. (Failure to turn in an evaluation can result in a loss of up to 10 points from your own individual project grade.) This evaluation will be accomplished only by the student and will assign the level of effort that every other team member contributed to each deliverable. These evaluations will be used to determine the number of points (out of 50) each team member receives. The following will contribute to project grading: 1. Timeliness (and quality) of first six documents. Failure to submit a deliverable on time will result in heavy point penalty. This is done to help you keep a pace that will result in a project. 10 points will be deducted for each calendar day a deliverable is late. For example, if a deliverable is due on 9/5, 1:30p and if the Team Coordinator turns it in 9/6 at 8:30a, the deliverable loses 10 points, if it is turned in 9/7 at 1:35p, the deliverable loses 22 points, etc. 2. Quality, completeness, and organization of the Final Report. Agreement of project with System Description. Project scope – Is it complex enough to provide good experience but simple enough to be completed within time and provide the 4-5K of code? 5. Quality and completeness of the Software System Design Project Contract, p.3 of 3 pages 6. Thoroughness, completeness, and organization of testing 7. Software System operation: Lack of errors, system crashes, ease of user interface, user manuals, correctness of user manual, correctness of user manual, correctness of user manual, correctness of user manual, correctness of user manual. 8. Quality of presentation (Organization, pertinence, clarity and understandability of oral presentation, preparation and use of visual aids, effectiveness of demonstration, etc.) 9. Implementation faithfulness to design; programming style

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The main issue that we encountered was to explain what we were doing to an outside audience. Student surveys reveal that the critical thinking and writing components are working well. As a student said in the post-survey response says, "I have a better understanding of what is meant by 'critical thinking' and I feel that I can explain my thoughts more clearly as a result," and "After handling the problems presented in this [CSc 4340] class I feel that I am better equipped at analyzing and thinking about problems as well as explaining them." Students also say things like "w Data Structures you need to think inside and outside the box..." This cliche has been abused for too long in our field and shows up in a large number of student responses. They need to learn that expressions like this are not good ways to communicate. Critical thinking, by definition, can certainly include stating and questioning assumptions. But it does not include statements about going outside of the specified boundaries. The responses for the software engineering class (CSc 4350) were on target, such as "Since this class is not about writing codes, but emphasis is placed on documentation, design, analyse, test, it forces us to think differently and outside the comfortable zones," "Critical thinking is a huge part of software engineering. It must be used to solve the various steps in creating a software, especially in the designing stages," and "The group project consists of creating a complex program which will result in a number of problems due to its complexity," Others commented on the team project aspect, e.g., "Team Work for group project." Communication among team members is an important part of the CSc 4350 class. The students in that class understand the definition of CTW, and are able to express it in their own words by the end of the semester.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

The project in CSc 4350 was, and continues to be, a huge success. Students spend all semester preparing a project that they then document thoroughly at the end of the semester. [See the attached 4350 Project Contract] This is a group project, forcing people to work with their peers who have a wide background of preparation. The systems that each group develops must conform to some criteria such as an accessible programming language, interactivity, and design over flashy interfaces. The project documentation includes a team description, including a coordinator/leader, requirements, analysis and rationale, design documentation for the system, the objects that make up the system, and a user's guide. On top of the extensive documentation, the groups must present their work to their fellow students. They are expected to professionally represent their projects, with status updates including current state, team accomplishments, and issues to resolve. The final report must contain the final test plan, and test cases. [A couple of examples are in the uploaded documents section.] The students must develop ways to test their system, and provide tests for it that are thorough. They must document when they encountered problems, and how they were fixed. For CSc 4310, in the Spring 2010 semester, there were 21 students with attendance being above average for the semester. Overall the class did well. The one person that failed did not turn in 2 assignments but did well on the other 4 that was turned in. He also did not do well on the exams. The 1 D student also did not do well in the exams with attendance being just about average. Students did show improvements as the class
CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? What happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

The CTW classes had three different instructors this year: Xiaolin Hu, Jaman Bhola, and Ming Fang. The first two conducted CTW classes in the previous year, so our meetings were more like discussion instead of instruction. Mr. Fang is a graduate teaching assistant, so he may or may not teach a CTW course again. Fortunately, he picked up materials from the previous semester. Group meetings were hard to schedule. Fortunately, one-on-one meetings did work. This is the preferred method of working for our group. This means some repetition on the part of the ambassador, but also that the meetings are tailored to each individual instructor. The training sessions went well. We have no consultants, and only one of the three instructors needed training in what the critical thinking through writing component is. We stress pre-conditions and post-conditions for assignments. That is, students are expected to document their assumptions for each method they write. And they are expected to document the results of the methods that they write. Not only must they specify methods in code, they must specify this in English. One other interesting note: prohibiting students from opening and/or using computers in class seems to have a positive effect. The whole class did very well as opposed to past CSc 3410 classes whereby students would open computers, be doing whatever without showing much attention to lectures.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

The main difference in assignments from the two classes are the scale of the work. The first class (CSc 3410) has smaller assignments, where students get frequent feedback and then move on to different, though related, material. In the second class (CSc 4350) students work on a semester-long project, with many steps along the way. Thus, they also get frequent feedback, but work to refine their project all semester. In the previous CTW report, we noted that “smaller, less ambitious assignments that clearly show the students’ thinking” would be good to have. This has been achieved in the CSc 4310 class. But one issue is that the project is required for the CSc 4350 class, and is expected by other universities and industry.” The semester project, with its many deliverables before the final report, strikes a good balance between what is expected in pedagogic goals and CTW. The current types of assignments appear to be optimal, so no major changes are recommended for next year. In the CSc 4310 class, the content is well defined. In the CSc 4350 class, the projects change from semester to semester, as they should since each project is novel. The main difference in assignments from the previous semester is in CSc 3410 in that the projects are more mandatory, external changes thrust upon faculty, the approach over the last year and a half has been a recommended set of practices. Faculty are much less resistant to this. In our case, we already had critical thinking and writing in these courses, so it wasn’t a matter of adaption rather than making new classes. I surveyed students. They were given a “before” and “after” survey. The “after” surveys were particularly interesting. Some comments show that the students are trying to tell us what they think we want to hear, for example, the course expectation responses include: “Carefully and meticulously documenting every detail how the code I write operates,” “Data structures are in general pretty challenging by learning how to manipulate them and understanding the concept behind them I will definitely enhance my critical thinking skills,” and “algorithm design strategies to come up with an answer to the solution my code has achieved.” Most points are concerned with the programming itself, especially in program comprehension, logic, and algorithm analysis. The feedback was more insightful, like “Examining your own thoughts, ideas, and emotions about a task or problem before you. Then taking those observations and either refining them or applying them,” and “It is the ability to logically deconstruct an argument or information. Find its flaws, subject, positive and negative consequences. It is breaking something into small details to understand the larger picture.” The first set of surveys were done on paper. Then I developed a system for them to enter comments electronically. The problem with this is that many students do not have access to computers, and we have no way of force them to participate outside of class. The primary impact of CTW on the students is that they see it as part of a thought process. “Critical thinking is the idea of clearly identifying the steps to most accurately and efficiently solving problems.” Another said, “Critical thinking is the process of coming up with a solution to a complex problem. It also involves the process of using logic to arrive at the solution one seeks.” Faculty see it as a refining process where students work on specific skills in communication, both human-to-human and human-to-computer.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The major change was to allow faculty the freedom to implement CTW into their courses as they see fit. Rather than approach CTW as a set of mandatory, external changes thrust upon faculty, the approach over the last year and a half has been a recommended set of practices. Faculty are much less resistant to this. In our case, we already had critical thinking and writing in these courses, so it was a matter of adaption rather than making new classes. I surveyed students. They were given a "before" and "after" survey. The "after" surveys were particularly interesting. Some comments show that the students are trying to tell us what they think we want to hear, for example, the course expectation responses include: “Carefully and meticulously documenting every detail how the code I write operates,” “Data structures are in general pretty challenging by learning how to manipulate them and understanding the concept behind them I will definitely enhance my critical thinking skills,” and “algorithm design strategies to come up with an answer to the solution my code has achieved.” Most points are concerned with the programming itself, especially in program comprehension, logic, and algorithm analysis. The feedback was more insightful, like “Examining your own thoughts, ideas, and emotions about a task or problem before you. Then taking those observations and either refining them or applying them,” and “It is the ability to logically deconstruct an argument or information. Find its flaws, subject, positive and negative consequences. It is breaking something into small details to understand the larger picture.” The first set of surveys were done on paper. Then I developed a system for them to enter comments electronically. The problem with this is that many students do not have access to computers, and we have no way of force them to participate outside of class. The primary impact of CTW on the students is that they see it as part of a thought process. “Critical thinking is the idea of clearly identifying the steps to most accurately and efficiently solving problems.” Another said, “Critical thinking is the process of coming up with a solution to a complex problem. It also involves the process of using logic to arrive at the solution one seeks.” Faculty see it as a refining process where students work on specific skills in communication, both human-to-human and human-to-computer.
Mission / Purpose
The Department of Criminal Justice undergraduate curriculum highlights the need for students to not only develop and improve their abilities to gather and synthesize information and research to gain knowledge relevant to activities and issues related to crime and criminal justice system responses, but also their abilities to utilize relevant information in developing frameworks that they will use in solving problems, critically assessing issues information, and situations, and in critical decision making. Students also should be able to communicate about their knowledge and the processes that they utilize in problem solving and decision making effectively in the written form.

The department utilizes as its foundation the university's definition of critical thinking, which reflects the position of Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace (2005, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction, McGraw-Hill, page 1) that critical thinking involves a "wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do."

Goals
G 1: Develop and enhance critical analysis abilities
Students will develop and enhance their abilities to critically think about and analyze issues within the field of criminal justice.

G 2: Generate coherent descriptions of extant knowledge
Students will explore, synthesize, and evaluate extant knowledge and scientific literatures on topics of interest to the field of criminal justice.

G 4: Identify ethical dilemmas in criminal justice decision making and processing
Students will become better at identifying moral dilemmas faced by criminal justice personnel and offenders.

G 3: Critically evaluate current issues in criminal justice
Students will become familiar with research processes, and will improve their evaluation skills.

G 6: Communicate effectively
Students will enhance their abilities to communicate their knowledge, analyses, evaluations, and decisions through writing.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their ability to generate a thesis/hypothesis/statement of the problem in the generation of a critical analysis paper on a salient issue in the field of criminal justice.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 1, 2, 3, 6) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their retention of knowledge about the criminal justice system and salient topical issues in the field in written form. Students will effectively communicate facts about an issue and apply theoretical frameworks to demonstrate the depth of both their knowledge and their ability to critically synthesize relevant information about that specific topic in this paper.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 1, 2)
Students will develop and/or enhance skills in applying theoretical frameworks to contemporary issues in criminal justice. Students will be able to not only synthesize and interpret extant information, but also identify patterns within extant information, be able to compare and contrast different sides of a problem, and/or generate new predictions through their presentation in a written form.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Critical Thinking

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
# Measures, Targets, and Findings

## M 1: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

This essay is designed to test students’ ability to critically evaluate an issue in criminology and/or criminal justice. Students will identify a single issue from the internship experience that involves crime or the criminal justice system and discuss why it is of interest. Students must define and clarify the issue and provide background information describing its significance. Students also must apply a relevant theoretical framework to demonstrate their ability to more formally analyze the issue. Students must assess the impact/potential impacts of the issues on the criminal justice system and/or personnel working within it and/or offenders and/or victims of crime and present potential responses/solutions.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric of crime and present potential responses/solutions.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Section A of the capstone had 22 students. Of the 22 students only one demonstrated an early ability to identify (scored an 4), while 21 students were rated as a 1 (the instructor noted that some of these students failed to turn in a first draft). At the end of the semester, the following percentages for identification of an issue were reported: 4 - 23%; 3 – 31%; 2 – 23%; 1 – 23%. While in this section of the class we fell slightly below our goal (77% as opposed to the targeted 80%), it is notable that significant advances through the semester were apparent (from beginning score to end scores); only six students did not improve their scores (27%); one of these earned an 4 both drafts, while the other five earned a 1 on both drafts. Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: One student (5%) earned an 4 rating; 7 students were rated as a 3 (31%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 1 (the instructor noted that some of these students failed to turn in a first draft). At the end of the semester 27% (n=6) student essays were rated as an 4; 41% (n=9) were rated as a 3; 27% (n=6) were rated as a 2; and 5% (n=1) was rated as a 1. Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester. Overall, in this section of the course, our goal of 80% passing was met and exceeded (95%). Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled.

### Target for O1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses

The goal is that by the end of their senior year (e.g., for the capstone seminar), 80% of students should be rated as an 4, 3, or 2 in their ability identify and state topical issues or hypotheses. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels.

## SLO 4: Generation of conclusions (G: 1, 3, 4, 6) (M: 1, 2)

Students will be able to develop meaningful conclusions from literature reviews and/or data analyses and/or be able to identify policy implication given the evidence available.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication
- 4 Critical Thinking

### Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

## SLO 5: Written communication (G: 6) (M: 1)

Students will be able to effectively communicate their knowledge and analytical skills in written form (paper). Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively identify issues, develop and organize subtopics, and generate streamlined presentations of information. In addition, students will utilize appropriate grammar and syntax, as well as the ability to adhere to APA style guidelines.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 1 Written Communication

### Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

## SLO 6: Identification of ethical issues (G: 1, 3, 4) (M: 2)

Students should be able to identify and evaluate the criminal justice system and issues that arise within it.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

- 4 Critical Thinking
- 5 Contemporary Issues

### Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

---

**Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information**

The goal is that by the end of their senior year (e.g., for the capstone seminar), 80% of students should be rated as an 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to comprehend and synthesize information. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: One student (5%) earned an 4 rating; 7 students were rated as a 3 (31%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 1 (the instructor noted that some of these students failed to turn in a first draft). At the end of the semester 27% (n=6) student essays were rated as an 4; 41% (n=9) were rated as a 3; 27% (n=6) were rated as a 2; and 5% (n=1) was rated as a 1. Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester. Overall, in this section of the course, our goal of 80% passing was met and exceeded (95%). Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled.
Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

The goal is that by the end of their senior year (e.g., for the capstone seminar), 80% of students should be rated as an 4, 3, or 2 in their ability conduct application and analysis of criminal justice subject matter. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: One student (5%) earned an 4 rating; 7 students were rated as a 3 (31%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 1. At the end of the semester 31% (n=7) of the student essays were rated as an 4; 23% (n=5) were rated as a 3; 41% (n=9) were rated as a 2; and 5% (n=1) was rated as a 1. Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester, while 4 students maintained their skill levels. Overall, for this section of the seminar we met our goal of 80% passing and exceeded that goal (95%). Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**Target for O4: Generation of conclusions**

The goal is that by the end of their senior year (e.g., for the capstone seminar), 80% of students should be rated as an 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to generate conclusions and implications pertaining to criminal justice subject matter. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: one student (5%) earned a rating of 4; 5 students were rated as a 3 (23%) and 16 students (73%) were rated as a 1. At the end of the semester 9% (n=2) of the student essays were rated as an 4; 50% (n=11) were rated as a 3; 36% (n=8) were rated as a 2, and one was rated as a 1 (5%). Overall, 18 students (82%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester, while 3 students (18%) maintained their skill levels. This section yielded a excess of our expected 80% passage rate (at 95%). Section B of the capstone had 17 students enrolled. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**Target for O5: Written communication**

The goal is that by the end of their senior year (e.g., for the capstone seminar), 80% of students should be rated as an 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to use high quality written communication to convey ideas about criminal justice subject matter. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Section A of the capstone (N= 22 students) posted the following data. For the first draft of the paper, the following distribution was noted: Four students (18%) earned an 3 rating; 4 students were rated as a 2 (18%) and 14 students (64%) were rated as a 1. At the end of the semester 23% (n=5) of the student essays were rated as an 4; 50% (n=11) were rated as a 3; and 27% (n=6) were rated as a 2. Overall, 19 students (86%) demonstrated improvement in these over the course of the semester, while 3 students (14%) maintained their skill levels. At 95%, this section of the course exceeded our goals in passage rates. Information on early draft breakdowns was unavailable. By the end of the semester, 53% of the students posted an 4 while 47% earned a 3 on the final draft of the essay (100% of the students met the goal in this section).

**M 2: Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice (O: 3, 4, 6)**

This writing assignment is designed to assess students' ability to critically assess material and apply course concepts to ethical issues in the criminal justice system. In this particular case, the assignment asked students to consider the ways in which plea bargaining practices impact aspects of procedural and substantive justice. They were also required to weigh in on the advantages and disadvantages of plea bargaining in the US. The assignment was based on class lectures and a documentary on the topic. (see attached file named Ethical Issue Assignment). This assignment was also intended as an assessment of students’ ability to express ideas in writing.

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

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the third assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

A random sample of 10 of the graded final assignments were provided for review to the CTW Ambassador. Of these 10, 10% (n=1) were rated as a 4 and 80% (n=8) were rated as a 3. (Only 10% were rated as a 2 – work in progress).

**Target for O4: Generation of conclusions**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the third assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

A random sample of 10 of the graded final assignments were provided for review to the CTW Ambassador. Of these 10, 40% (n=1) were rated as a 4 and 60% (n=8) were rated as a 3.
Target for O6: Identification of ethical issues

We want 80% of our students to be able to identify ethical issues when they are present.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

A random sample of 10 of the graded final assignments were provided for review to the CTW Ambassador. Of these 10, 10% (n=1) were rated as a 4 and 80% (n=8) were rated as a 3. (Only 10% were rated as a 2 – work in progress).

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

Continued data collection
We will continue to collect data on this component of critical thinking through the capstone seminar across instructors. We will increase our collection of data in different semesters to see if we have variance in assessment techniques across instructors. We want to determine if our overall rates are meeting our overall goals and to identify where discrepancies occur.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty involved with Capstone seminar in conjunction with CTW Ambassador.

Continued monitoring and data collection
Continued monitoring and data collection efforts should be pursued with a focus on determining the degree to which outcomes may vary across instructors and students to determine what students need to ensure their success. It is recognized that there are cohort effects and that in a different class or a different year, we may find that we reach our goal. Continued monitoring and collection/analysis of data can help us determine the source/s of achievement levels.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses

Implementation Description: On-going.
Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador and section instructors

Improved collection of data, monitoring
In the next year priority should be given to improving assessment approaches for this course to further enhance the use of CTW in the Ethics course. Given the short implementation phase that occurred this year, not enough "bones" were in place to ensure a wider breadth of data collection. It is recommended that the next phase of assessment consider collection of information for all student essays/assignments in this course, along with data on all students. This would allow for a determination if there are improved outcomes throughout the course as well as a measure of success at the end of the course. Rubric scoring should be utilized in the assessment approach.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
| Generation of conclusions | Identification of ethical issues

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
We are fairly satisfied with the university's definition of critical thinking in our application of the CTW initiative in our undergraduate program. The broad definition allows individual course instructors to work together to create assignments and assessments that apply in the field. In order to facilitate and enhance further discussions among the faculty, we have determined that keeping this broad definition is useful.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
Two primary achievements for the year are notable for the program overall. The final assessment of the viability of CTW in our methods of analysis course (CRJU 3020) ultimately concluded that this course was the wrong placement for the initiative. This was determined by a series of interviews of the CTW ambassador with instructors for this course, as well as an unscientific sample of students. In addition, student comments in the SLC (sophomore learning community) concurrent, according to the adviser of this program. With this determination, in conjunction with a host of undergraduate curriculum changes, faculty voted to remove the CTW requirement from this course and to integrate it into a new co-requisite for the program, CRJU 3060, Ethics in Criminal Justice. With this vote came a quick push for approval so that the course could go "live" sooner rather than later to ensure that students would be able to meet the CTW requirements in the major. We were successful on this front. The second achievement was the first collection of data to determine the effects of CTW on our student learning outcomes. Prior to this point, we had only assessed the implementation of the CTW initiative in our programming. With the onset of data collection, we continue to refine and hone our understanding of CTW, its meaning for our students and our application of the tenets of the initiative not only in the CTW identified
CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

We held a training for faculty and graduate student consultants involved in the CTW initiative in the fall semester. The CTW ambassador (Brenda Blackwell) worked with the CHHS CTW expert (Spencer Middleton) to host the training, and presented to students and faculty the background of the initiative as well as expectations, tips, and job responsibilities. Training in the fall will need to be further honed to ensure that all faculty with consultants participate and to ensure that consultants are appropriately matched with faculty and that expectations are clear from the outset. At this point, the majority of our faculty are trained to lead CTW courses (Profs. Blackwell, Brezina, Collins, Dabney, Finn, Daigle, Friedmann, Guasaferro, Muflic, Payne, Reed, Teasdale, Topalli, Warner, and Yang; as well as McEntire as a part-time faculty member). We consider this a major success of the initiative, for while not all faculty are regularly teaching CTW course sections, the breadth of participation indicates that faculty are interested in improving student learning outcomes across the curriculum, with critical thinking and writing considered to be key components. In the future, it is recommended that training sessions include a time frame for individual faculty who will be teaching CTW sections to work specifically with the consultants to clarify their personal expectations, general impressions of workload, and what to expect from student work and participation. While the Ambassador can provide overall information, individual differences in use of consultants clearly necessitates the need for such a meeting.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

The CTW assignments have evolved since we implemented the CTW initiative. In the case of the Capstone seminar, the assignment has generally stayed the same with the primary evolution occurring in the form and scope of the questions asked, as well as considerable change to the rubric used to assess the learning outcomes as we have addressed and tightened our focus. In addition, with the removal of the CTW requirement from Methods, new assignments were generated for the ethics course. At this point, only one of the assignments was involved in the overall assessment portfolio for this year. We believe that it is important for more than one instructor to be involved in teaching courses included in the CTW initiative to ensure that there is more than one "set of eyes" on the development and refinement of assignments and assessments. As such, with a second faculty member involved in teaching the ethics course, we anticipate further refinement of the assignments and assessment rubrics over the next year. It is recommended that in the next year a more complete set of assessment data should be collected, with particular attention paid to the ethics course to bring it up to the status currently offered in the capstone assignment. It is recommended that faculty and the Ambassador collaborate to ensure that the assignments are appropriately structured to meet CTW goals and that the rubric adequately allows for assessment of these goals.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Per our response to item 2, one major change in implementation occurred this year with vote to remove CTW from our methods course and to implement CTW in our ethics course. The full implementation will come online in the Fall of 2010 with other significant changes to the curriculum. One of the key curriculum changes also is designed to ensure that students take a CTW course early in their studies, with Ethics required as a co-requisite to any upper division course. Faculty should be advised to students to take this course sooner rather than later. CTW has had a significant impact on our major in a number of ways. First, it has led to increased consideration faculty-wide of student learning goals. Second it has prompted discussions about ways to design assignments geared to stimulate critical thinking across the faculty. Third, it had significant impact on our curriculum in our determination to ensure that students take a CTW course earlier in their studies. Overall, we anticipate that the CTW initiative will continue to be a source of collaboration and conversation among faculty and with students in the years to come.

---
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### Mission / Purpose

**Mission:**
To create future teachers who can apply critical thinking skills to their teaching practices and their own professional development.

**Purpose:**
The purpose of the CTW initiative within the Early Childhood Development BSE program is to engage early childhood educators in critical thinking and communication. The department of Early Childhood Education considers critical thinking to be an important aspect of teacher education. In Prekindergarten through Grade 5 teaching, critical thinking is essential for evaluating teaching methods, advocating for "best practices," considering student assessment data, and expanding theory and practice to account for a variety of socio-cultural influences on children’s development and learning. We consider critical thinking to include the following practices: *the thoughtful consideration of detail and evaluation of evidence *the willingness to analyze broad perspectives, question assumptions, and explore and evaluate personal subjectivities *the ability to defend a position or argue for a course of action based on the synthesis of cited sources and personal experiences *the ability to craft a comprehensible message for a particular audience using appropriately selected modes and genres of communication

### Goals

**G 1: Think critically in online environments**
Students will develop and present ideas in online fora. Their ideas will indicate that they are: 1) making reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do based on experiences, readings, conversations, etc., and 2) demonstrating the willingness to recognize and challenge personal biases and assumptions. Through asynchronous online interactions, including conversations, brief postings, and content organization, they will demonstrate developing awareness and use of critical thinking. Students will synthesize their thinking through beginning-of-semester and end-of-semester essays that capture and communicate the ideas they developed via their online discussions.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Demonstrate developing awareness and use of evaluation methods to think critically in hybrid learning environments

Our graduates will be able to demonstrate developing awareness and use of evaluation methods to think critically in hybrid learning environments.

#### SLO 2: Literacy Philosophy (G: 1) (M: 1)

Literacy Philosophy: The students will use an online environment to review examples of quality children’s literature, reflect upon what makes quality children’s literature, and engage in online discussions designed to further their understanding of literature and its function in the literacy development. Details follow: To teach reading and writing, we must be readers and writers. We need to have opportunities as professionals to examine our own lives, our own literacy practices, and to do so in a context that helps connect these experiences to our roles as teachers and learners. It is important for you, as a teacher, to be able to articulate your philosophy about the teaching and usage of literacy in the 21st century. To help you begin thinking in this direction, you will participate in a semester-long activity designed to achieve two aims: 1) help you become a connoisseur of children's books, and 2) see how quality children's books can be used to effectively develop elementary students' literacy practices. This assignment will have 3 components: Ø An initial 2-5 page essay describing your philosophy about literacy instruction for 1st-3rd grade children. This essay will be submitted on LiveText. Ø Participation in our private online Good Reads group, I Want to Be THAT Teacher! Participation will mean becoming a member, friending everyone in the class, and using the site throughout the semester to explore children’s literature. As part of your participation, you will read 100 children's books, write reviews, respond to peer comments, and take part in online discussions prompted by the instructor and CTW consultant aimed at deepening your understanding of literacy instruction. Ø An end-of-the-semester revision of your initial essay (3-5 pages) that reflects the growth you have made in your thinking about literacy instruction and the role of quality children's literature.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

#### 1 Written Communication

#### 3 Collaboration

#### 4 Critical Thinking

#### 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
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

4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

#### SLO 2: Inquiry into Educational Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)

Inquiry into Urban Education Essay: Students will explore an inquiry question they have developed concerning urban education; locate, read, and discuss in small groups professional literature related to their topic; and write an essay that combines readings and personal experiences to communicate their thinking about their topic. Details follow: This semester you will expand upon the “burning question” you developed last semester. Grouped according to related questions, you will participate in inquiry clubs to read professional texts related to your burning question. Based on your ongoing inquiry into your question, you will write a 3-5 page essay articulating your question and what you are coming to understand about it. This essay needs will undergo a mandatory revise and resubmit cycle with Nicole Pourchier, our CTW consultant. This assignment will be submitted on LiveText. The CTW consultant will provide written feedback directly on your drafts with the aim of deepening your thinking about the topic. Feedback will include suggestions about how/where to add examples, use citations, add voice, more directly address the question, evaluate and acknowledge your biases and subjectivities, etc. Each draft must show substantial changes based on the consultant’s feedback. I will grade your final draft using a rubric that I will give you in advance. Your grade in part will be based on how well you used the CTW consultant’s comments to rethink, enrich and improve your essay. Superficial consideration of the CTW consultant’s feedback will not be considered an adequate revision.

#### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
SLO 3: Demonstrate an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement

Our graduates will be able to demonstrate an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement through writing, revision, and collaborative experiences that support the exploration of their literacy pedagogy, practice, and current trends and issues impacting education.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 3: Literacy Outreach (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)

Students will select a major literacy topic, locate and read professional literature to inform their thinking, and produce a written product aimed at communicating their position. Details follow. Assignment description: Understanding the profession of reading teachers is an important piece of teaching and changing young children’s lives. A teacher’s job will not solely exist within the confines of the four walls of the classroom or even the school. Being an advocate at district, state, and national levels is key to being an educator. To this end, choose one of five major literacy topics facing education in 2010 and beyond. Briefly familiarize yourself with the options to choose the one you are most interested in researching. The topics are: (1) The Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (LEARN) Act; (2) Common Core Initiatives; (3) Hot Topics in 2010 (results of IRA’s national survey); (4) Revised Standards for the Assessment of Reading and Writing; (5) Reauthorization of NCLB Below are “provocative prompts” designed to encourage you to take an informed stance and to support your position with information derived from course readings, class discussions, and other resources. LEARN Act Within the “quick read” informing you about the LEARN act, the writer makes a strong case for the importance of high-quality literacy instruction for every child. Researchers have found frightening differences in children who receive high quality literacy instruction and those who don’t. “The new Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (LEARN) Act, if passed, will create a blueprint for $2.35 billion in literacy program funds for states to enhance literacy professional development efforts for teachers of grades K–12 in high-poverty and low-achieving schools.” To this end, what types of professional development are needed to better equip educators to teach high-quality literacy? What works? What doesn’t? The LEARN act will build off predefined goals of Early Reading First, Reading First, and Striving Readers. Which of the goals of Early Reading First and Reading First do you believe we should use to promote high quality literacy instruction and opportunities? Why? Write a letter to Georgia’s U.S. Senator, Saxby Chambliss, outlining professional development you believe should be part of the LEARN Act. Include your reasoning based on Early Reading First and Reading First goals. Lastly, be sure you familiarize yourself with Senator Chambliss and what he supports within the field of education (you can check out his website for this information). Common Core Initiatives (www.corestandards.org) Highly anticipated Common Core Standards should be released for K-12 in January. Kathryn Au, IRA’s current president, had much to comment on the College- and Career-readiness standards released in September of 2009. Both sets of standards are expected to be finalized in 2010, meaning, conversations will be brief and editing will be minimal. Thus, your voice and opinion will be of a time-intensive manner. After reading Au’s comments, review the current College- and Career-readiness standards (follow the website above for more detailed information). Do you believe these standards (related to Literacy) are appropriate? How would you modify them? Keep your eyes peeled for K-12 standards, as you’ll be responding to these as well. Importantly, when you enter your classroom in a year, you’ll be required to meet these standards. Now is the time to voice your opinion to the decision-makers on a national level. Craft a letter to Georgia’s U.S. Senator, Johnny Isakson. Discuss the pro’s and con’s of implementing the Common Core Initiatives (as they are currently written for College- and career-readiness). Discuss what you are hopeful about seeing listed in the K-12 standards (you may refer to NAEP for a list of their current requirements (and you may agree/disagree with any of those)). Hot Topics in 2010 Briefly describe how the survey is developed, respondents selected, and how data is collected. Of the “very hot” topics in 2009, why were these chosen (especially RTI, the “hottest” of hot)? Though researchers speculate into the popularity of RTI, what are your thoughts? Do you agree/disagree? Why? Look at the topics that have “cooled off,” the “crumbling pillars.” Researchers have speculated why these have lost their heat. Given their perspective, why do you believe they are becoming “cool”? Are there any topics you believe should be “hot” that are not, or any that are “cool” you believe should be hot? In a letter written to Governor Sonny Perdue, summarize these hot/cool topics as you believe they should be focused on in elementary classrooms. You may ask that funding be focused primarily on these “hot” topics or you may ask that professional development around these “hot” topics be funded. You may talk about individual experiences in classrooms where “cool” topics are too prevalent and need a change, or you may simply write in praise of GA education system and our ability to focus on “what’s hot.” Either way you take this letter, the purpose is to provide Governor Purdue with an awareness of where focus is (and should be) when making choices related to Literacy. Revised Standards for Assessment Of Reading and Writing How do you define assessment? How does your definition compare to the joint definition from IRA and NCTE? Familiarize yourself with the Revised Standards for Assessment of Reading and Writing. After reading the introductory discussion of assessment, familiarize yourself with two standards specifically. How does this conceptualization of assessment vary from (or align with) your experiences in your field placements? What are some ways to implement these revised standards into your classroom (both present field experiences and future classroom). Lastly, craft a letter to U.S. Department of Education Head, Arne Duncan. Discuss what you are currently seeing in classrooms related to the assessment of reading and writing. Discuss IRA and NCTE’s definition and standards and specific ways you think these could be implemented in classrooms today. It would be helpful to familiarize yourself with his beliefs related to assessment and broader discussions of education found on his website. Reauthorization of NCLB It looks imminent that NCLB is here to stay, at least for the next four years. On a hopeful note, the Obama administration is looking to reauthorize aspects of NCLB. First, providing funding to states in the form of Race to the Top Grants is the largest amount of money ever allotted for education. What are your thoughts related to the changes Race to the Top hopes to impart? Beyond Race to the Top, there are many difficult issues to resolve within current already formulated NCLB Act. How do you believe schools should be identified as “Needs Improvement?” How can NCLB support schools serving high-needs students living in poverty, requiring special services? How can NCLB support English Language Learners and provide appropriate services? It might be helpful to inquire about some ideas already suggested by emailing irawash@reading.org. After researching Race to the Top and generating some ideas related to better serving our students through amending NCLB, write a letter to Georgia’s head of Department of Education, Kathy Cox. Share your ideas and thoughts related to Race to the Top and reauthorization of NCLB.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this last two years?

In our 2009 report, we noted that because of faculty feedback, we would be revising our definition of critical thinking to better reflect what the instructors see as valuable in their classrooms. Specifically, we said, "Since the CTW course is a literacy course and includes the teaching of writing and the use of technology, we are contemplating adding elements to our current definition to reflect those emphases." Upon further meetings with CTW faculty during the 2009 and 2010 academic year, we decided that our definition was fine as it was. Instead, the need was in a revised scoring scale that better operationalized our definition. The following reflective questions provide more detail for how we addressed this issue.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Last year, our action plan included providing additional faculty support, revising the CTW definition used in the BSE program, and continuing the strong role of the CTW consultants. During the 2009-2010 academic year, we dug more deeply into those three areas in order to improve what we came to understand as recurring weaknesses in our CTW program. In on-going conversations with CTW faculty, several critiques emerged that we decided to assertively address: 1) the way we had operationalized the departmental critical thinking definition for scoring purposes pre-determined particular kinds of writing and limited faculty choices in writing genres; 2) assignments were too narrowly designed and did not provide faculty with flexibility in choice and content; and 3) CTW consultants needed ongoing support and professional development so they could continue their role as an integral part of the CTW initiative in BSE. We list among our achievements this year the steps we took to address these concerns. Below are overviews of how we

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Measure for Early Childhood Education BSE CTW Assignments**

Aligning our measure with our goals and objectives, critical thinking indicators are presented in rubric format. The rubric is broken down by objective to allow for greater instructor understanding of evidence of critical thinking. Each CTW assignment was assessed for evidence of critical thinking using this measurement scale. Please see Measurement Scale for Early Childhood Education BSE Program attached.

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

**M 1: Rubric for CTW Component of All Assignments (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Scoring Scale for Early Childhood Education BSE CTW Assignments

- 1)
  a) Aligning content with student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
  b) Analysis of data (2.4.1.1)
  c) Analysis of literature (2.4.1.2)
- 2)
  a) Aligning content with student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
  b) Analysis of data (2.4.1.1)
  c) Analysis of literature (2.4.1.2)
- 3)
  a) Aligning content with student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
  b) Analysis of data (2.4.1.1)
  c) Analysis of literature (2.4.1.2)

**Target for O1: Literacy Philosophy**

We did not establish a target for the 2009-2010 academic year. Going forward our target is for 50% of our students to score a 5 out of a 5pt. scale on this assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

*Beginning and ending scores this assignment are as follows:*

- **Beginning Average: 3**
- **Ending Average: 4.1**

**Target for O2: Inquiry into Educational Issues**

We did not have a target for the 2009-2010 academic year. Going forward, our target is for 50% of our students to score a 5 on a 5 pt. scale on this assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

*The scores for this assignment are:*

- **Beginning Average: 3**
- **Ending Average: 4.6**

**Target for O3: Literacy Outreach**

We did not choose an achievement target for the 2009-2010 academic year. Going forward, our target will be that 50% of our students will score 5 in a 5 pt scale for this assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

*Beginning and ending scores this assignment are as follows:*

- **Beginning Average: 2.7**
- **Ending Average: 3.95**

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

In our 2009 report, we noted that because of faculty feedback, we would be revising our definition of critical thinking to better reflect what the instructors see as valuable in their classrooms. Specifically, we said, "Since the CTW course is a literacy course and includes the teaching of writing and the use of technology, we are contemplating adding elements to our current definition to reflect those emphases."

In on-going conversations with CTW faculty, several critiques emerged that we decided to assertively address: 1) the way we had operationalized the departmental critical thinking definition for scoring purposes pre-determined particular kinds of writing and limited faculty choices in writing genres; 2) assignments were too narrowly designed and did not provide faculty with flexibility in choice and content; and 3) CTW consultants needed ongoing support and professional development so they could continue their role as an integral part of the CTW initiative in BSE. We list among our achievements this year the steps we took to address these concerns. Below are overviews of how we responded to faculty comment:

1) The way we had operationalized the departmental critical thinking definition for scoring purposes pre-determined particular kinds of writing and limited faculty choices in assignment choices and writing genres. In looking closely at how we had created rubrics to capture critical thinking in our students, we saw that the scoring criteria favored certain kinds of writing over others, thereby limiting faculty instructional options and student expressive choice. The CTW ambassadors met with CTW faculty to revise the scoring rubric to increase instructor flexibility while better focusing specifically on critical thinking criteria. The original rubrics developed to capture student growth in critical thinking were designed to specifically measure the CTW assignments.

In on-going conversations with CTW faculty, several critiques emerged that we decided to assertively address:

1. The way we had operationalized the departmental critical thinking definition for scoring purposes pre-determined particular kinds of writing and limited faculty choices in writing genres.
2. Assignments were too narrowly designed and did not provide faculty with flexibility in choice and content.
3. CTW consultants needed ongoing support and professional development so they could continue their role as an integral part of the CTW initiative in BSE.

We list among our achievements this year the steps we took to address these concerns.

**Standard Associations**

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
Since feedback alerted us that faculty concerns about inflexibility in the assignments, we knew we needed to rethink not only the assignments but the assessment tools as well. To make possible the choice faculty needed, we developed a 5-pt. critical thinking scoring scale that faculty could insert into any rubric they created for a CTW assignment. This 5-pt. scale follows: 5: Makes reasonable decisions about what to believe and what to do based on experiences, readings, conversations, etc.; demonstrates the willingness to recognize and challenge personal biases and assumptions. 4: Attempts to link decisions about what to believe and what to do based on experiences, readings, conversations, etc.; makes judgments and decisions that indicate awareness of personal biases and assumptions but the willingness to challenge them is tentative. 3: Makes statements about what to believe and what to do based on experiences without consulting additional resources; indicates awareness of personal biases and assumptions but doesn’t indicate willingness to challenge them. 2: Makes statements about what to believe or do, but they are not linked to experiences, readings, conversations, etc.; needs to show more awareness of personal biases and assumptions. 1: Makes superficial statements about what to believe or do without supporting reasons for positions; seems unaware of personal biases and assumptions.

Initiation since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Since the inception of the CTW initiative in the BSE program, we have had the good fortune of benefitting from instructors who were either WAC-trained or had worked closely with faculty who were WAC-trained. Likewise, the majority of our consultants had either received WAC training or had at least bachelor’s degree backgrounds in literacy, which brought them to the CTW initiative. Until this year our training, while regularly held at the start of each semester, was semi-structured and consisted of review, brainstorming, and feedback. Our BSE program is expanding, and as we move forward, faculty and ambassadors recognize we cannot rely on prior knowledge of our faculty and consultants. Starting Fall 2010, we will implement a more formal workshop that will allow faculty and consultants to practice and review writing pedagogy-informed techniques as well as conceptualizations of critical thinking. CTW consultants will need to demonstrate experience in either teacher development or writing pedagogy. Qualifying experiences will need a detailed description of WAC and/or their equivalent: Professional Training Project (PTP) or a workshop at ECE 8400-Teacher Development or ECE 9400-Academic Writing or their equivalent. It’s important to consult the ESE Program or their equivalent: Professional Training Project (PTP) or a workshop at ECE 8400-Teacher Development or ECE 9400-Academic Writing or their equivalent. By requiring these pre-requisites, we hope to mentor CTW consultants to provide on-going and effective support to our undergraduate students while also improving their own teacher development skills.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

Consistent feedback from CTW faculty has indicated the need for increased instructor flexibility in both assignments and assessments. Each year we have made modifications to the assignments and assessments in response to faculty concerns, but this year we made more demonstrative changes. Initially, the CTW ambassadors, who were also CTW instructors, designed specific assignments and corresponding rubrics. As more faculty taught the CTW courses, however, the assignments did not necessarily meet their needs nor teaching styles. During the 2009-2010 year, the CTW ambassadors and instructors met to discuss new ways to envision the assignments. The heart of the change is our new assessment method. (See Reflection 1.) With the CTW assessment now a single criterion that can be embedded into any rubric, faculty have more choice in designating assignments as CTW, provided the assignments meet the additional CTW requirements of addressing the program definition and allowing multiple revisions. The prior rubric favored essayistic forms of writing; with the new scoring tool, faculty can consider various genres, including multimodal and digital projects, as potential CTW assignments. Because the new scoring tool increased faculty flexibility, instructors were able to create an array of different CTW assignments. CTW ambassadors and faculty met at the end of each semester to discuss their assignments and provide feedback. The assignments used this year were: Literacy Philosophy Essay Students were asked to articulate their philosophy about the teaching and usage of literacy in the 21st century. To facilitate their thinking, students enrolled in faculty- and consultant-moderated groups on GoodReads, an online social networking site dedicated to reading. Students had to read and review 100 children’s books and engage in facilitated online discussions designed to help them improve their critical thinking. In each of our faculty debriefing sessions, faculty emphasized the importance of the CTW component of our courses that positively impacted the implementation of the initiative: The redesign of the scoring tool to a single criteria that could be embedded into any assignment rubric. Based on faculty feedback, we will further revise the scoring tool for next year by breaking it into two criteria, one that captures student evidence for stances and one that captures awareness of personal biases and assumptions. The change in scoring tool allowed us to improve in at least three ways: 1) expand the types of assignments and genres that can be used for CTW development in our students, 2) provide faculty with flexibility in conceptualizing CTW assignments that will fit with their curriculum and teaching style, and 3) increase the innovation ECE can bring to the initiative. In regards to the latter, we anticipate future CTW assignments that focus on digital, multimodal, and multi-genre projects as faculty focus on integrating technology and the arts into their literacy instruction.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

As noted earlier, we made one primary change in the CTW component of our courses that positively impacted the implementation of the initiative: the redesign of the scoring tool to a single criteria that could be embedded into any assignment rubric. Based on faculty feedback, we will further revise the scoring tool for next year by breaking it into two criteria, one that captures student evidence for stances and one that captures awareness of personal biases and assumptions. The change in scoring tool allowed us to improve in at least three ways: 1) expand the types of assignments and genres that can be used for CTW development in our students, 2) provide faculty with flexibility in conceptualizing CTW assignments that will fit with their curriculum and teaching style, and 3) increase the innovation ECE can bring to the initiative. In regards to the latter, we anticipate future CTW assignments that focus on digital, multimodal, and multi-genre projects as faculty focus on integrating technology and the arts into their literacy instruction.
Starting in Fall 2010, all ECE BSE students will graduate with either a dual certification in elementary education and special education, or an ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) endorsement. These credentials will increase our students' skills in teaching diverse learners. As CTW faculty and ambassadors, we feel that the changes we have made this year directly address the new requirements of the BSE program, i.e., by creating room for innovation, we also increase opportunities for differentiation and Universal Design for Learning considerations in our CTW assignments, two educational philosophies that speak to the educational needs of diverse learners. We continue to be enthusiastic about the CTW initiative. The development of critical thinking in our students as future teachers is crucial, and we are finding that the specific focus on CTW is increasing critical thinking by our students throughout their coursework. As we move forward, we want to continue the role of CTW in guiding our students as teachers of diverse learners, specifically in the area of literacy. To that end, we want to explore ways in which CTW can be a vehicle for improving student writing. While we understand that this is not a mandate of the CTW initiative, we also do not believe that critical thinking can be separated from the media through which it is expressed. This coming year, we will investigate additional ways that we can provide our students support in the development of their writing. For example, would it be possible for the CTW initiative to develop online modules that support writing skills? Such modules would help give students out-of-class support for writing basics so CTW faculty and consultants can focus more effectively on critical thinking itself.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**
Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. As at most universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and help them develop their critical thinking skills. The CTW components, embedded in problem sets for ECON 3900 and a book review and quizzes in ECON 4999, require the students to assess and evaluate concepts in economics as they relate to the real world and to be able to recognize (1) how economic theory relates to policy and (2) how many classical assumptions in economics do not apply in reality yet can still be a useful point of departure.

**Goals**

**G 1: relate economic theory to policy**
Students will recognize how economic theory relates to policy.

**G 2: relevance of classical assumptions in economics**
Students will recognize the relevance of classical assumptions in economics, and how they may not apply in reality yet can still be a useful point of departure.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: ECON 4999: Book Review (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize and apply economic concepts by reviewing a book that is not primarily an economics book. Examples of such books include 1984, Confessions of an Economic Hitman, and The Firm. 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 (with instructor approval) and thoroughly review. The review should be done in 5-6 pages, incorporating 2-3 economic concepts and provide a detailed, thoughtful analysis of the book, not simply a summary. There will be multiple drafts where the instructors will provide feedback. Students will be required to address any concerns the instructor has in subsequent draft. In particular, the student will be graded on the following components of the book review: the introduction, explanation of the book, application of at least two economic concepts to the book, structure of the review, valid opinion and conclusion, and references (graded also through citing sources accurately and not plagiarizing).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**SLO 2: ECON 3900: Short Assignment 1 (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Respond to prompts about applications of macroeconomic theory. See attachments for more details.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**SLO 3: ECON 3900: CTW paper (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**
Students were required to read Easterly's "The Ellusive Quest for Growth" and get inspired to write about something that calls their attention. See attachments for more details.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: ECON 4999 Book Review Rubric (O: 1)

See attached document for the rubric for the ECON 4999 book review. Each of the first 2 book review drafts is rated based on the criteria outlined on the rubric (i.e., Introduction, Book explanation, Economic Concepts, Structure of the book review, and valid opinion/conclusion). The Critical Thinking components of the assignment are mainly embedded in the "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the assignment. So we pay closer attention to these components. Our measures are based on the ratings on each of these components. A "1" is assigned for "missing information", a "2" for "incomplete or lack of clarity", a "3" for "complete but needs minor revision" and a "4" for "complete, appropriate, no changes needed". We measure progress in critical thinking (between drafts) by the changes in ratings on the Critical thinking components of the assignment (economic concepts and valid opinion) as well as overall book review grade.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

#### Target for O1: ECON 4999: Book Review

We measure progress in critical thinking (between drafts) by the changes in ratings on the Critical thinking components of the assignment (economic concepts and valid opinion) as well as overall book review grade. We set the following specific targets: 1. On the second draft of the book review, at least 75 percent of students should make an average rating of 2.5 (on a scale of 1-4) or higher, 2. On the second draft, at least 60 percent of students should make a rating of 3 (on a scale of 1-4) or higher on the 2 critical thinking components of the book review assignment (economic concepts and valid opinion) 3. On the final book review, at least 75 percent of students should make a grade of 85 percent or higher.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

We met Target 1 (78 percent meet the threshold rating of 2.5), and Target 3 (about 84 percent of students make 85 percent or higher). However, we fall short on Target 2 (only 58 percent and 53 percent make the 3 rating threshold on "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the book review. In terms of tracking progress in critical thinking, average rating for "economic concepts" (i.e. how well students identify economic concepts and tie them to the book they are reviewing) increased from approximately 2.05 on the first draft to 2.75 on the second draft. On the second critical thinking component, "valid Opinion", (a student's own opinion about the issue(s) discussed in the book), the average rating increased from 1.74 on the first draft to about 2.42 on the second draft.

#### M 2: Criteria for grading ECON 3900 Short Assignment (O: 2)

Grading of this assignment will be done based on the following: Identifying the issue(s): Clearly identifying the problem(s), question(s) or issue(s). Providing background for the problem(s), question(s) or issue(s). Analytics: Applying economic concepts to the questions. Developing logical arguments. Drawing substantiated conclusions. Drawing connections between economic concepts and real world applications. Communication and Structural Organization: Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Assignment is organized with an introduction, body, discussion, conclusion and reference section, if applicable. Grammar, syntax and appropriate style.

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

#### Target for O2: ECON 3900: Short Assignment 1

No specific target was set this year; we are still working on this ECON 3900 course, and instructor turnover is great.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

The instructor that used this assignment in ECON 3900 gave the following qualitative assessment of the progress of students on this particular assignment: "I had two CTW assignment. For CTW 1, there are 11 students whose final draft % grade is lower than their first draft % grade. and for CTW 2, 5 students. The reason is that they forgot to hand in final draft (mostly in CTW 1 case,) or their final draft is late, and penalized. After first draft feedback, their work shows improvement."

#### M 3: Rubric for ECON 3900 CTW paper (O: 3)

See attached document for the rubric for the ECON 3900 CTW paper.

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

#### Target for O3: ECON 3900: CTW paper

No specific target was set this year; we are still working on this ECON 3900 course, and instructor turnover is great.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

The instructor that used this assignment in ECON 3900 gave the following qualitative assessment of the progress of students on this particular assignment: "The students performed well in general. The first draft is always a challenge. In my experience, students approach the first draft as an "easy" and "relaxed" term paper like, I guess, all other term papers they write for other courses. As a result, students tend to write "essay" type of papers (with personal stories) as opposed to research papers. Once they see a low grade tin their first draft, then they realize that they have to strictly follow the guidelines and that this paper is different from what they have done in the past. Once they getthis first shocked, normally the second draft shows tremendous improvement."

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

**incorporate Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) elements into two required major courses**

The economics department plans to incorporate Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) elements into the following two required major courses: ECON 3900 (Macroeconomics) and ECON 4999 (Senior Capstone in Economic Policy). The CTW components, embedded in problem sets for ECON 3900 and a book review and quizzes in ECON 4999, require the students to assess and
evaluate concepts in economics as they relate to the real world and to be able to recognize (1) how economic theory relates to policy and (2) how many classical assumptions in economics do not apply in reality yet can still be a useful point of departure. All CTW assignments will be redone after students incorporate the feedback they have been given by the instructor.

Set more specific targets and establish more formal assessment reporting procedures

Formal targets were not set this year. There were many different instructors for ECON 3900, and each of them had slightly different approaches to working CTW into their course, although all of them were appropriately working it into their course in some way. The ECON 4999 has more consistency across sections in terms of which specific assignments are done and how they are reported. More discussion needs to take place to set specific targets and more formal assessment reporting procedures for the ECON 3900 course across all sections.

working with CTW consultants

Several CTW instructors have expressed concern about the ability of CTW consultants to provide good and clear feedback to students on CTW assignments. Often times their comments on assignments are not clear or are written in a way that does not encourage students' critical thinking. But even more concerning for Economics CTW instructors is that they don't get to keep the same CTW consultant for more than a few semesters (at best). Most of our CTW consultants are Masters students (often in their second year). So going forward, we need to think about the most effective ways to train consultants so that instructors do not have to train a new consultant every semester.

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

Our discipline-specific definition of critical thinking has not changed over the last two years.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

We have more fully developed the CTW assignments and reporting procedures for the ECON 4999 course, and it is quite consistent across sections now. The book review is taking a nice form now. Instructors in all CTW courses report some improvement by students on later drafts of papers and assignments with multiple drafts, so the feedback students are receiving seems to be effective at helping them improve.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

We met once at the beginning of the fall semester with all faculty scheduled to teach CTW courses in fall 2009 and/or spring 2010, as well as those that had taught CTW in the 2008-2009 academic year. We included CTW writing consultants as well. Jennifer Lawrence and George Pullman attended to help us explain the CTW initiative from the University's point of view. We shared ideas about what CTW instructors have done in the past and made suggestions about ways instructors might work CTW components into their courses. Sample syllabi, assignments, and rubrics were distributed. We also discussed our department-specific definition of critical thinking. Generally, the meeting went pretty well. There were several instructors new to CTW, and as usual, there was a learning curve for them, but it seemed everyone had a general idea of what was expected by the end of the meeting.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

The ECON 4999 book review assignment is reaching a "steady-state" after some initial revisions. The ECON 3900 instructor turnover is quite high and how the CTW components are worked into different sections varies more than with the ECON 4999 course (this is, in part, because the ECON 4999 is actually "team-taught", so those instructors tend to collaborate in general about the entire course more). The ECON 3900 instructors were asked to reflect on their teaching experience and report on how they thought it went, what worked, what did not, and what they might change in the future. Here are the responses from the 2 instructors that responded:

Instructor 1 comments: “Well, a lot goes in my mind for question 5. First, I could have spent some time to explain how to write a paper/report/article. Most students do not have knowledge how to write, not for economics, but in general. And I assumed that this was not needed, but I guess it was. When I use group project, I ask librarian to come to my class to show students how to research. I could have done that for CTW class as well. Most students do not know how to research, other than wikipedia or textbook. (even
SLO 2: Unknown (G: 2, 3) (M: 8)

Student Learning Outcomes/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 worked on the ECON 4999 book review and how it is assessed and reported. We made ECON 3900 instructors aware that assessments were required, but we still need to get more detailed about those assessment procedures. We need to set more specific targets for the ECON 3900 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.

We have not made any specific program changes based on the assessment data yet, but it could happen as we think about our targets for the ECON 3900 courses.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW English
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Department of English promotes the pursuit 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 practice of critical thinking fosters development in all of these areas. For English majors, critical thinking means working towards the expression of an informed, valid, and persuasive understanding of a text. Critical thinking activities in our discipline include rigorous testing of ideas against evidence; interrogating the relation between the production and reception of a text; analyzing the components of a text's form; summarizing a text's argument and purpose; evaluating the merit of a text, and articulating a point of view within relevant literary, historical, and theoretical frameworks.

Goals

G 1: Reflection

Students will learn to examine their assumptions about texts, evaluate competing ideas, and defend their interpretations.

G 2: Engagement

Students will learn to ask relevant questions of texts and audiences.

G 3: Communication

Students will learn to write clearly for a specific audience and work towards developing an individual voice and style.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2: Unknown (G: 2, 3) (M: 8)
### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Unknown (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Rubric

Rubric to determine strength of student critical thinking skills in English. See Repository.

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

#### M 7: Unknown (O: 3)

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

**Target for O3: Unknown**

In all Senior Seminars, students should show a full range of the critical thinking skills specified in our rubric: extensive engagement with ideas and conventions, reflection on their thinking process and its implications, judgment, and strong communication in an appropriate and individual style. Our target for the next cycle is for 75 percent of the class to score 3 or higher (out of 4) in comparable categories in the new rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Because this assignment was assessed using our original rubric, the findings will not correspond exactly with our achievement target. The students earned a score of 4 out of 5 on critical thinking, 3.6 on citation format, 3.4 on interpretation, 3 on the organization of their argument, and 3.6 on their analysis.

#### M 8: Unknown (O: 2)

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

**Target for O2: Unknown**

Our target for all introductory courses in the next cycle is for 75 percent of students to score at least 3 out of 4 in two rubric categories.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Data on how students were assessed for this assignment is not available.

#### M 9: Unknown

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

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

#### CTW English Website

We created and maintain a departmental CTW website. The site is for students majoring in English and for English instructors. For students, the site provides links to important information on the CTW initiative and identifies English CTW courses. For instructors, the site provides training documents such as the departmental rubric, tips on assignment design, information on assignment submission, etc. The site also contains sample syllabi and assignments. The site will continue to be updated and maintained in 2010-2011.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Melissa McLeod

#### Rubric Revision

Many faculty who taught CTW courses during our pilot year did not find the rubric we had developed to be entirely satisfactory. Some of the categories in our rubric focused more on the outcome than the process of critical thinking, while others did not serve students in all four concentrations. This year the CTW faculty proposed several alternative rubrics, and we have decided to revise our rubric to clarify the essential activities all students in the major should practice: thoughtful engagement with the ideas in a text; thorough reflection on their own position in relation to those of other readers and writers; and clear communication.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** All CTW assignments will be assessed using the revised rubric, which will be posted on the online writing environment course pages.
Workshop Revision

In the past year, we have held workshops for all CTW faculty twice each semester, once to introduce the program and answer questions for new faculty and then to discuss problems and share ideas about how to improve the program. However, as we began to debate the merits of our rubric and to clarify the purpose of CTW components in our courses, it became clear that separating instructors into new and experienced groups would allow us to use our resources more efficiently. For 2010-2011, we plan to hold orientation meetings before the start of each semester for new faculty and substantial meetings for all faculty towards the end of each semester. This revision to the workshop plan should allow us to improve the integration of CTW assignments into each of the required courses.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Workshops will be scheduled in August and January for new faculty and in November and April for all CTW instructors.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Audrey Goodman

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
While we have consistently focused our definition of critical thinking in English on the processes of interpreting and evaluating texts, in the past year we have paid more attention to how students engage with ideas and express their interpretations. We’ve developed a more holistic rubric to encourage faculty to identify three activities common to all four of the concentrations in our major: engagement, reflection, and communication. This revised rubric has helped to clarify our definition of critical thinking, specify our common goals regarding critical thinking, and to develop a greater awareness of how each concentration puts critical thinking to use.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
As indicated in last year’s Action Plan, we created and maintain a CTW website www.english.gsu.edu/~ctw dedicated to the specific interests of our degree major instructors and students. For both instructors and students, we’ve included links to relevant sites such as the university CTW website, explained how CTW works in the English department, listed the classes designated as CTW courses, and included sample syllabi and assignments, along with other useful information. We will continue to maintain and update the website. We find that it’s especially useful as a place to for instructors to access departmental CTW training material and as a bank of syllabi and assignments. The website will help to maintain continuity for departmental CTW activities and to establish institutional memory. Another accomplishment, which is discussed in Reflection 1, is that we developed a new rubric. We developed this rubric in response to faculty concerns that the former rubric was too prescriptive; the new rubric is more holistic and manages to identify critical thinking tasks from four different concentrations: literary studies, rhetoric and composition, creative writing, and secondary English.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
All CTW faculty attended two workshops each semester this year. While I provided some training for new instructors, I focused the workshops around issues that all instructors confronted when designing assignments, applying the rubric, and integrating CTW assignments with other course work. Overall faculty seemed to welcome the opportunity to express their frustration with some aspects of their CTW courses -- and to discuss their approaches to teaching. Because faculty from all four concentrations met together, we gained a greater understanding of how students work in different concentrations. The Rhetoric and Creative Writing instructors provided especially useful suggestions regarding how to teach students to become aware of their audience and to use elements of their craft. Our meetings in the fall revealed that most faculty wanted to link CTW assignments with the objectives for each CTW course rather than separate them as distinct activities. We debated how to make the CTW assignments part of larger projects so that faculty and students could realize the benefits of engaging more fully with ideas and develop a greater awareness of their position in relation to other points of view. While students might not achieve mastery in the introductory classes or at the beginning of the semester, they could develop greater proficiency and confidence as they proceeded from simpler to more complex assignments at the end of the semester or in more advanced courses. A second major topic addressed in the workshops was the rubric. Many faculty found the rubric did not correspond with the work students did in class, and they had difficulty separating assessment of CTW assignments from grading. Because the distinction between assessment of critical thinking with a numerical rubric and overall evaluation of student work with letter grades remains challenging, many instructors expressed a desire for a new, simpler rubric that would clarify the purpose of the critical thinking assignments. At our spring workshops, I introduced a revised rubric that we discussed and refined together. Although some faculty found only a few categories to be relevant to the work they ask their students to do, most welcomed the new rubric as an opportunity to specify to students what they expect in their CTW assignments. Given the diversity of teaching styles and the range of concentrations in the English Department, it is not surprising that we could not come to a solid agreement about how many categories we need for the rubric and what those categories should be. However, we did devise a working rubric and will begin to incorporate its emphasis on engagement, reflection, and communication into our planning for next year’s assignments. The value of the workshops, in my view, lies in the opportunity they provide for faculty to present and debate their ideas about teaching. In some cases, faculty who resisted incorporating CTW assignments into their courses at the outset came to advocate for the benefits of the workshops and, at times, for the CTW initiative. After piloting courses for a year and testing them for a second year, faculty in the English Department have developed enough experience to instruct other about how to use CTW in their courses. As a result, my role as ambassador has changed: instead of providing only instruction and training, now I also encourage and mediate discussion. As we proceed, my decisions about how to shape our program will be based substantially on ideas proposed by my colleagues.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
Whereas our earlier assignments tended to separate critical thinking activities from other course assignments, some assignments this year were more integrated into a series of skills or a longer project. For example, the Senior Seminars in Creative Writing both asked...
students to reflect on their own writing or on another student's work over an extended period, making their reviews more comprehensive and accountable. Another change is that many assignments show a greater awareness of how critical thinking skills would be put to use in a broader context or for a larger audience. One example of this approach is the Audio Script assignment for English 4320. I would recommend that faculty continue to develop assignments that are closely linked to major activities in each course and that develop a greater awareness of how students express their ideas for a specific audience.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

With the addition of the departmental website, we have also worked to connect the communities of students and faculties involved with CTW. By sharing the motivation for the initiative and materials we use to implement it, we have sought to make the process of integrating CTW courses into the major accessible and transparent. The plan that we devised last year has been successful overall, as we continued to hold workshops and prepare faculty to incorporate CTW assignments in their courses. As indicated earlier in the report, we are refining the structure of our workshops to take advantage of the experience our faculty are gaining in teaching CTW courses. One of the main effects of CTW has been the formation of a flexible group of instructors willing to engage in the process of re-designing courses, and over time this process should lead to new approaches to teaching. While it is too soon to measure the impact of the initiative on students, the faculty involved with CTW courses have gained a greater awareness that they are beginning to share with students and to apply to the design of their assignments.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Entrepreneurship**

**Mission / Purpose**

Successful entrepreneurship requires an individual to possess a high degree of self-sufficiency with respect to a wide range of business skills. Communication is critical among those skills. In particular, entrepreneurs must be measured in their thinking and persuasive in their writing. Writing about business situations requires a mix of skills. The writer must be succinct, tools of business analysis must be employed, and arguments have to honestly consider alternatives. The argument made in business writing in general and entrepreneurship writing in particular is often requesting, however indirectly, that the reader make some sort of commitment to the writer that puts the reader at risk. That risk is assumed in the hope of some return. This is true when a business plan is submitted to a banker or investor as much as when trying to persuade a desirable prospect to become a key member of the management team. The reader is going to be highly circumspect and look carefully at the reasoning and support that is woven into request. The mission of the Entrepreneurship faculty members is to emphasize this point to students through the placement of critical thinking and effective writing components in the undergraduate Business Planning class.

**Goals**

**G 1: Improve Writing Skills**

To effectively improve the student's writing ability through focused and constructive feedback over the course of the semester.

**G 2: Improve Critical Thinking Skills**

To effectively improve the student's ability to think critically about problems that entrepreneurs face through constructive feedback over the course of the semester.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Effective Writing (M: 1, 2)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 student can effectively write a complete analysis of an entrepreneurship case.

**O/O 2: Gathering and Generating Data (M: 1, 2)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The student can effectively gather and generate data needed to do a critical analysis of an entrepreneurship case.

**O/O 3: Analysis and Interpretation (M: 1, 2)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The student can systematically and logically analyze and interpret the data collected and produced.

**O/O 4: Recommendations for Action (M: 1, 2)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The student can reach conclusions and make defendable recommendations based on the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered and generated.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: The Initial Case Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Each student will prepare an initial analysis of a business case that focuses on an entrepreneurial firm that is facing multiple, serious
problems. The problems are in many ways ill-defined and the information is less than complete. The student will have to organize information, identify critical issues, and separate relevant facts from those less important. In doing so the student will have to apply analytical tools developed throughout their business curriculum when analyzing the facts and, where necessary, use techniques developed in their business curriculum for drawing inferences when faced with incomplete information. Based on the above the student will then present a recommendation as to how the entrepreneur should proceed. This initial case write up will be analyzed with the MGS 4560 CTW rubric and qualitative feedback will be prepared for the student.

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

Target for O1: Effective Writing

The initial target will be a level of 3 on the four-point rubric item 1 for all students. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Effectively write a complete analysis of the case Student always applies proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is clear throughout. The composition flows logically from start to finish. Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation. Student shows very limited or no ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Students averaged 2.6 on the rubric on the initial case analysis.

Target for O2: Gathering and Generating Data

The initial target will be a level of 3 on the four-point rubric item 2 for all students. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) ii. The ability to gather and generate data. Student presents the ability to identify almost all of the relevant data within the case and generates a significant amount of additional meaningful data that is called for (e.g. ratios and similar metrics) Student presents the ability to identify much of the relevant data within the case, and generates some additional data that is called for (e.g. ratios and similar metrics) Student presents a weak ability to separate relevant data from superfluous data and often omits important relevant data. No or very little meaningful additional metrics are generated. Student shows very limited or no ability to separate relevant data from superfluous data and often omits important relevant data. No meaningful additional metrics are generated.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Students averaged 2.4 on the rubric on the initial case analysis.

Target for O3: Analysis and Interpretation

The initial target will be a level of 3 on the four-point rubric item 3 for all students. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) iii. The ability to systematically and logically analyze and interpret the data collected and produced. Student analyzes and interprets data with a high degree of accuracy and clarity exhibiting systematic and logical thinking processes. Student analyzes and interprets data with a moderate degree of accuracy and clarity exhibiting acceptable systematic and logical thinking processes. Student presents a weak ability to analyze and interpret data with accuracy and clarity exhibiting limited systematic and logical thinking processes. Student presents a no or very limited ability to analyze and interpret data with accuracy and clarity exhibiting very limited systematic and logical thinking processes.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Students averaged 2.8 on the rubric on the initial case analysis.

Target for O4: Recommendations for Action

The initial target will be a level of 3 on the four-point rubric item 4 for all students. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) iv. The ability to reach conclusions and make recommendations Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data analysis to reach clearly supportable conclusions and to make a well argued recommendation. Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation. Student shows very limited or no ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Students averaged 2.4 on the rubric on the initial case analysis.

M2: The Subsequent Case Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The student will re-write the same case as in the initial case write up incorporating the feedback written and face-to-face meeting from the CTW review. This subsequent case write up will be analyzed with the same MGS 4560 CTW rubric. Based on this further feedback will be given to the student and comparative measures will be drawn on the CTW outcomes sought.

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

Target for O1: Effective Writing

The subsequent goal is to improve the student average by 0.5 from the actual average produced in the initial analysis on the first item in the CTW rubric. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Effectively write a complete analysis of the case Student always applies proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is clear throughout. The composition flows logically from start to finish. Student largely applies proper grammar and sentence structure. There is little difficulty in discerning meaning throughout and the composition has a rational if not ideal structure. Student shows difficulty with proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences occasionally difficult to infer. The structure of the composition is not tight and integrated. Student exhibits poor skills in grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is often difficult to infer. Haphazard organization of the composition.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Development of Critical Thinking Skills**

In reviewing the initial and subsequent case write-ups, and in talking with the students individually when reviewing the initial write-ups it was clear that and that many had little idea as to what critical thinking exercises entailed. Although this course is situated as the senior-level CTW class, these students did not have the junior-level CTW class and did not have the core CTW exercises that have been added recently (many did not complete their freshman and sophomore course work at GSU). Thus, unlike students who we hope will matriculate through the entire undergraduate CTW sequence, these students were encountering an explicit CTW approach for the first time in their semester of graduation. Action Plan: In the 2010-2011 offering of the course a review module will be added prior to the first case write up that will describe the process of and the reason for critical thinking approaches in business problem solving with particular emphasis on the importance of this skill in the Entrepreneurship context. This will be a module that will be modified in the 2011-2012 academic year as the composition of the class includes more students who have been through the junior-level CTW course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: The Initial Case Analysis</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Analysis and Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering and Generating Data</td>
<td>Recommendations for Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** William Bogner; Stan Little
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Increased Preparation for Initial Assignment**

Students' composition skills were disappointing in the initial draft. Students do have a course that emphasizes business writing in their...
junior year so the writing style needed for effective business communication should not be difficult. In talking with students when reviewing their performance on the initial case write-ups most indicated that they had not done structured writing assignments since their business communication course. Many had reverted to writing in bullet lists and simplistic outline formats. Action Plan: In the 2010-2011 offering of the course a review module will be added prior to the first case write up that will emphasize effective business writing points with particular emphasis on the importance of this skill in the Entrepreneurship context.

### Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th>Measure: The Initial Case Analysis</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Effective Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** William Bogner; Stan Little

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Increased Revision Performance

Students were generally found not to be highly engaged in the revision process in spite of the relationship between the revision performance and their final grade. Action Plan For the 2010-2011 academic year two modules will be added prior to the initial paper being written. If the logic of both effective writing and critical thinking for effective entrepreneurship can be effectively increased by those modules, then the opportunity to have a better follow-up, one-on-one meeting with the students should emerge. At those meetings the opportunity to further develop critical skills will be stressed. The ability to achieve the 0.5 level improvement will be re-measured.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
<th>Measure: The Subsequent Case Analysis</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Effective Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Responsible Person/Group:** William Bogner

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

For the 2009-2010 academic year a mission for critical thinking in the context of Entrepreneurship was developed. There was no change in the general Managerial Sciences’ definition of critical thinking.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

The CTW aspects of this course were completely revised for 2009-2010. A new case was brought in that would better present students with a set of interwoven business problems that required disciplined critical thinking skills to untangle. The assignment would limit writing to business memo length, which would put a premium on effective business writing skills. A new rubric was developed as well. This was based on some of the better rubrics developed for other CTW classes. Finally, the integration of the CTW exercises into the syllabus of the course was revised to provide a longer time for revision and meetings between the ambassador, who reviewed the CTW aspects of the case analysis, and individual students. The process by which these changes were made are described next.

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

The CTW class for Managerial Sciences – Entrepreneurship is MGS 4560. This course is offered in the Spring Semester each year and has enrollments of between 20-25 students on a regular basis. In the 2009-2010 academic year the instructor was relieved during the semester for reasons unrelated to the CTW program. This required the recruiting and training of a new instructor for the course. In the Fall Semester of 2009 the Ambassador, William Bogner, and the new Instructor, Stan Little, began a series of meetings to both familiarize the instructor with the CTW program and to weave the assignments into the course. Below is the outline of the first meeting: Meeting with Stan Little on CTW Friday October 2nd What is CTW? Why is GSU doing this? How is GSU doing his? What are the implications for classes? CTW in Small Business Planning The role of the assignments. Grading Revisions Integration with the rest of the course Student resistance Assistance and Support At this meeting it was decided to use the case "Pro-Clean Tennesse" as the case that would be used in the CTW exercises. Stan Little was very enthusiastic about CTW and its practicality for students seeking to be entrepreneurs. In subsequent meetings the syllabus was developed and the assignment woven in. The rubric was also finalized in November. There was regular interaction between the ambassador, and the instructor during the semester. Because the course failed to qualify for a graduate assistant, the ambassador did all of the CTW evaluations with the instructor do all of the content evaluations of the case analysis. All in all this was a very positive relationship and one that will only get better as the instructor takes the class for the second time in the Spring Semester of 2011.

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

As noted in question two, we have added a more complex case as the CTW assignment for the 2009-2010 academic year. The results as reported in the findings were disappointing in both the initial student performance level and the amount of improvement students showed in the revisions, but individual meetings with students provided valuable feedback as to why we were getting these performance levels. The action plan largely describes what was learnt and how we intend to change the presentation of the CTW assignments in the 2010-2011 academic year.

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW**
initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Many of the content-oriented items are reported in the above questions. The main change in implementation was the more active role of the ambassador in the assessment of the CTW exercises and meeting with the students individually on their performance in the initial assignment. Although this did not produce the level for improvements desired it provided the faculty members with a lot of information of why we were not producing case analysis on the desired level across all of our senior-level courses.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Film**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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>Students who graduate with an undergraduate degree in film should be able to participate fully in our media-intensive society as both critical consumers and informed creators of film and television. Critical thinking is crucial for this purpose. In film, “critical thinking” is defined as identifying, analyzing, and evaluating arguments and truth claims; and formulating and presenting convincing reasons in support of conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **G 1: Thinking about Media**  
Students should be able to identify, analyze, and evaluate theoretical arguments about media and to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of their own theoretical arguments. |

**G 2: Writing about Media**  
Students should be able to write clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct English prose to make a persuasive argument. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **O/O 1: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Structure (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**  
The CTW faculty in Film will develop an assignment structure whose core elements can be implemented across all sections of Film 4750 (Film Theory and Criticism) while providing faculty with the potential to adjust aspects of the assignment to the theoretical content they privilege in their own individual sections. In this assignment, students will research an appropriate area in film theory and investigate how a specific theoretical construct functions in a particular film. The skills involved in this assignment will include: generating a clear, appropriate research question in film theory; finding and interpreting the relevant critical literature; applying theoretical material to a specific film text to produce critical insight into the film; supporting the student's argument with well-chosen examples; organizing the criticism into a persuasive whole; and writing the paper in clear, concise, grammatically correct prose. |

**O/O 2: Development of Senior Seminar Assignment (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**  
The CTW faculty in Film will develop an assignment that can be implemented across all sections of the capstone course Film 4910 (Senior Seminar in Film: The Author vs. The Audience). In this assignment, students will detail a structure for their final project (either a research paper, a video production, or a website) and justify why this structure will accomplish their rhetorical goals. The skills involved in this assignment will include: generating a clear, appropriate research question/argument dealing with some aspect of authorship/reception; situating the project's approach within the critical debate about authorship and/or audiences; organizing the materials into a persuasive whole; and either writing the paper in clear, concise, grammatically correct prose or creating video that is proficient and clear. The CTW faculty will also develop a rubric for the assignment that lays out clear grading parameters and that allows the faculty to set measurable targets for student performance. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **M 1: CTW Faculty Discussion (O: 1, 2)**  
At the end of each semester, the CTW faculty in Film meet to evaluate the CTW procedures both in Film Theory and Criticism and in Senior Seminar in Film. Instructors read A, B, and C papers from each class section to determine if grading procedures are comparable across instructors. Faculty discuss their experiences that semester in implementing CTW assignments, evaluating what the best practices are. Faculty will arrive at a consensus about which will be the core CTW practices for each class in the future, and they will also set student performance goals for future semesters (by consensus). The CTW Ambassador will update the assignments, rubrics, and syllabi in the Weave system. |

Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

**Target for O1: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Structure**

100% of CTW Film faculty participating in the end-of-semester meetings should approve of the CTW core assignment structure for the next semester.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the CTW Film faculty participating in the spring 2010 discussion approved of the core assignment structure for the 2010-2011 year.
Target for O2: Development of Senior Seminar Assignment

100% of CTW Film faculty participating in the end-of-semester meetings should approve of the CTW assignment writeup and grading rubric for the next semester.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the CTW Film faculty participating in the spring 2010 discussion approved of the assignment writeup and grading rubric for the 2010-2011 year.

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

Grading Rubric Standard
In the 2010-11 year, the CTW Film faculty will create quantitative targets for the new grading rubric in the Senior Seminar in Film.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW Faculty Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Development of Senior Seminar Assignment

Implementation Description: Faculty will determine these targets by consensus in end-of-semester meetings.

Responsible Person/Group: CTW Film Ambassador in coordination with CTW Film faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition of critical thinking in Film has remained unchanged.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The six stage series of CTW writing exercises that previously was the model for Film Theory and Criticism was found to be too unwieldy. The assignment structure for this class was fundamentally redesigned during the fall 2009 CTW faculty meeting, and a draft version of the new assignment was implemented in spring 2010. All instructors agreed that the new assignment produced clear, well-reasoned papers. This core assignment was further improved in the spring 2010 meeting for future implementation in 2010-11. The CTW assignment for the Senior Seminar In Film was improved in its spring 2010 implementation, and the class used a rubric for the first time. Both instruments were improved for future implementation in 2010-11. Since this is the first year of Weave reporting, there are no previous Action Plan items for CTW Film.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
At the end of the fall 2009 semester, the three instructors (Jennifer Barker, Alessandra Raengo, Greg Smith) who taught sections of Film Theory and Criticism met to discuss the implementation of Critical Thinking through Writing in that class. The section of the other CTW class (Senior Seminar in Film) was canceled for fall because of low enrollment. Also in attendance was Harper Cossar, who would teach Film Theory and Criticism for the first time as a CTW class in Spring 2010. We compared sample A, B, and C papers and found that our grading norms were consistent across all three classes, though the ways that we implemented the CTW assignment structure varied among the three instructors, allowing us to compare the effectiveness of different practices. Barker tried using an assignment from the Senior Seminar in Film class: having students articulate the rhetorical structure for the final paper before they write it, defending their choices for how they will organize their argument. The problem was that this forced students to try to defend their choices early in the process, while those choices were still relatively unformed. Students who handed in their rhetorical structures late did not get a grade on that assignment (though they did receive feedback). Unfortunately this strategy resulted in almost half of the students turning in late papers. The instructor believed that this set of assignments did not help her students. What was effective was using an early writing assignment to do a close analysis of a film and then have that early assignment become the basis for the larger paper. Raengo did a variation on Barker’s structure, using two close analyses of films and a paper proposal for the final paper (with no rhetorical structure assignment). The paper proposal asked the student to articulate a research question and to provide an annotated bibliography, discussing why the student chose these particular sources to answer their question. This proposal was ungraded, which meant that many of these proposals were poorly prepared, but they allowed the instructor to provide useful feedback to help students narrow their research question. The student revised the proposal for a grade, and then they researched and wrote the final paper. In addition, Raengo kept the class focused on the concept of the research question. Whenever the instructor introduced new theories, she would prompt the class to come up with “on the fly” research questions again and again, giving them practice at understanding what makes a good research question. On the last day of class, the instructor provided students with an opportunity to present a mini-version of their project in class: a 2 minute clip, a statement of the research question, and a brief summary of how they will go about answering that question. The instructor felt that although this presentation was optional, it was effective because the students who did good work were the ones who presented, and it demonstrated what good work looked like for those who were not yet at that level. Smith used the 6 stage model that breaks the task of critical writing into substeps, each one of which must be mastered before the student moves on to the next higher skill, allowing the student to gain skills at an individualized pace. This model has been used before in Film Theory and Criticism, but Smith believed that it has become cumbersome. Although the students who do progress through the 6 steps write exemplary prose and all students find the process beneficial because of its clarity and structure, too many students plateau at a particular level. The problem appears to be that the students are not reading the carefully worded assignments, and so when they repeat a step in the process, they often end up making the same mistakes. Since every student is on an individualized track through the sequence of writing steps, it becomes difficult to go over the assignments orally, and some students clearly learn better orally. The instructor was not in favor of continuing to use this structure. The consensus among the instructors was that the best practice was to use a paper proposal focused on articulating a research question for the final paper, with that proposal being revised for a grade. Portions of the content from the 6 step model could be dealt with in class to provide useful clarity for the paper writing process. The instructors agreed to implement variations on this structure for Spring 2010. At the end of the spring 2010 semester, Jennifer Barker, Harper Cossar, and Alessandra Raengo met (with CTW Ambassador Greg Smith) to discuss the implementation of Critical Thinking through Writing in Film Theory and Criticism. Many of Barker’s students continued to use the first writing assignment in the class as the basis for their longer CTW
Critical thinking through writing in Finance is defined as using appropriate business writing techniques and processes as a vehicle to research pertinent economic and financial data and apply proper analytical processes, including mathematical and statistical techniques, to identify and evaluate business strengths and weaknesses in order to structure and effectively communicate policies and/or solutions, to both lay and professional audiences.

To effectively write in finance, students must learn the difference between business writing and academic writing. Business writing is a unique form of writing with a specific style and focus. Business writers write to transact business and/or to recommend a specific action. Good business writing is often described as “writing to do” as opposed to writing to learn or to describe. Business writers design their documents to be visually attractive, effectively utilizing 'white space' in the documents by incorporating powerful headings and subheadings, listing information with bullet points, and effectively using properly constructed graphs and charts. Business writing is concise and conclusion oriented; conclusions or recommendations are directly stated first followed by convincingly structured supporting data. Finally, good business writing uses the active voice, uses ordinary words, and is concrete, personal, and informal.

### Goals

**G 1:** Students will learn how to use financial tools to identify relevant strengths and weaknesses.
Critical thinkers must be able to evaluate financial and economic data in order to identify a firm's relevant strengths and weaknesses. To accomplish this task, students must first learn financial analysis tools and processes. They must then learn which tools and/or processes to apply to different problems. Finally, they must learn to focus on a few specific strengths and weaknesses to make sure that proposed solutions will address specific weaknesses without negatively impacting business strengths.

G 2: Students will develop the skills needed to ask pertinent questions
Critical thinking involves questioning in order to discover the “what” and the “why” behind every assumption and every proposition. We want to teach our students to always seek out proof and evidence, from simply verifying the source of information to determining the difference between speculation and testing to establishing and properly presenting verifiable facts. We also want to teach our students to determine when to seek additional information and how to properly find or request additional information.

G 3: Students will be taught to gather and assess relevant information
Critical thinking requires gathering as much information as available and then separating relevant from superfluous information in order to form effective solutions. We want to teach our students to reduce information sets to the minimal amount necessary so that presentation of the problem and proposed solutions are simple and tenable.

G 4: Students will make well-reasoned conclusions and derive effective solutions
All conclusions must be supported by facts. Critical thinkers must be able to demonstrate the basis for a conclusion and must be able to show how a proposed solution can solve an identified problem and/or weakness.

G 5: Students will be encouraged to think open-mindedly and to adopt different perspectives
Critical thinking requires that problems must be approached with an open mind and makes every attempt to reduce biases in evaluation, assessment and proposed solutions. Critical thinking must also consider the diverse nature of today's business and management landscape. Problems must be approached from the point of view of the participants. For example, an Asian manager may not view a given problem in the same way as will an American manager. We want to teach our students to consider that although different parties may use the same problem-solving processes, techniques and tools, their different experiences and perspectives can provide valuable insights into the nature of business problems and/or opportunities.

G 6: Students will use appropriate business writing techniques and processes to communicate effectively
Students must be able to effectively communicate their assessment of a situation and their proposed solution(s) to a problem. They must know how to communicate to the audience they are addressing, whether that be financial managers, general business managers or individuals with no or very limited understanding of business or finance.

---

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: In-class writing assignment 1a--Define CTW in Finance (M: 1)
The first writing assignment in this class is a two part assignment. The first part of the assignment is completed in-class on the first day of class. In this assignment, students are asked to write a one sentence definition of “critical thinking through writing in finance.” The assignment is given after the instructor explains the difference between business writing and general writing and after the instructor briefly discusses the importance of writing in finance. The purpose of this assignment is to encourage students to consider the meaning of critical thinking in finance. By asking them to write a definition of critical thinking in finance, we begin the process of setting a goal for them to follow for the entire semester.

SLO 2: Takehome Writing Assignment 1b - Define CTW in Finance (G: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 3)
This second writing assignment in the course is a follow-up/expansion to the first writing assignment. Here we ask students to rewrite their definition of critical thinking through writing in finance at home between the first and second class periods. We encourage students to research the topic and discuss the topic with other students and/or friends. In addition, we ask them to expand the definition to three (3) sentences, where the second and third sentences expand/explain/illustrate their definition (sentence one) to provide more direction, detail or clarity. On the day the assignment is turned in, the instructor will display some reports via the overhead projector. Open discussion will produce a “class” definition of critical thinking through writing in finance, which will be displayed on the course uLearn page and used as a guide for all writing assignments in the course.

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 3: CTW Writing Assignment 2 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 3)
In this assignment, students read two articles and then write an engaging introductory paragraph to an argumentative essay on what, in their opinion, is the best way to prevent firms from committing inventory fraud. We ask students to evaluate the articles, analyze the presentation of the problem and proposed solutions are simple and tenable.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assignment 1a: Purpose and Grading Rubric (O: 1)
The grading of this assignment is very simple. Students are assigned a grade of 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 as follows: 0 = not present (assignment not turned in) 1 = little more than repeating the words “critical thinking through writing” and/or a definition with multiple
spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors 2 = a mediocre definition with multiple spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors 3 = a definition that needs additional work, but that is clearly stated and free of spelling and/or grammatical errors 4 = a well thought out definition that the instructor would consider using as the guide for all future assignments in the course

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

**Target for O1: In-class writing assignment 1a—Define CTW in Finance**

The first writing assignment in this class is a two part assignment. The first part of the assignment is completed in-class on the first day of class. In this assignment, students are asked to write a one sentence definition of “critical thinking through writing in finance.” The assignment is given after the instructor explains the difference between business writing and general writing and after the instructor briefly discusses the importance of writing in finance. The purpose of this assignment is to encourage students to consider the meaning of critical thinking in finance. By asking them to write a definition of critical thinking in finance, we begin the process of setting a goal for them to follow for the entire semester. Our target score is 2.5.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The actual grades were lower than we expected. There were some well written and thoughtful definitions, but many were very poor. Several merely restated the obvious. For example, one student definition we received stated: “Critical thinking through writing in finance is defined as using writing to think critically about issues in finance.” Many definitions had misspelled words (they wrote these by hand so they could not use Word automatic spell checker) and several had terrible grammatical errors. The average grade was 2.1.

**M 3: CTW Writing Assignment 2 (O: 2, 3)**

This assignment was graded using the General Rubric for FI 4020 Assignments. The assignment was graded for Items 1, 4, 6 and 7. The maximum grade possible was 15 and the minimum possible grade was 0. We divided the total score by 4 to derive an average score. The average score ranged from 0 to 4.

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

**Target for O2: Takehome Writing Assignment 1b - Define CTW in Finance**

The target grade for this assignment was 3.0.

**Target for O3: CTW Writing Assignment 2**

Our expectation was an average grade of 3.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

The average grade on this assignment was 2.8. Students, by and large, did well on items 6 and 7, but struggled with the others. Specifically, they struggled to effectively identify the main issues/problems in the case and to effectively analyze the case data. More specifically, although the assignment asked them to suggest, in their opinion, the best way to prevent firms from committing inventory fraud, many students offer multiple suggestions and some offered none at all. Also, although they were told to “present a clear idea of the essay's focal point,” few papers achieved this goal.

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

#### Future Action Plan for All Writing Assignments

Since all of the writing assignments that we used this past year were new, we consider this past year as a learning experience for both our students as well as us. We recognize that it is possible that our target grades were overly optimistic and possibly unrealistic. In the future we will use the average grades from this year as the base standard for future years. We also recognize that perhaps our assignments need improvement. We will work together this summer to clarify the goals in our assignments and make changes as needed. As noted in CTW Reflection 2, we believe that the results from this year show that our students tend to: Struggle when faced with complex issues and “messy” data. Experience difficulty when asked to critically assess their arguments or policy decisions. Tend to approach every problem believing that it can be solved with a formula. Answer case questions using data in the case only - that is, they do not seem to make the connection between academic cases and real world events or effects. Often make biased decisions and seldom develop robust conclusions. Our major action plan for the future is to determine the best way to help our students improve these critical thinking skills. One issue that we must address is how to best incorporate critical thinking exercises into this already very full and challenging class. Most of us who teach this required class for all finance majors, do not believe there is enough time in the semester to teach the skills, tools, processes and techniques needed to do good financial analysis while at the same time teaching and evaluating critical thinking through writing. Although most students write well (we do have a significant number of students in our classes for whom English is a second language - these students need help outside of what we can do to assist them with basic writing skills, specifically spelling and grammar), since business writing is different from writing literature in an English class, we are forced to spend a significant amount of time teaching business writing skills. To also teach critical thinking through writing skills is challenging for all who teach this course. In addition, adding CTW to this course makes it very difficult to find faculty willing and able to teach the course. Nonetheless, we will continue to work as best we can to make FI 4020 an effective CTW course. We believe that we have now made a good start in finding articles in our field that address some of the issues related to critical thinking in finance. Indeed, the student critical thinking struggles that we identified above are similar to those reported in these articles. We now better understand the challenge that we face and that allows us to focus on effective solutions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Fendler and the finance faculty assigned to teach FI 4020 during the 2010-11 academic year (not yet decided).

#### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?**

The definition of CTW in finance has changed over the past two years and it will continue to evolve in the future. Our original
definition focused on the importance of “writing” in finance. More recently, we have changed our focus to deeper consideration of the “critical thinking” aspect of CTW. Because we believe that the definition of critical thinking should vary from discipline to discipline, in particular, from non-business to business fields of study, we began our process by investigating different definitions of critical thinking in finance. All finance instructors who teach this class read the following articles: “Messy Problems and Lay Audiences: Teaching Critical Thinking within the Finance Curriculum,” by David Carrithers, Teresa Ling and John C. Bean. Business Communication Quarterly, Volume 69, Number 2, January 2004, pp. 152-170. “Using a Client Memo to Assess Critical Thinking in a Finance Major,” by David Carrithers and John C. Bean. Business Communication Quarterly, Volume 71, Number 1, March 2008 10-26. “Beyond Critical Thinking and Decision Making: Teaching Business Students How to Think,” by Gerald F. Smith. Journal of Management, Volume 27, Number 1, February 2003, 24-51. This study led to our current CTW in finance definition and associated goals. Our first two writing assignments in the course ask students to write their own definition of critical thinking through writing in finance. We will modify our department definition of critical thinking in finance if student responses improve upon our current definition.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

As noted in Reflection 1, our most significant CTW accomplishment this year was our change in focus from writing to critical thinking. After much discussion, we decided that business thinkers think critically when they analyze situations without a point of view, critically, in terms of the essential facts only. Many aspects of our course, from writing assignments to the implementation of new cases, were changed to match this new focus. A second significant CTW accomplishment this year, which is also related to our Action Plan from last year, was our discovery, via student writing, class discussion of new cases, etc., that our students: Struggle when faced with complex issues and “messy” data Experience difficulty when asked to critically assess their arguments or policy decisions Tend to approach every problem believing that it can be solved with a formula Answer case questions using data in the case only that is, they do not seem to make the connection between academic cases and real world events or effects Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

We did not conduct any workshops for faculty this year. Instead, the three faculty members who usually teach this class met several times during the year to conduct the meaning of critical thinking through writing in finance and to implement new cases and assignments in the course. We agreed on the definition of CTW for our course and on some common cases and assignments; however, each faculty member continues to conduct aspects of the course as they think best matches their teaching style while still meeting the course CTW definition and goals. We have agreed to meet again throughout the summer to discuss what worked and what did not work. My general impression is that all of us are positive about CTW and all of us want to continue to make this course the best that we can. The most significant change this year was that each faculty member involves two issues. First, this course is already a very full and challenging course. It is a case based course, but nearly half of the course is devoted to teaching students the skills and procedures needed to analyze financial data. In fact, most of us believe that this course should be a two semester course, with the first semester devoted to learning processes and procedures needed to evaluate financial data and the second course being cases where critical thinking and writing are central to the entire course. Second, because this is a required course for finance majors, enrollments in this course average 40 to 45 students. Grading papers and providing significant feedback is very challenging. Consultants are difficult to find because a good consultant for this course must first know financial statement analysis techniques and processes. Additionally, because we are still finding our way in CTW and because many of our CTW assignments are new, we do not exactly know what we want a consultant to do for us. Going forward, all of us hope that consultants can be found and/or developed to assist us in the evaluation of student papers and assignments as well as being able to serve as a resource to students who want and need additional help and guidance.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

Our assignments continue to evolve each year as we continue to learn about CTW and better understand effective ways to implement CTW in finance. As mentioned above, the most significant change in our assignments has been a move from emphasizing writing to instead stressing critical thinking. Most of our assignments and grading rubrics are now being designed to promote and evaluate critical thinking. We plan to continue the process of developing assignments and finding new cases for the course that force our students, as we teach ourselves, to think critically. Some of the cases that we have used for many years have been replaced with new cases and many of the older cases have been enhanced or reworked to incorporate elements of CTW. Going forward, I plan to suggest that we try harder to standardize more writing assignments and grade more consistently. I also plan to suggest that we try to find effective ways to address the student critical thinking deficiencies that I noted in CTW Reflection 2: Achievements above.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

There has been little change to our department’s approach to CTW. Our chairman is fully supportive of CTW and all faculty teaching this class support the initiative. The faculty members teaching the class meet to talk about CTW, usually during the summer and after each semester. No one else attends these meetings. Thus, I believe that there has been little impact on the faculty or students beyond those who teach or attend this class. For those who teach and take the class, the impact has been significant. CTW has caused us to rethink how we teach the course as well as our objectives in the course. The discussions we have had about critical thinking, the articles we have read and the writing assignments we have designed, are forcing each of us to reevaluate the purpose of this course. Although we still believe that adding CTW to the course is difficult and, given our average class sizes, the burden of extra grading is heavy (on top of what was already a very full and challenging class), we understand the importance of the CTW initiative. Our main difficulty is deciding whether CTW should be “added” to this course, if this course should undergo a major adjustment to incorporate CTW, or whether our department would be better off creating a new course with CTW as the centerpiece.

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 degree program since last year’s assessment report. As noted above, the CTW initiative has been confirmed in our department to mainly those instructors who teach the course. We hope to expand the faculty who teach this course. Unfortunately, Financial Statement Analysis and Commercial Loan Structuring, even before CTW, was a difficult course to staff. Although this is an important area in finance (important enough for us to require this course for all of our majors), the research and teaching expertise of most of our faculty is in other areas. Also, the additional burden of adding CTW to this already
very full and challenging course makes faculty recruitment to the course especially difficult. I hope that new faculty will be found to teach the course and to consider CTW. I believe that those of us who have discussed CTW over the past couple of years are making changes (I believe improvements) to how we teach other classes. I also hope that additional faculty (even those who will not teach the course) will join some of our CTW discussions. I plan to encourage our department chair to ask other faculty to attend some of our meetings in the fall.

**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.

I do not foresee any changes being made to our education program based on this year’s assessment data. We are still in the discovery stage of CTW, making changes to our CTW course as we better understand CTW and how to incorporate CTW into this course. Because our assignments are still evolving and our grading of those assignments is still being perfected, we do not consider the data that we have collected to date to be significant for any purposes other than our one CTW 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 are trying to get more faculty engaged in the implementation of CTW to our CTW course. To date, the faculty involved in CTW in our department has focused all of their efforts on the teaching of our specific CTW course.

**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?

Until we feel that we have properly incorporated CTW into our specific CTW course, the implications of this year’s assessment has few implications for our department. We believe that what we learn about CTW and about our students will be useful in the future.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

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

We plan to get more faculty involved with the CTW course and therefore with CTW in general. However, given the limitations specified in answers above related to the difficulty of incorporating CTW into this existing, already full and challenging course, and in getting new faculty to teach a writing intensive course with existing large enrollments, I do not see much improvement in this area in the near term future. As faculty who teach the course, we will continue to meet, continue to encourage others in the department to join us and do the best we can to make the finance department’s CTW course the best that it can be.
In each CTW French course, two written assignments are rated. In the FREN3033 course (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts), one assignment is a literary essay, the second is a text analysis. In the civilization courses (FREN4103 and FREN4123), the two assignments are essays related to civilization topics.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The target is a rating of 4 (on a scale going from 1 to 6) for 80% of the students enrolled in the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The two assessments given in each course permit to give students a CTW rating for their overall performance.

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The definition has remained the same.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

The figures (see uploaded document: “CTW for The French Major: Data Analysis 2009-2010) show that in most cases students manage to earn better ratings throughout the semester, and a good number of students earn a rating of 4 (goal) on the first phase of each assignment.

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

The three faculty members involved with teaching CTW courses held two workshops during fall 2009 (none in spring 2010). The discussions were mostly based on the rubric and the number of phases for each assignment. Rubric: the rubric that was defined last year (uploaded in the Depository) works fine, but one faculty member would prefer to use a “simplified rubric” (uploaded in the Depository). One instructor saw an obvious correlation between the CTW rating and the overall grade of the paper, which show that there is a link between critical thinking and writing successfully. Also, the detailed rubric allows to have very detailed ratings (for instance, 4.82), which the simplified rubric does not; with the detailed rubric, the figures indicate more precisely the progress of the student. It was decided that each faculty member would choose what he/she feels best for the course. For the four CTW courses taught in 2009-2010, one faculty member decided to use no rubric (two courses taught), one faculty member decided to use the simplified rubric (one course taught) and one faculty member decided to use the detailed rubric (one course taught). We will work in fall on a simplification of the rubric, although it should remain detailed enough to give precise ratings. Assignments: It was decided at first that each assignment would be rated 3 times (i.e. three phases). The first phase would be a very detailed outline of the paper; the second phase would be a first draft of the paper and the third phase would be the final version of the paper. However, discussions arose about the fact that it is extremely time-consuming (especially as a faculty member has a teaching load of 3 courses each semester). Moreover, another faculty member noted that this would maybe not be a problem in civilization courses, but would be an issue for the literature course which is precisely cut into two parts: prose (study of a novel) and poetry (study of poems). Students could not start each writing assignment until they had read most of the novel or analyzed several poems in class; two weeks would be needed for each draft. This would mean that the two segments of the course would overlap greatly: for example, students would still be working on their novel paper when they would well be into the section of the course covering poetry. The main issue being a problem of timing, two drafts could be done easily enough without creating a very complicated classroom schedule. It was therefore decided that each faculty member would choose either two of three phases. As a result, one faculty member chose three phases for each assignment and ended up doing nothing but reading and grading papers through the semester, whereas two other faculty members chose two phases only for each assignment. Considering the fact that from fall 2010 each semester will be one week shorter, it has finally been decided that two phases would be sufficient for each assignment, so the semester schedule will not be too complicated for each course, whether in civilization or in literature.

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

There were no pilot courses for French last year, so the nature of the assignments has not changed. What has changed is the view to assess each assignment (see previous answer): two phases instead of three. It is unlikely that the nature of the assignments will change as they fit perfectly the CTW initiative and allow a very good perception of student learning.

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

There were no pilot courses in French last year so it is difficult, as of now, to really measure a change for the degree major. However, the ratings (see table in the Depository) show that most students benefit from the CTW exercise, as their ratings generally improve during the semester. Faculty members, on the other hand, feel that this is a huge amount of work.

### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Most Important Accomplishments for Year

Four CTW courses have taught successfully this year, two in literature and two in civilization. The results show that most students benefit from the CTW exercise. Also, the goal is a rating of 4 for each assignment; many students reach that rating for the first phase already (sometimes, as many as 84%), which shows that we have a good pool of majors.

#### Challenges for Next Year

The most difficult challenge will be student resistance. The percentages (see Data Analysis 2009-2010 in the Depository) show that the number of students who do not do all assignments is simply not satisfactory; sometimes, the figure is as high as 42.8%. We need to find a way to penalize students who do not do all assignments, especially because those numbers give an overall wrong figure.
Two courses did not reach the goal of 4 for a number of 80% students. One was as low as 52.4%, but once again this percentage takes into account assignments that were not done (in one case, a student did none of the 3 phases for each assignment and ended up failing the course). We need to better involve some of the students in the CTW process and to show them that it is a major aspect of their improvement.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**
No modifications are planned.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**
We need to simplify the rubric although we want to maintain a detailed rubric as it is very useful to give precise figures.

**University-wide Committee Participation**
n/a

**Publications and Presentations**
n/a

**Academic Teaching Activities**
n/a

**International Activities**
n/a

**Contributions to Student Retention**
Impossible to evaluate so far.

**Service to the External Community**
n/a

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Geosciences**

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

#### Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking is defined as "a wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do." (Bassham, G., Irwin, W. Nordone, H., & Wallace, J., 2005. Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill, page 1.). For both geography and geology, critical thinking involves the ability to recognize and evaluate truth claims, synthesize different approaches to knowledge/scientific findings, and articulate coherent and logical arguments.

#### Goals

**G 1: Analysis**

Students should be able to engage with scholarly literature in their respective fields and analyze arguments, validity, and findings.

**G 2: Communication**

Students should develop communication skills to appropriately convey their analysis of texts and data.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Reflection paper (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**

In Urban Geography, students will complete weekly reflection papers. In at least one paragraph and not more than one page, students reflect on the readings by exploring the connections of the authors’ arguments. Students’ reflection papers may be guided by the questions posed each week in the syllabus. The purpose of reflection papers is to encourage students to read carefully, and consider critically, the literature being explored and to articulate critical thinking in a brief, organized essay. Students will complete ten response papers over the course of the semester. Two papers, one from the beginning of the semester and one from the end, will be evaluated with a rubric.

**SLO 2: Synthesizing Paragraphs (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**

In Climatic Change, students are expected to summarize the topic of a day's lecture and to include outside research to support the claims and observations made in the paragraphs. Students will turn in three paragraphs during the semester and will receive detailed feedback on each submission. Rubric assessment scores will be recorded for the first and third paragraph submissions.

**SLO 3: Research Project (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 3)**

The term paper will be an opportunity for students to develop an original research paper. The student will identify a topic and submit a research proposal. The instructor will give feedback to the students, and the students will develop a research project, complete with explicitly identified methods and data. The student will submit a rough draft of the paper, and the instructor will provide detailed feedback. The student will incorporate the feedback and develop a final paper, which will also be orally presented to his or her peers.

**SLO 4: Group Research Project (G: 1, 2)**
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Paper Rubric (O: 1, 2)**

Please see Rubric in attached documents.

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

**Target for O1: Reflection paper**

80% of our students should average 4 or better on each of the seven elements of the rubric, with a total of 28 or greater on the seven elements combined. Importantly, we are looking for improvement from our students through the course of a semester. As such, we would like to see 80% of our students improve from the first response paper to the final one that is collected.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Synthesizing Paragraphs**

80% of students should achieve a 26 or better in the seven combined elements. 80% of students should demonstrate improvement from draft 1 to draft 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Term Paper Rubric (O: 3)**

Please see the attached Term Paper Rubric for Geology of Georgia

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

**Target for O3: Research Project**

80% of students should achieve at least a total rubric score of 20 (an average of 4 or better for each of the five elements) for draft 1 and draft 2. Ideally 80% of students should improve from draft 1 to draft 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Rubric Scores for DRAFT #1 Rubric Scores for DRAFT #2 Std. 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 6 4 5 22 5 4 6 6 27 23 3 4 5 4 6 22 5 6 5 5 6 27 4 2 6 3 6 1 7 3 4 6 5 6 24 5 3 4 6 24 5 6 5 6 27 6 5 5 4 6 25 5 5 5 4 6 25 7 5 5 6 5 6 27 5 6 6 27 8 6 5 6 5 4 6 6 5 6 6 28 9 5 6 4 4 22 5 5 6 6 27 10 4 2 4 4 6 20 5 5 6 6 27 11 0 2 3 2 4 1 1 3 4 5 6 6 26 14 5 2 5 6 23 4 6 5 6 27 15 5 4 6 5 6 26 5 6 6 27 16 6 7 6 5 6 28 17 6 3 5 4 6 24 6 5 6 28 18 1 0 3 3 4 1 1 3 4 5 4 6 22 19 0 2 4 2 1 4 9 4 6 5 23 20 0 3 4 2 1 3 5 4 6 6 25 21 5 6 5 6 28 5 6 5 6 28 22 6 6 6 5 6 29 6 6 5 6 29 23 0 2 1 4 9 4 5 6 24 2 4 4 5 6 21 4 5 5 6 26 25 1 3 3 2 1 2 3 3 2 1 2 6 0 2 2 1 6 1 1 3 4 5 3 6 21 6 4 6 5 6 27 5 6 5 6 27 28 4 5 4 6 5 23 5 6 6 26 20 of 28 students, or 71% achieved a score of 20 or better for draft 1. 27 of 28 students, or 96%, achieved a score of 20 or better for draft 2. 76% of students, improved from draft 1 to draft 2, and the other seven students had the same score. This represents a partial fulfillment of the achievement goals. Rubric Criterion Mean Improvement (Points) Mean Improvement (%) 1 1.25 21% 2 1.29 21% 3 0.82 14% 4 0.82 14% 5 0.61 10% The above table reflects the improvement of each element of the rubric.

**M 3: Final Paper Rubric (O: 3)**

Geog/Geol 4830: Senior Seminar rubric attached.

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

**Target for O3: Research Project**

80% of students should score a 22 total on the six elements for each draft of the term paper. 80% of students should improve scores from draft 1 to draft 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

For draft 1, 5 of 10 students achieved a 22 or better on the rubric. For draft 2, 8 of 10 students achieved a 22 or better on the rubric. 10 of 10 students improved from draft 1 to draft 2.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Refine rubric
For the literature review assignment, the instructor will refine the rubric to capture integral elements of the assignment and will include more explicit discussion of critical thinking and writing skills in the course of the class.

  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Paper Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Synthesizing Paragraphs

Strengthen curriculum for Urban Geography
In order to facilitate meeting the CTW goals for the urban geography course, the instructor will strengthen her curriculum to include more explicit teaching on various components of writing, providing more examples to students. She will make a more demonstrated effort to articulate clearly the strengths and weaknesses of the reflection papers that the students turn in so that they may learn from their own writing experiences. Throughout the semester, she will schedule one-on-one conferences with students to discuss their writing strengths and weaknesses.

  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Paper Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Reflection paper

Strengthen focus on structure of research paper
The instructor will focus her efforts on improving students’ understanding of the component parts of a research paper, which include identifying a problem, articulating an argument, identifying (and justifying) methods and data, and analyzing data and drawing conclusions.

  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Final Paper Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Research Project

Writing skills course
The instructor plans to devote several class periods to focus on critical thinking skills with less emphasis on technical writing skills.

  Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High
  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Term Paper Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Research Project

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The Department of Geosciences currently has two majors, and as such, the definition of critical thinking has remained broad throughout the last two years. Faculty members in the Geosciences agree that critical thinking skills can be demonstrated through the construction of academic papers, whether they are literature reviews or responses, laboratory write-ups, or original research papers.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The major accomplishments included having the other CTW instructors submit complete and thoughtful analyses of their students’ CTW assignments. What I would like to continue doing is to meet with the other CTW instructors and brainstorm ideas and strategies to improve the implementation and data-gathering for our CTW assignments.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
The training sessions I held with the two other faculty members Drs. Deocampo and Diem were brief and productive (they occurred at the beginning of fall 2009 and the beginning of spring 2010). I also met one-on-one with both faculty members and exchanged ideas and strategies for implementing the CTW assignments throughout the course of the semesters. I emailed both instructors, offering help for their CTW tasks. Overall, the assignments and assessments we have in place will be discussed at future meetings, as we seek to improve and streamline the implementation of CTW in our two majors.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
My assignments have not changed per se, but my data-collection methods have. Instead of collecting rubric assessment data on all
of my assignments (I believe that they are all CTW-related), I have chosen to collect just two datapoints per semester. I recommended this strategy to my Geosciences colleagues, who also have collected two datapoints (either draft 1 and draft 2, or from a paper submitted at the beginning of the semester and at the end). That way, we can assess not only progress from year to year but also progress during the course of the semester. I anticipate meeting with my CTW Geosciences colleagues to discuss aspects of their CTW assignments or data-collection that could use improvement and implementing those changes for 2010-2011. Both Dr. Diem and Dr. Deocampo indicated satisfaction with their assignments. I will offer to help refine rubrics and data-collection processes if necessary.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

One major change is that 1) Geology 4830 Senior Seminar was created as a capstone course, and that 2) this course has been combined with the existing Geog 4830 Senior Seminar. This has meant changes to the initially proposed CTW assignments for each class and instead a broader writing assignment that includes the critical thinking requirements of both geography and geology.

Another impact on the department has been a more explicit discussion of what critical thinking is and how it is assessed within our two disciplines.

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?

Instructors for two of the CTW courses developed tailored rubrics for the CTW assignments. Otherwise, the assessment has been consistent from the pilot CTW course implemented in spring 2009. I think the assessment process worked well, although I will encourage CTW instructors to carefully evaluate assignments and rubrics before the 2010-2011 courses begin.

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.

I am not aware of any changes that will be made because of the assessment 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 these changes affected your outcome?

2009-2010 was the first full year of CTW assignments with participation from other faculty members, and I believe we implemented the planned assignments and assessments with some 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?

I am not yet certain what the findings for this year’s assessment will mean for my department.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

I anticipate meeting with my CTW Geosciences colleagues to discuss aspects of the planned assignments and assessments with some success. I am not yet certain what the findings for this year’s assessment will mean for my department.

I anticipate reviewing the assignments and assessment procedures with the CTW faculty members and making minor adjustments as needed. I think our plan is working well, and with more attention in classroom instruction given to critical thinking assignments (see the Action Plan) and to tailored rubrics, we will have even greater success next year. In future reports, I will emphasize student improvement in my target goals.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW German
As of: 12/13/2010 03:07 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. Critical thinking goes hand in hand with analytical thinking. For Cottrell (1999:188) analytical thinking involves the following additional processes: • Standing back from the information given • Examining it in detail from many angles • Checking whether a statement follows logically from what went before • Looking for possible flaws in the reasoning, the evidence, or the way that conclusions are drawn • Comparing the same issue from the point of view of other theorists or writers • Being able to see and explain why different people arrived at different conclusions • Being able to argue why one set of opinions, results or conclusions is preferable to another • Being on guard for literary or statistical devices that encourage the reader to take questionable statements at face value • Checking for hidden assumptions • German = Auseinandersetzungsmöglichkeiten (Discussion/Debate/Looking into a subject + capacity/ability/assets/means). In terms more specific to the German major, the assignments in our CTW courses will enable students to gain a better understanding of literary and -- more broadly -- cultural and historical trends in the German-speaking world, and equip students with the tools necessary to query intellectual and personal discourses.
positions with respect to the long and complex tradition of Germanic cultural production, which at times intersects with other traditions with which students may be familiar, and at times diverges from them. Ultimately, students in our CTW courses will be able to comprehend German texts within their cultural, intellectual, and historical contexts, and engage these texts in ways that are both intellectually rigorous and personally meaningful.

**Goals**

**G 1: Demonstrate Understanding of Culture of Target Language**
Logically interprets evidence, statements, graphics, and questions, including more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences, and points of view of others

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Cultural Analysis (M: 2)**
Describes events, people, and places with supporting details from the source. Make connections to sources, either personal or analytic.

**SLO 4: Literary Analysis Based on Central Theme (M: 1)**
Student shall write a 3-4 page essay on 2 of 3 texts read in the course. The essay will be a comparison of the texts based on a central theme such as "identity crisis" or "dysfunctional family relationships."

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Reflective Essay on the "Other"**
Students write a reflective essay on what it means to be "other" in Germany. This may be from personal experience as many of our majors are from Bosnia and other Eastern European countries and have experienced it first hand, or it may be based on research.

**O/O 3: Contrastive Cultural Analysis**
Students are given a copy of the American Bill of Rights in German. They are then asked to choose one of the amendments and reflect on its impact on American culture and investigate if this right is guaranteed in Germany (or should be).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Thematic Analysis and Comparison of Literary Texts (O: 4)**
Outcome: Student should demonstrate critical thinking through writing skills by supporting the main idea of the assignment and showing proficiency in analysis of text. Measure: Student shall write a final paper which analyzes 2 of 3 texts read during the semester. The analysis will be a comparison of the texts around a central them chosen by the student such as identity crisis, first-person narrative, coming to terms with the past, etc. Concrete examples should be cited and interpreted from the text. The essay should contain: a title, a clear structure with introduction, analysis and conclusion, a comparison of the texts and personal intellectual ideas, not merely summaries.

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

**Target for O4: Literary Analysis Based on Central Theme**
Target: The paper will be evaluated on a scale of 7-10: 7 = developing, 8 = acceptable, 9 = proficient and 10 = advanced. The essay was evaluated on: focus on topic, literary lens used, organization and grammar and spelling. The target for this assignment was for all students to receive at least an 8 and for 75% of the students to receive a 9 or 10 (the rating to be an average of all 4 criteria).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Findings: In terms of this outcome, 90% of the students achieved an average of at least an 8, and 58% received an average of 9 or 10.

**M 2: Essay European/German Issue (O: 1)**
A general assignment was given in which the student could choose any "controversial" topic affecting Germany as part of the EU today. Three samples were provided by the faculty who taught the spring capstone CTW course. The data is not meant to give specific statistics on performance of the whole class, but rather was submitted to underscore a problem in tracking progress and providing a tool for evaluating and fostering critical thinking. Sample 1 = Essay on Homosexual Marriage Score of 1 on Departmental Rubric (biased interpretation, no identification of counter-arguments, exhibits closed-mindedness, etc.) Sample 2 = Essay on the Wearing of the "Hidschab" in Europe Score of 4 (some supporting data, basic ability to analyze and formulate inferences, etc.) Sample 3 = Essay on Whether Turkey Should be Allowed to Become a Member of the EU Score of 6 (accurately interprets evidence, thoughtful analysis, alternative explanations, etc.) Because the essays are in German, they are not reproduced in the repository. The findings reflect almost no progress from entry level major to capstone course in the area of CTW based on the current rubric. This is easy to track because of the size of the department (3 full time faculty). Most majors are known to the faculty and have been in multiple courses with the faculty. Thus we are all very familiar with the work of the students in essays, tests and oral presentations. What is most disconcerting is that the weaker students remain fixated in the same errors of language as well as philosophical argument. The native speakers also have a clear advantage, both due to language ability and the tradition of education in the home country. Action Plan: The lack of definable and measurable progress in some students may lead to a reevaluation of the rubric, the
nature of assignments and expectations/limitations of writing in the target language.

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

**Target for O1: Cultural Analysis**

The departmental goal is a score of 4 on the assignment based on the rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The findings reflect almost no progress from entry level major to capstone course in the area of CTW based on the current rubric. This is easy to track because of the size of the department (3 full time faculty). Most majors are known to the faculty and have been in multiple courses with the faculty. Thus we are all very familiar with the work of the students in essays, tests and oral presentations. What is most disconcerting is that the weaker students remain fixated in the same errors of language as well as philosophical argument. The native speakers also have a clear advantage, both due to language ability and the tradition of education in the home country.

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

**Action Plan for CTW 2010-2011**

The German Section has plans to meet more regularly to discuss and develop a body of thematic exercises that can be used for critical thinking writing assignments in upcoming classes. Although generic in character, these assignments can be adapted to fit the goals of any CTW class in German, whether it be a writing assignment, a 5 minute speed paragraph, or a final exam topic. This should help us codify not only the type of assignment we feel can most fairly assess student learning and achievement, but also guide us in a more reasonable expectation on each assignment by limiting which CTW aspects from the rubric are actually being assessed. The faculty will come together as a whole to discuss and compare evaluations and brainstorm broad discrepancies or variables in assessment. It is expected that these discussions will lead to further fine tuning of the rubric itself. From previous CTW classes and pilots, we have discovered as well that the type of assignments we currently use to evaluate critical thinking are very limited (traditional essays with “controversial topics”). We plan to implement more “speed” paragraphs in which comprehension of and/or reaction to a class discussion point is “tested” immediately and then used to further examine the topic being examined. It is hoped that from these spontaneous reactions the students can develop a greater sense of what a longer critical thinking assignment entails. A curriculum change throughout the entire major has been drafted and will focus on German Studies rather than on traditional language and literature. This should facilitate communicating expectations to students as the courses will be designed around a theme or cultural focus rather than a historically delimited body of work.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Action Plan implemented through German section meetings
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Robin Y. huff
- **Additional Resources:** None

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?**

I don’t feel that the definition per se has changed. We still expect a valid argument with supporting data and the ability to stand back from information so as to be able to examine it from all sides. What has changed in principle are the expectations of what students should be able to do for each assignment, i.e. narrowing of elements of the rubric that are being evaluated. Moreover we have come to understand that the students don’t have the tools necessary to query their intellectual and personal positions on the complexities of another culture. This coupled with the barrier of linguistic tools in a foreign tongue have moved us to lower expectations (and not in a mediocre way) and focus less on accuracy and more on development. Otherwise the consistency of lower scores as they relate to the same students would lead one to believe that critical thinking is inherent or has been developed elsewhere and cannot be nurtured. Rather than simple have students rewrite or “repair” flawed essays (whether in argument, ideas, supporting evidence or basic coherence of language), we are now inclined to avoid endless drafting and identify strengths and weaknesses, relying on the student to make and justify changes, reengaging and not repairing faulty construction.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?**

The main achievement for the year was the realization that our course design is not suitable for the type of critical thinking we demanded from our students. We therefore decided to rework the entry level course into a more issue based essay structure (i.e. cultural topics that are less “controversial” and more geared toward contrastive analysis of cultural issues such as integration and social welfare). There was, however, a clear improvement in writing as evidenced in the ratings of German 3301 students. Only 5 (out of 18) students received a rating of 3 (fair) and the other 14 met our expectations of 4 or higher. Additionally the capstone course (German 4402) will be replaced by a writing based conversation and composition course being designed by our section. This will alleviate the dual expectation of advanced grammar acquisition through writing and critical thinking. What worked well were the essay topics that focused on cultural issues in a contrastive manner. That relates directly to our action plan on cultural awareness through contrastive analysis.

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.**

I attended all but one of the workshops and each was very beneficial, largely because of the less formal atmosphere and opportunity to brainstorm. One especially useful discussion was on focus, namely what kind of critical thinking is being asked for and how does the assignment get students to this point. One frustration documented elsewhere in this document from one of our faculty teaching the capstone course was the inability to address what should have been a well known cultural event in Germany. We are to blame to some extent by randomly selecting a topic not covered in class, assuming appropriate background knowledge of the event to be analyzed, and not teaching editing skills when the task was marked as unacceptable. As a result of these CTW training sessions, Drs. Stewart, Carey and myself have met and will meet in late summer to devise a new course more conducive to critical thinking assignments. In addition, we will meet to discuss how to draft assignments that are more focused and which have a structure where
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?  

The faculty who taught the capstone CTW course this spring 2010 made the following comment: I'm finishing up the grading of essays for 4402 and as always the grammar is rough - very rough - for most but even more disconcerting is the extent to which the essays are radically and obscenely misinformed. The theme was simple: Wiedervereinigung: erfolgreich oder nicht? (Reunification: successful or not?) And the vast majority of reactions were utter nonsense so ridiculous that it would be laughable, if education weren't a serious matter. This was my experience last semester as well. 4402 is a grammar course, I'm not teaching or discussing any grammar but the constant comments indicate a complete lack of discipline and even less discipline on the part of the students to engage with their own work. And that's on top of the fact that the grammar remains a major source of confusion for the students.  

The main impact has been to reevaluate the curriculum to broaden the focus of the major, make it more interdisciplinary and adaptable to changes in the profession. This would include adding new survey courses that purport to give a broad education in all aspects of literature and culture through chronological journeys through all that is German history, both intellectual and geographic, and literature. An example would be our proposal on the graduate level, replacing the century based surveys with thematic studies such as: 8835 Comparative Cultures 8841 Intellectual History in German Studies 8842 Political History in German Studies. 8843 Representations and Constructions of Identity in German Culture 8844 Genres of German Literature and Film 8845 Material Culture in German Society. This incentive is a direct result of lackluster results in the CTW first pilots and subsequent frustration with the superimposing of random "CTW sounding" essay topics onto courses with no such component.

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 these changes affected your outcome?

Unfortunately I can think of no operational improvements per se except in the area of learning outcomes. We have moderated our expectations to take into account the lack of language acumen in many cases that have consistently dragged down the scores of certain weaker students. In the area of literary analysis for example we have developed a rubric (not yet adapted to the CTW rubric) that scores on focus on topic, use of literary lens, organization and grammar & spelling. These areas are only rated from developing and acceptable to proficient and advanced. We are considering using these learning outcome ratings for the draft to offer more specific praise in areas of achievement and highlight areas that simply distract the reader from the content intended. The hope is that the positive assessment of outlines and drafts will lead to a more developed final product and higher scores.

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 disappointment in our findings was largely in the realm of inability to express oneself in the target language. This coupled with an incomplete understanding of the target culture in its historical context has led us to redesign the curriculum in both focus and expectations. With the addition of a conversation and composition course in 2011, the student in the capstone course will have the advantage of first being exposed to other critical essays, journals and news reports before being asked to draft their own ideas on topics of which they have an incomplete understanding. This technique of "mirroring" is used in our translation certificate program whereby the student reads other German to English translations on a particular subject such as a corporate annual report to have a better idea of language and structural differences in that category. Our expectations are thus more clearly defined without the
additional burden of the core course expectations (such as grammar, syntax and linguistics). The assignments will thus mirror what has already been approached critically by others. This should help eliminate the woeful ignorance of some students as regards the target culture and current trends in the German speaking world as well as level the playing field by focusing on language improvement in speaking and writing. That way our heritage speakers will not have an advantage over the non-native speakers.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The German Section has plans to meet more regularly to discuss and develop a body of thematic exercises that can be used for critical thinking writing assignments in upcoming classes. Although generic in character, these assignments can be adapted to fit the goals of any CTW class in German, whether it be a writing assignment, a 5 minute speed paragraph, or a final exam topic. This should help us codify not only the type of assignment we feel can most fairly assess student learning and achievement, but also guide us in a more reasonable expectation on each assignment by limiting which CTW aspects from the rubric are actually being assessed. The faculty will come together as a whole to discuss and compare evaluations and brainstorm broad discrepancies or variables in assessment. It is expected that these discussions will lead to further fine tuning of the rubric itself. From previous CTW classes and pilots, we have discovered as well that the type of assignments we currently use to evaluate critical thinking are very limited (traditional essays with "controversial topics"). We plan to implement more "speed" paragraphs in which comprehension of and/or reaction to a class discussion point is "tested" immediately and then used to further enlighten the topic being examined. It is hoped that from these spontaneous reactions the students can develop a greater sense of what a longer critical thinking assignment entails. A curriculum change throughout the entire major has been drafted and will focus on German Studies rather than on traditional language and literature. This should facilitate communicating expectations to students as the courses will be designed around a theme or cultural focus rather than a historically delimited body of work. As for the degree of improvement, we plan to implement writing portfolios so that the student can both work on line (perhaps Live Text) on self improvement and share ideas in a "blog" setting so that peer tutoring can replace to a large part the red marker. For the weaker students that could bring up the "score" by 1-2 points and a more thorough preparation in class to handle the complexity of a topic should produce improvement as well.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The history department subscribes to the definition of Critical Thinking as it was proposed to the Faculty Senate: our courses will help “students develop the ‘wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.’” When students graduate we expect that they will be able to demonstrate historical mindedness, multidimensional analysis, knowledge of historical context, ability to analyze texts, and how to present their findings. They will also demonstrate a range of professional skills, a knowledge of historiography, an awareness of interdisciplinary methods and larger (trans-national, -regional, or global) perspectives, as well as a set of professional values. Please see the "history standards" in the document repository for further details.

**Goals**

**G 1: Historical Mindedness**

Students will understand the connections and disconnections between past and present.

**G 2: Historical Interpretation**

Students will be able to ask relevant questions of primary and secondary texts.

**G 3: Historical Communication**

Students will be able to communicate their findings in clear ways.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Historical Mindedness (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)**

Students will demonstrate facility in historical thinking. See "CTW Assessment Instrument" in the Document Repository for more information.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication

4 Critical Thinking

**O/O 2: Historical Interpretation (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)**

Students will become adept at historical analysis. See "CTW Assessment Instrument" in the Document Repository for more information.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Martin Guerre** (History 3000; Davidson) (O: 2, 3)

In class writing exercise on *The Return of Martin Guerre* Consider the differences between the film and book versions of this story. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each? What can you learn from one that you could not learn from the other?

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

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**

Students should achieve scores of 1 or better on the Assessment Instrument (see document repository).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores ranged from 1 - 3. See Martin Guerre Documents in the Repository

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

Students should achieve scores of 1 or better on the Assessment Instrument (see document repository).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores ranged from 1 - 3 (See Martin Guerre documents in the Repository).

**M 2: My Lai** (History 3000; Davidson) (O: 1, 2, 3)

Source Analysis I Read *My Lai: A Brief History with Documents*. After reading and considering all the documents collected here, select three sources of different varieties and write a short paper (3 – 4 pages) describing what could be learned from them. Analyze them as sources of historical knowledge. Consider who wrote the source and why? In what context did it originally appear? Was it public or secret? Was it private or widely known? How did people at the time respond to the particular source? What is the nature of the source—is it an economic report, a legal proceeding, a photograph, a memoir—and how does that determine how an historian could use the document in question? You will present your analysis to the rest of the class.

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**

We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores ranged from 1 - 3 (see My Lai/Davidson Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**

We expect students to achieve in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores ranged from 1 - 3 (see My Lai/Davidson Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

We expect students to achieve in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores ranged from 1 - 3 (see My Lai/Davidson Documents in the Repository)

**M 3: Paper** (History 3000; Davidson) (O: 1, 2, 3)

The longer writing assignment for the class, due at the end of the semester, is a short research paper. For this assignment, you will need to do preliminary research in order to explain and define the topic, construct a bibliography, and present a plan for your research. Then you will write an 8 to 12 page paper where you develop an argument based on your research. You will be receiving more details on this assignment soon, and will be submitting various parts of the paper (short explanation, annotated bibliography, draft, and revision) over the course of the semester.

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**

We expect students to achieve in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores ranged from 1 - 3 (See My Lai/Davidson Documents in the Repository)
Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Paper/Davidson Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Paper/Davidson Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Paper/Davidson Documents in the Repository)

**M 4: Response Paper (History 3000; Reid) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will write two short response papers; three are listed in the syllabus. Response Papers must be typed and are limited to 500 words. They are due on the scheduled class day (typically every other week) by 11:30am on uLearn. Response Papers must address the following issues: 1. Identify a major issue from the readings. 2. Discuss how the issue connects to the topic for the week. Be sure to include an example(s) from the readings to support your point. 3. Explain how the reading(s) helped you think more critically about this week's topic.

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Response/Reid Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Response/Reid Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Response/Reid Documents in the Repository)

**M 5: Prospectus (History 3000; Reid) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Each student will write a 10-page Research Prospectus addressing one of the major course topics – race, gender, labor, or Atlantic history. A Research Prospectus is an analytical paper that addresses a future research project. The final prospectus must reference 12 sources: 10 books and articles, and 2 primary source collections. Additional instructions will be provided.

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Response/Reid Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Response/Reid Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Response/Reid Documents in the Repository)

**M 6: Assignment 1 (History 3000; Selwood) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Compare the styles of historical writing found in any two sources read so far. How do these sources differ as historiography? What the effects of these differences on the ways in which the writers convey the past?
## Target for O1: Historical Mindedness
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Assignment 1/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

## Target for O2: Historical Interpretation
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Assignment 1/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

## Target for O3: Historical Communication
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Assignment 1/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

### M 7: Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood) (O: 1, 2, 3)
Using Historical Abstracts, America: History & Life, or JSTOR, write a historiographical review of two journal articles on the same subject.

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

#### Target for O1: Historical Mindedness
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Assignment 2/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

#### Target for O2: Historical Interpretation
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Assignment 2/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

#### Target for O3: Historical Communication
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see Assignment 2/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

### M 8: Assignment 3 (History 3000; Selwood) (O: 1, 2, 3)
Final Project: the Research Prospectus These papers will culminate in the production of your final project, a research prospectus for a hypothetical major research paper of the kind produced in History 4990. Your research prospectus will include: Project Description: This should include a general description of the project, your hypothesis, the questions your project will investigate and the larger significance of your paper (the "so what"). Historiographical Review: A short overview of the main historical works on this topic. You should show awareness both of recent historiography and of older, established works in the field, along with the larger historiographical areas that this topic intersects with. Theory and Methodology: Describe your research methods and, if possible, the larger theoretical or disciplinary framework that you are using (e.g. social/cultural history, analysis of discourse, gender, etc). Sources: Description (in words) of the collections and archives you will use, with as much detail as possible of their contents and geographical location. Bibliography: This should be divided between primary sources and secondary sources. It should be in perfect Chicago bibliographic format. Include everything you have mentioned in the text of your prospectus (for which you should also have a footnote in perfect Chicago/documentary-note style), along with any other relevant sources you have encountered but did not mention.

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

#### Target for O1: Historical Mindedness
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Scores ranged from 0 - 4 (see Assignment 3/Selwood Documents in the Repository)

#### Target for O2: Historical Interpretation
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Scores ranged from 0 - 4 (see Assignment 3/Selwood Documents in the Repository)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Historical Communication</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 0 - 4 (see Assignment 3/Selwood Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 9: My Lai (History 3000; Poley) (O: 1, 2, 3)** | Source Analysis I. Read My Lai: A Brief History With Documents by James A. Olsen and Randy Roberts. After reading and carefully considering all the documents collected in My Lai: A Brief History with Documents, select three sources of different varieties and write a short paper (3 – 4 pages) to be handed in during class describing what could be learned from them. Analyze them as sources of historical knowledge. Consider, for instance, who wrote the source and why? In what context did it originally appear? Was it public or secret? Was it private or widely known? How did people at the time respond to the particular source? What is the nature of the source—is it an economic report, a legal proceeding, a photograph, a memoir—and how does that determine how an historian could use the document in question? You will present your analysis to the rest of the class. |
| **Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see My Lai/Poley Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see My Lai/Poley Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Historical Communication</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 1 - 4 (see My Lai/Poley Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 10: Paper (History 3000; Poley) (O: 1, 2, 3)** | You must write a final paper (roughly 10 pages) in which you investigate in greater detail the history and historiography of a particular theme appropriate to the class. Part of this grade consists of your ability to do certain things on schedule: on September 22 you need to hand in a 1-paragraph topic proposal, on October 6 you need to provide copies of a 1-page discussion of your thesis to the entire class, and on November 3 you must submit an annotated bibliography. As part of the peer review you must have a completed draft on December 1 and critical comments for your assigned colleague on December 3. Final Portfolios are due between 2:45 and 4:45 on December 8 in my office. |
| **Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see 3000 Paper/Poley Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see 3000 Paper/Poley Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Historical Communication</strong></th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see 3000 Paper/Poley Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 11: Exit Statement (History 3000; Poley) (O: 3)** | Write a short statement (no more than two pages) describing how your thinking about the project changed over the course of writing. How did the “process” affect the outcome? |
| **Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

<p>| <strong>Target for O3: Historical Communication</strong> | We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Annotated Bibliography (History 4990; Grubbs) (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See &quot;Grubbs annotated bibliography assignment.pdf&quot; in the document repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Prospectus (History 4990; Grubbs) (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See document &quot;Grubbs prospectus assignment&quot; in the document repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores ranged from 3 - 4 (see Prospectus/Grubbs Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot) (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Proposal/Skwiot Documents in the Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| Scores ranged from 3 - 5 (see Exit/Poley Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met |
| Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Annotated Bib/Grubbs Documents in the Repository) |
Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Proposal/Skwiot Documents in the Repository)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Draft (History 4990; Skwiot) (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Historical Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Paper (History 4990; Skwiot) (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Historical Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Reading Response (History 4990; Poley) (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal.dotm 0 0 1 38 219 Georgia State University 1 1 268 12.0 false 18 pt 18 pt 0 0 false false false I will expect short written responses (roughly one page) to be produced before the discussion. In these responses you must summarize the reading and then offer your interpretations, focusing especially on questions of sources, method, theory, and overall approach. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Historical Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores ranged from 2 - 4 (see Reading Response/Poley Documents in the Repository)

M 18: Paper (History 4990; Poley) (O: 1, 2, 3)
You must write a final paper (roughly 20 – 25 pages) based on the research themes of the class: the history of the avant garde. Part of this grade consists of your ability to do certain things on schedule: on February 16 you need to hand in a 1-paragraph topic proposal, on March 2 you need to provide copies of a 1-page discussion of your thesis to the entire class, and on March 4 you need to provide a report to the class on the primary source material you will be employing in your final paper. On March 16 you must submit an annotated bibliography, and on March 30 you must hand in a progress report on your research and writing. As part of the peer review you must have a completed draft on your assigned due date and critical comments for your colleagues. Final Portfolios are due between 2:45 and 4:45 on May 4 in my office.

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**

We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Scores ranged from 3 - 5 (see 4990 Paper/Poley Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**

We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Scores ranged from 3 - 5 (see 4990 Papers/Poley Documents in the Repository)

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Scores ranged from 3 - 5 (see 4990 Papers/Poley Documents in the Repository)

M 19: Standards Statement (History 4990; Poley) (O: 3)

Short statement (no more than three pages) describing how your thinking about the project changed over the course of writing. How did the “process” affect the outcome? You must also indicate how the project meets the ten history standards.

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

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Scores ranged from 3 - 5 (see Standards/Poley Documents in the Repository)

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

**assignment workshop**

Hold assignment workshops for instructors of history 3000 and 4990.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Annotated Bibliography (History 4990; Grubbs) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: Assignment 3 (History 3000; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Davidson) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: Prospectus (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: Reading Response (History 4990; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Measure: Response Paper (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication

Implementation Description: Launch a series of brown bags to discuss critical thinking and its relationship to various critical thinking outcomes.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010

Responsible Person/Group: Jared Poley
Refine document collection strategies
Refine document collection strategies. I asked instructors to submit examples of student work that they felt demonstrated poor, adequate, and advanced critical thinking skills. In the future I plan to modify this strategy, asking instead for "representative" or "random" samples of work from instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Annotated Bibliography (History 4990; Grubbs) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Assignment 3 (History 3000; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Davidson) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Reading Response (History 4990; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Response Paper (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Response Paper (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness

Implementation Description: Refine document collection strategies.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Jared Poley

rubric evaluation
Self-evaluation of the rubric to see if it continues to hold meaning as an assessment instrument.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Annotated Bibliography (History 4990; Grubbs) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Assignment 3 (History 3000; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Davidson) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: My Lai (History 3000; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Prospectus (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Reading Response (History 4990; Poley) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Response Paper (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Response Paper (History 3000; Reid) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
  | Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness

Implementation Description: Self-evaluation of the rubric to see if it continues to hold meaning as an assessment instrument.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Jared Poley

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The overall definition has not changed, but the initiative has allowed people throughout the department to think on a deeper level about the role and function of these two courses and how they can work better together to promote critical thinking over a longer (gateway to capstone) span of time. We still have the same idea in mind when it comes to critical thinking as when we started this process, but the we’ve become more sophisticated in how we promote it in these courses.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
We have continued to certify faculty (and there are now 18 historians certified in CTW). We have also initiated a series of brown bags/workshops dedicated to teaching History 3000 and History 4990 (the two CTW courses), in which the CTW “pilots” described their experiences. Both of these developments were a part of the implementation plan described in last year’s report.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
The workshops this year were smaller and less formal than in the first year, which I think was nice since it allowed for a looser
CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

We have such a wide variety of teachers and assignments that any type of "evolution" is difficult to see in just one year. I think that the main suggestion that I’ll make will be to experiment with a type of pre/post assignment, which I think will let us see what types of individual developments our students may (or may not) be making over the course of a semester. I also think that I’ll be more specific in the types of assignments I request from instructors (rather than leaving it up to them), and I’ll also request a random sample of work (rather than asking for work that the instructor feels demonstrates a “range” of critical thinking.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

I think that history had thought of itself as a department that "taught" critical thinking for a long time, and so in that sense very little has changed in the past year. But what has shifted is the degree to which we have stepped back and imagined new ways of teaching and considered how specific assignments were implicated in critical thought. This larger “metacriticism” of teaching and learning has been a useful project for many of us.
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
2 Outcomes of administrative support services (3.3.1.2)
3 Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)
5 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**SLO 2: Effective delineation and prioritization of operational options (M: 1, 2)**

In two assigned case studies and in the business project, students will delineate relevant options in the process of decision-making and will prioritize these options are related to the business’ mission and goals.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Effective development/evaluation of business goals, action plans and implementation progress (M: 3, 4)**

Through the business project, students will develop specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-specific goals and corresponding action plans. They will evaluate their progress as related to the goals and action plans.

**O/O 4: Unknown (M: 1)**

Unknown

**O/O 5: Demonstrating professional business communication (M: 1, 2, 4)**

Students will deliver a professional presentation of their project results with supporting written documentation provided. They will also provide written responses to two cases that must clearly reflect their analytical decision-making processes. Two other assignments, a strategic career plan and an information interview, must also clearly reflect a logical process followed and the information gained.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Unknown (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors**

The goal was for 100% of the class to understand at least 80% of the relevant business factors that could impact, in this case, the upstart of a business operation and the successful maintenance of it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Through check-points throughout the semester including a written mid-semester synopsis of the progress of the business project, it was evident that 100% of the class did understand at least 80% of the factors.

**Target for O2: Effective delineation and prioritization of operational options**

In this project, the goal was to delineate at least five business locations for the planned restaurant, menu options for a three day part (breakfast, lunch, dinner), options for recruiting employees (students, referrals through service organizations like Goodwill) and marketing options (social media, on-campus marketing, marketing to surrounding businesses.)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Through group work, each group delineated all of the above options, at minimum, in addition to other suggestions and ideas.

**Target for O4: Unknown**

All students were expected to complete an in-depth analysis of their team's functioning.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

This was completed at 100%. It was expected that students would achieve at least an 85 for contributions to their group which were delineated in detail. The average score on group performance was 88. Thirteen students (7.3% of the class) made less than 85 on their evaluations for performance on the team.

**Target for O5: Demonstrating professional business communication**

It was expected that all presentations would be effectively done including PowerPoints that were properly done with correct font, graphics and clear, accurate information. It was also expected that presenters would be very good communicators and would explain the slides. Only two to three students presented for each group but the other students were in charge of graphic support (PowerPoint slides).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All groups demonstrated effective business communication skills. This also involved clearly answering questions at the end of the presentations with relevant, focused and factual answers. This was shared among group members as well.

**M 2: Unknown (O: 1, 2, 5)**

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

**Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors**
The target is for all students in HADM 4800 to achieve competency in delineating and prioritizing at least 80% of the relevant business factors featured in each assigned case.

**Target for O2: Effective delineation and prioritization of operational options**
The objective in the case studies was to achieve a clear delineation of options. For one case, this was options for different leadership approaches in dealing with a challenge in a hotel setting. The other case involved a delineation of different options that were available to managers in dealing with an ethical problem.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The goal was to have 85% of the class delineate at least three options for each case. This was achieved by 88% in the leadership style case and by approximately 80% in the ethics case. With the ethics case, a number of students focused solely on what they considered to be the “right” choice without pursuing other options.

**Target for O3: Demonstrating professional business communication**
Both of the cases were written assignments. The goal was to clearly and efficiently communicate managerial-level responses.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
The goal was for 80% of the students to achieve these objectives. Approximately 75% of the class met this goal. The grammatical and syntax errors were numerous. Many case responses were wordy with the point hidden in rambling sentences.

**M 3: Career Strategic Plan (O: 1, 3)**
This written assignment involved applying strategic planning principles to one’s career plan. As with a business strategic plan, students had to delineate a mission statement, core values, an environmental analysis, SWOT analysis, goals and action plans.

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

**Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors**
The goal was for students to write individual strategic plans for their careers with at least 80% of the plans clearly including the following components reflecting that they understood application of terminology and processes: 1) Delineation of core values 2) Written mission statement 3) Written vision statement 4) SWOT Analysis 5) Environmental scanning - both external and internal (internal would be focused on the student and current employer) 6) Benchmarking 7) SMART Career Goals 8) Action Steps/Metrics/Time Schedule The goal, therefore, is for 80% of the students to achieve at least a minimum score of 80.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
This was accomplished by 88% of the class in identifying at least three relevant business factors that could impact one’s career choice. This was accomplished by 88% of the class in identifying at least three relevant business factors that could impact one’s career choice.

**Target for O3: Effective development/evaluation of business goals, action plans and implementation progress**
Students were to develop specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-specific career goals, action plans and how progress would be measured with at least 85% accuracy.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Regarding goal development, approximately 90% of students demonstrated effective goal development. Action plan development dropped to around 80% and measurement of progress was in that same range.

**M 4: Career Strategic Plan (O: 1, 3)**
This written assignment involved applying strategic planning principles to one’s career plan. As with a business strategic plan, students had to delineate a mission statement, core values, an environmental analysis, SWOT analysis, goals and action plans.

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

**Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors**
This was part of the rubric for this assignment as applied to the environmental scan and SWOT analysis of one's strategic career plan. The goal was for 85% of the class to comprehensively identify current, and potentially future, business factors that could impact career choices. (For example, with the economic problems of the last two years, fine dining business has declined with many fine dining establishments closing. Therefore, my goal of opening a fine dining restaurant after graduation should be evaluated and revised to start work in a different restaurant segment to gain relevant experience.)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
This was accomplished by 88% of the class in identifying at least three relevant business factors that could impact one’s career choice. This was accomplished by 88% of the class in identifying at least three relevant business factors that could impact one’s career choice. [Preview Formatting]

**Target for O3: Effective development/evaluation of business goals, action plans and implementation progress**
Students were to develop specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-specific career goals, action plans and how progress would be measured with at least 85% accuracy.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Regarding goal development, approximately 90% of students demonstrated effective goal development. Action plan development dropped to around 80% and measurement of progress was in that same range.

### M 4: Information Interview (O: 1, 5)

Each student had to select an industry manager/executive who held a position to which he/she aspired to interview. Students had to research this individual and his/her company in advance. Interview questions were developed by the students and the one-on-one interview was held. The resulting report was to reflect the major turning points in this person's career, how the person prepared for their career progress and advice for someone entering the industry.

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

#### Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors

The goal was to have 85% of the students develop an understanding of the business environment in which the person interviewed worked. Another goal was to develop an understanding of the decision-making process this person engaged in to make their career choices.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

This was achieved by 79% of the class. Nine students grades ranged from 70 to 80 because they were vague, did not sufficiently address business challenges, the changing business environment and other real-world aspects. The focus was too narrowly centered on the person's early career stages.

#### Target for O5: Demonstrating professional business communication

As with other written assignments in this course, there were elementary, fundamental grammatical problems. Because this assignment was shorter and in an interview format, the problems were not as extensive as the lengthier written assignments.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Two students experienced significant point reductions (five to eight points) because of the writing problems.

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

#### Interview Outline

An outline with suggested topics to cover will be provided. I do not want to require these topics because the students need to be empowered to ask the questions most important to them. I do expect, however, that students cover current business challenges and the realities of today's business environment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Measure: Information Interview | Outcome/Objective: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors |

- **Implementation Description:** This outline will be tested summer semester 2010.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010

#### Sample plans

Samples of the problem sections will be provided with more class time allocated to working on the goal-setting and particularly the action plans.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Measure: Career Strategic Plan | Outcome/Objective: Effective development/evaluation of business goals, action plans and implementation progress |

- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010

#### Written communication resources

A list of resources to help students with the written assignments will be developed. A sample of a "good" case and a sample of an "unsatisfactory" case will also be presented.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Measure: Unknown | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrating professional business communication |

- **Implementation Description:** These tools will be provided for summer 2010 in HADM 4800 but will be revised based on the students' feedback for fall 2010.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010

#### Written communication tools

Students in HADM 4800 will be provided, on the syllabus, a list of writing resources. Some of these will be on-line and others will be on-campus. These resources will be developed prior to the start of fall semester 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

We have tried to expand it into other courses - particularly the other required major hospitality courses. For the most part, this has been successful with high-level course projects being incorporated into all major courses.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

The business projects were successful this past year. For fall semester, the project was with the Captain Planet Foundation and involved students planning their big fund-raiser for the year. This was similar to developing a business plan, put students in touch with many hospitality community leaders and also involved a volunteer-based organization which added an interesting dynamic. The project for spring semester was with Blue Earth with is an organization, in the beginning stages, that is planning on opening a sustainable cafe on or near campus. This project provided the students to develop a business plan that was environmentally-focused. With an increasing number of hospitality businesses becoming more sustainable, this was excellent preparation for the students.

The business projects were successful this past year. For fall semester, the project was with the Captain Planet Foundation and involved students planning their big fund-raiser for the year. This was similar to developing a business plan, put students in touch with many hospitality community leaders and also involved a volunteer-based organization which added an interesting dynamic. The project for spring semester was with Blue Earth with is an organization, in the beginning stages, that is planning on opening a sustainable cafe on or near campus. This project provided the students to develop a business plan that was environmentally-focused. With an increasing number of hospitality businesses becoming more sustainable, this was excellent preparation for the students.

Another change this semester involved students planning their big fund-raiser for the year. This was similar to developing a business plan, put students in touch with many hospitality community leaders and also involved a volunteer-based organization which added an interesting dynamic. The project for spring semester was with Blue Earth with is an organization, in the beginning stages, that is planning on opening a sustainable cafe on or near campus. This project provided the students to develop a business plan that was environmentally-focused. With an increasing number of hospitality businesses becoming more sustainable, this was excellent preparation for the students.

Instead, the students had the opportunity to present their business project results about three weeks prior to the end of the semester and, based on student and faculty input, had the chance to make revisions. Another change this semester involved one of the two cases. The first case, to provide the students with the experience of writing a response to a case, was traditionally done with the case written and specific questions asked. The second case involved the students writing the case. This worked very well. The topic of the second case was "business ethics" and the results from the students was more varied and realistic than if a "canned" assignment had been used.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

The training is always helpful and well-organized. I found the training in September - at the kick-off of the year - to be helpful because it involved sharing of what other departments were doing with their CTW courses. I feel that I have refined the CTW course over the last three years based on the training. I would like to expand the number of people who attend because I think other courses would benefit in our program.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

The business project has become more detailed and structured. I did not use the case rewrites this past semester and this was a positive change. Instead, the students had the opportunity to present their business project results about three weeks prior to the end of the semester and, based on student and faculty input, had the chance to make revisions. Another change this semester involved one of the two cases. The first case, to provide the students with the experience of writing a response to a case, was traditionally done with the case written and specific questions asked. The second case involved the students writing the case. This worked very well. The topic of the second case was "business ethics" and the results from the students was more varied and realistic than if a "canned" assignment had been used.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The major changes have included revisions in the assignments, asking for input from other hospitality faculty since this is considered the capstone course, and also getting our Industry Board involved in asking their participation in the business projects. Having realistic learning experiences, in which the students can refine their critical thinking skills, is extremely important for our majors to be successful in their careers. Revising the assignments has helped in integrating the writing component in a more effective way.

Georgia State University
Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking has four components: identifying consequential issues, generating alternatives, anticipating outcomes, and drawing correct conclusions. Furthermore, it is important to consider all forms of risk, not just legal ones. Effective decision-makers generate several views of a problem and alternative solutions that account for various advantages and disadvantages. This includes sensitivity to the organization’s mission, values, strategies, goals, HRM practices, performance, and reputation. The ability to conceptualize and articulate solutions is essential for convincing various stakeholders to adopt a strategic rather than legalistic view.

Goals

G 1: Legal Environment of HR

The goals for this course include: (1) students become critical thinkers; (2) students become knowledgeable about the legal implications of HR policies and programs; (2) students learn specific techniques for analyzing situations, diagnosing problems, and developing solutions; (4) students are prepared for the "real world" where HR decision-making should be driven, not just by legal considerations, but by organizational strategy, culture, image, competition, and ethics.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identify Relevant Facts (M: 1)

Students will be able to distinguish relevant from trivial facts.

SLO 2: Specify Legal Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)

Students will be able to specify the legal issues related to the situation.

SLO 3: Discuss Legal Principles (M: 1)

Students will be able to discuss relevant cases, statutes, and regulations related to the situation and explain what is required of employees and employers.

SLO 4: Draw Reasonable Conclusions (M: 1)

Students will be able to make conclusions based on pertinent legal and HRM principles.

SLO 5: Write Clearly and Organize Logically (M: 1)

Students will be able to writing clearly and present ideas logically.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Vignette (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students will analyze at least nine "in-class" and a least three on-line critical incident vignettes. These "minicases" are based on actual legal findings, but are written from the perspective of the management professional rather than an attorney.

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The definition has not evolved in the last two years. However, my methods have.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

I created about 25 new vignettes based on actual legal findings. Written from the perspective of the management professional rather than an attorney, the vignettes provided many opportunities for students to infuse their understanding of the critical thinking process with their knowledge of employment law, HR practices, and strategy. They require various responses such as identifying the problem, recommending an intervention for a line-manager, or writing an employee handbook passage. I focused more attention on addressing student anxiety and self-efficacy about CTW. To accomplish this, I added more assignments, provided more detailed feedback, and emphasized the link between course assignments and the "real world." Many students seemed to enjoy the vignette assignments after getting over their fears. Recently, several of them said they considered dropping the course upon learning that "writing was involved" but were glad they stayed.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

There is considerable support for the ambassadors. I have attended several workshops, met with members of the CTW Leadership
Team, and presented at two workshops. The formal and informal meetings have been invaluable. These efforts have spurred my interest in CTW research. I have published three CTW scholarly papers and have two papers in progress.

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments**

How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

At the center of many employment law cases is a relatively simple incident such as the rejection of a job applicant or the misclassification of a nonexempt employee as exempt. These incidents are the basis for CTW vignettes that reflect the real world of the manager where information is incomplete and time to make a decision is limited. This has been the focus of my CTW assignments since the initiative started. What has changed is the number and length of the assignments. Rather than two or three long assignments, students complete 10 to 15 shorter assignments. This reduces resistance and enhances transfer of learning by depicting situations that are similar to the actual work environment, providing a variety of situations, inculcating theory and concepts, and facilitating practice.

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall**

What changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

There were no significant changes in the last year, but as previously mentioned, the course continues to evolve.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW International Business**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Institute of International Business does not offer an undergraduate major. However, it does provide a core required course for all RCB students. The course is also the gateway to the International Business Certificate. This course is the one being used for the first phase of CTW. Each department in the College will offer the higher level discipline-specific CTW course. CTW criteria are applied in the course writing assignment called the Individual Term Paper (international business proposal). This addresses basic international business functions in the context of the challenges of globalization, and involving corporate international business analysis and international data gathering.

**Goals**

**G 1: International Business Issues**

The underlying goal of the assignment is to familiarize the students with the role of basic international business processes (Export/Import, Out-sourcing; Off-shoring; Foreign Direct Investment; etc.). Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze basic international business processes, operations, and the challenges of globalization. Communication: students will demonstrate the ability to communicate their knowledge of international business processes directly to business leaders. They will put their analysis in written form appropriate for presenting a business proposition based on their understanding of the fundamentals of the field and their research. Research Skills: students will develop research skills and an awareness of the limitations of on-line material related to international business, including the use of foreign media sources.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Term Paper (G: 1) (M: 1)**

With the CTW assignment (Country Market Report) the students will demonstrate an understanding of the requirements for making a clear and concise international business proposition. The students will also effectively support the proposition in a manner that could be persuasive for making an investment decision. At the same time, the proposition and evidence will logically relate to realities in the target country.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.3 International Initiatives
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Rubric for International Business (O: 1)**

Rubrics Applied to BUSA 3000 "Globalization and Business Practices." To date, rubric scores have not been compared either over time or across the many sections of the course. The multiple instructors need to be consulted on the potential application of this
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Action Plan 2010-2011, International Business**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The CTW course for the entire College of Business is BUSA 3000, Globalization and Business Practices. The course is conducted as a core required course for the College by the Institute of International Business (IIB). Consequently, the rubrics and other criteria for the definition are those of the discipline of international business. All students in the College take the course and then only later perhaps have a second CTW course in their respective majors. The CTW definitions in those courses are discipline specific. Given this, IIB has begun a dialogue with the Undergraduate Program Council to evaluate if the CTW definition should be adjusted in BUSA 3000 to reflect the general discipline of business rather than specifically international business. In the meantime, based on a reevaluation of the application of the rubrics to date, changes have been made to the rubrics for 2010-2011.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

BUSA 3000 was used as a pilot for the CTW program. This last year it became a regular CTW course. Reference to each Action Plan follows: 1. Develop rubrics for team project papers: So far, we have been using the initial rubrics. These may be adjusted once we conclude the evaluation of the issue of international business versus business definitions. 2. Compare writing styles: This objective needs to be pursued formally in the next year. 3. Add structure: This has been done. It has been noted that business students need more specific instructions and assignments with clear headings for their writing to be more direct in the form of business writing. 4. Conduct Evaluations: Only some students have responded to the CTW evaluation requests from the CTW program. During the next year we need to conduct these in class to get more complete information. 5. Conduct Training: We continue every year to have two meetings of faculty and GRAs. Of course, several GRAs are new each semester. Thus, we involve those repeating in sharing their experiences with the new ones. In the case of this multi section class we also often have new instructors (especially PTIs). Consequently, some are starting from the beginning. In conclusion, we do have institutional memory among some faculty and GRAs. However, next year we will again also have new participants that need complete training. Maintaining continuity, the two ambassadors regularly participate in the CTW meetings. 6. Focus on WAC: Some instructors have used on-line WAC and some have not. Reviews are mixed as to how well that system works for the BUSA 3000 assignment. We will review this option again with the new faculty and GRAs. 7. Adjust for Maymester: We have not compromised on the CTW assignment for Maymester. In fact, we reduced other assignments and expanded the CTW paper so as to ensure that the students could accomplish the objectives of the writing assignment.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Workshops and Training are discussed above under Achievements. These have been successful and we will continue to have sessions each semester, especially considering that we will probably have new GRAs and PTIs.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

The CTW assignment for this class was based on an assignment used in the past for this course. That was the International Newspaper Report. The current CTW assignment is more extensive and action oriented. Although, we have retained an element of the earlier assignment by requiring the use of at least one media source of evidence from the country being considered. The key change should be to emphasize the importance of clear headings and divisions in the paper. This addresses the tendency of the students to mix information in run-on paragraphs.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Since the course already had a writing assignment, the CTW requirement built on that. The current assignment is more extensive and has more specific evaluation criteria. This has proved useful in focusing the students on the requirements of business writing which generally needs to be briefer and more focused than in other disciplines.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Journalism
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Journalism faculty members view the process of critical thinking as part of the routine of professional journalists/PR practitioners who use journalistic norms, standards and conventions of objectively assessing information and then decide what portions of synthesized information their audiences will receive.

Goals
G 1: Evaluation
find and evaluate credible sources of information

G 2: Interpreting information
to analyze and interpret information for bias and objectivity

G 3: Creating appropriate materials
to apply ethical standards and conventions of journalism and related to the mass communication industries when creating original content, e.g. news stories, press releases, newsletters, etc.,

G 4: Producing original materials
to understand the professional standards and apply them to produce materials in a variety of different media appropriate to diverse audiences.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: •Think critically, creatively and independently (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2)
operationalized: rubric item Critical Thinking

SLO 2: •Critically evaluate their own work and that of others (G: 1, 2, 4) (M: 1)
Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correct (operationalized: rubric item Writing Competency)

SLO 3: •Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles (G: 3, 4) (M: 5)
Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity (operationalized: rubric item Logic/reasoning)

SLO 4: •Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate (G: 3, 4) (M: 3, 6)
Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve (operationalized: rubric items: Audience Awareness + Content)

SLO 5: Apply appropriate tools and technologies (G: 4) (M: 6)
Apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work (operationalized: rubric item Content + Logic/reasoning)

SLO 6: Understand concepts and apply theories (G: 4) (M: 1, 4)
Understand concepts and apply theories in the use of and presentation of images and information (operationalized: rubric item Writing Competency + Research Competency)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Writing Competency (O: 1, 2, 6)
Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity (paragraph construction, coherent flow and transitions), appropriate style, grammatical correctness, accurate spelling and proper punctuation
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: •Think critically, creatively and independently
75% of the students in the senior capstone course will score 80 or higher on the Report Writing rubric.

Target for O2: •Critically evaluate their own work and that of others
Average score will be a minimum of 16 out of 20 points on the rubric item (80%)

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Jour 3010: Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 16.7 or 83.3% Jour 4040: 16.2 or 81% Jour 4800: 16.2 or
81% combined Jour 4040 and Jour 4800: 16.2 or 81% combined Jour 3010, 4040 and 4800: 81.8

**Target for O6: Understand concepts and apply theories**

Average score will be a minimum of 32 out of 40 points (80%) on the combined rubric items of Writing Competency and Research Competency

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Combined Writing Competency + Research Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jour 3010</td>
<td>16.2 + 16.7 = 32.9 or 81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4040</td>
<td>16.2 + 16.9 = 33.1 or 82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4800</td>
<td>16.2 + 15.7 = 31.9 or 79.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 2: **Critical Thinking (O: 1)**

assessments and judgment used to select credible sources that provide evidence; demonstration of ability to discern facts from assertions, opinions, and/or unwarranted claims; use of recognized standards to develop own reasoning and arguments; present a synthesis of information from diverse sources

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

**Target for O1: •Think critically, creatively and independently**

Average score will be a minimum of 16 out of 20 points on the rubric item (80%)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Combined Writing Competency + Research Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jour 3010</td>
<td>16.6 or 83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4040</td>
<td>16 or 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4800</td>
<td>15.3 or 76.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 3: **Audience Awareness (O: 4)**

understanding of the academic nature of the report and use of appropriate format and syntax

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

**Target for O4: •Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate**

average score of 8 out of 10 or 80%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Combined Writing Competency + Research Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jour 3010</td>
<td>9 out of 10 or 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4040</td>
<td>8.8 out of 10 or 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4800</td>
<td>8.6 out of 10 or 86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 4: **Research Competency (O: 6)**

survey of credible sources to provide historical context and to include diverse viewpoints not only from those supportive of the author's arguments

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

**Target for O6: Understand concepts and apply theories**

average score of 16 out of 20 points or 80%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Combined Writing Competency + Research Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jour 3010</td>
<td>15.4 out of 20 or 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4040</td>
<td>16.1 or 80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4800</td>
<td>16.6 or 83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 5: **Logic/reasoning (O: 3)**

factual information and opinions presented in a logically consistent manner

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

**Target for O3: •Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles**

average score of 8 out of 10 or 80%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Combined Writing Competency + Research Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jour 3010</td>
<td>7.3 out of 10 or 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4040</td>
<td>8.8 or 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4800</td>
<td>8.6 or 86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 6: **Content (O: 4, 5)**

report contains facts and opinions that meet the requirements of the assignment

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

**Target for O4: •Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate**

average score of 16 out of 20 points or 80%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Combined Writing Competency + Research Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jour 3010</td>
<td>14.2 out of 20 or 71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4040</td>
<td>17.1 or 85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour 4800</td>
<td>16.1 or 80.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O5: Apply appropriate tools and technologies**

average combined score of Content + Logic/reasoning of 32 out of 40 or 80%

---

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

Jour 3010: Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 14.2 + 7.3 = 21.5 or 71.7% Jour 4040: 17.1 + 8.1 = 25.2 or 84% Jour 4800: 16.1 + 7.9 = 24 or 80% combined Jour 4040 and Jour 4800: 16.6 + 8 = 24.6 or 82% combined Jour 3010, 4040 and 4800: 78.6%

---

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

#### content for Jour 3010

The average score for the content of Jour 3010 was 71.1%, below the target score of 80%. This low score can be partially explained by the low score for the learning outcome of research competency because not enough sources with varied perspectives were found or used by the students in their stories. A meeting with the Jour 3010 instructors will help strategize how to improve the quality of the story content, including earlier interventions by the instructors before the final stories are written. One reason why the score is so low is that the stories were not randomly chosen for the assessment process. The instructor provided several in each of the categories of "superior," "average" and "below average," and clearly the submissions in the latter two categories resulted in such poor content quality to drive down the overall learning outcome average. More on this in the analysis section.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Content | **Outcome/Objective:** Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate
- **Implementation Description:** Meeting with Jour 3010 instructors
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador and Jour 3010 instructors
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Critical Thinking

The average score for Jour 4800 was below the target of 16 out 20 points or 80% on the rubric item: 15.3 or 76.5%. The average score for Jour 4040 met the minimum of 80%, and so the combined average score for the two senior capstone courses in Journalism was below the target of 80%; 15.7 or 78.5%. There can be several explanations for the underperformance to be detailed in the analysis section. A few items to consider for next year to improve the critical thinking component: - improved instruction on finding, evaluating and interpreting credible sources of information; - a detailed rubric for critical thinking to help determine if there is one or more specific components of the critical thinking process that is lacking so better instruction can be targeted to help students improve; - a random selection of students’ reports to have better representation of Jour 4800 student performance; - an assessment of the students’ annotated bibliography to determine at an earlier stage in the course if their critical thinking skills need to be improved prior to the start of the final research report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Critical Thinking | **Outcome/Objective:** Think critically, creatively and independently
- **Implementation Description:** Meeting with Jour 4800 instructors
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador and Jour 4800 instructors
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### logic/reasoning for Jour 3010

The average score for logic/reasoning was 73%, below the target of 80%. This score was low because most of the stories written by the students did not have a logical structure and poorly transitions within the stories. The CTW Ambassador will meet with the instructors of Jour 3010 to determine if more emphasis should be given to improving the outline of stories before they are written to allow greater input from the instructors before the first draft of the story is submitted.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Logic/reasoning | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles
- **Implementation Description:** Meeting with Jour 3010 instructors
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador and Jour 3010 instructors
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### logical content for Jour 3010

The average combined score of Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 71.7% for content and logic/reasoning was below the target of 80%. This demonstrates that the stories were not well constructed and should have had more diverse sources included in the stories. A meeting with the Jour 3010 instructors will help strategize how to improve the students’ writing to emphasize more perspectives and better transitions among the different viewpoints that should be included in their stories before writing the final draft.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
The average score for Jour 4800 Research Competency measure of the learning outcome of "Understanding Concepts and Applying theory" was below the target of 80% at 77%. There may be several explanations for the underperformance to be detailed in the analysis section. The CTW Ambassador will consult with the instructor and any other faculty assigned to Jour 4800 to strategize about how to improve the research competency of the students. Some suggestions may include: - more rigorous instruction in searching for more and varied sources to be included in the research report; - different measure for Research Competency; - random sampling of students’ final research paper; - a random sampling of students’ annotated bibliography submitted earlier in the semester to assess earlier research efforts.

The average score for research competency for Jour 3010 was 77%, below the target of 80%. The CTW Ambassador will meet with the instructors of 3010 to determine if greater emphasis should be given in the instruction of 3010 assignments that require the students to obtain more sources with a variety of perspectives.

The instructor for Jour 4040 provided nine final research reports, which were identified by the instructor as "superior," "average," and "below average." Nearly all of the submissions for assessments were devoid of instructor marks, and those that had markings were primarily the first few pages consisting of corrections of spelling, citation error and writing style. This adheres to the guidelines for assessing Journalism curricula in that assessors should not be instructors of the assessed course material that should not be marked to influence the assessor. The CTW designation of Jour 4800 significantly changed the course content because no lengthy research report had been previously required in the course. Using Jour 4040 as the model, Jour 4800 now helps fill the void of all journalism majors to understand the elements of critical thinking skills to complete a major research project. The instructor of the course found the incremental writing assignments required before the submission of the 20-25-page report to be helpful to the majority of the students who had never had such a lengthy assignment mandated in their academic careers. The junior-level CTW course, Jour 3010 (originally Jour 3030 but has subsequently had a title and number change), is a practical journalism writing class in which students write more stories requiring original reporting and research. No CTW assessment was made in the course last year so this year is the first time the stories are being examined for elements of critical thinking and for meeting the major's curricular goals and outcomes. Changes in the selection of stories for assessment should be considered as well as greater emphasis on instructor input prior to the students' final draft will be considered for next year.

There are two capstone CTW courses in Journalism: Jour 4040 and Jour 4800. The CTW Ambassador met individually with the Jour 4040 instructor to explain the protocol of submitting the final research papers, and the protocol was followed nearly perfectly. The training was a success. The CTW Ambassador met individually with the Jour 4800
instructor to explain the Jour 4040 model of several submissions prior to the final research report being due and the protocol for the assessment of the course. Prior to the spring semester both the Ambassador and Fall Semester Jour 4800 instructor met with an instructor assigned to a spring semester Jour 4800 section and began training, but it was ended when that section of Jour 4800 was cancelled. The Jour 4800 instructor followed the protocol to submit "clean" research reports. The training was a success. The CTW Ambassador met with both Jour 3010 instructors prior to the semester they taught the course to explain the CTW requirements and how stories should be submitted for assessment. Because all of the CTW requirements were a part of the course and the instructors of Jour 3010 had previously taught Jour 3030 numerous times, little change in course content was necessary. The training sessions were a success but based on the assessment results, further meetings with the Jour 3010 instructors will take place prior to the fall semester to devise a strategy to improve the research competency and logical writing of the students.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

The faculty teaching CTW courses decided that only the final research papers would be required to adequately assess the CTW elements for Jour 4040 and Jour 4800. There are other assignments in the course that require the students to submit portions of the final research paper to allow feedback from the instructor about the sources and writing style, but these were not considered for the CTW assessment process. Perhaps an earlier assignment, e.g., annotated bibliography, before the final research paper would be helpful to assess the learning outcomes, critical thinking and research competency. The assignments for Jour 4800 were modeled after those in Jour 4040. No changes were anticipated for next year. Only final assignments of Jour 3010 were submitted for assessment in the same performance categories ("superior," "average," and "below average") that the instructors of the senior capstone courses provided. This submission selection should be changed but not necessarily the assignments within the course to determine if the assessment results can be explained by the non-random selection process rather than the kind of assignment required in the course.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Jour 4040 was taught before the CTW initiative began as the most rigorous research-oriented course in the curriculum. It was the model for the other senior-capstone CTW course in the major Jour 4800. The assessment of the Jour 4040 course confirms that it is meeting or exceeding the minimum target score. For Jour 4800 the average scores for a few rubric items, the associated learning outcomes and CTW goals did not meet the targets. There could be a number of explanations for these results: the assessment measures may not be the best for the learning outcomes and goals; the sample of students may not be representative of the CTW student population (in fact, the sample was not random but segregated by a sample of reports judged to be "superior," "average," and "below average" reports; the learning outcomes may not be aligned with the CTW goals; the target for minimum average score of 80% may be too high; the definition of critical thinking may not be developed well; Action plans should be implemented to examine changes in the assessment measures and other factors that may improve the results for Jour 4800. For Jour 3010 the average critical thinking score exceeded the target, but the research competency, logic/reasoning and the content of the stories assessed were below the target score. In addition to the items listed above that may explain the low averages for Jour 3010, the action plans call for meeting with the course instructors to devise a strategy to improve the students' performance in finding diverse sources and then writing their stories better to allow for logical story construction to include various viewpoints. The lowest scored stories indicated a lack of effort on the part of the students to seek out contrasting sources. The impact of the CTW initiative on the Journalism curriculum has been substantial.

Although those curricular changes have been approved by the curriculum committee, the impact of the CTW initiative on the Journalism curriculum has not been an easy process. The CTW courses have been added to the Journalism curriculum because of the increased emphasis on critical thinking as part of the professional practice of journalism. Critical thinking is needed to be thorough and logical when conducting research, writing stories, and preparing reports. Journalists need to be thorough and logical in their research and writing to produce credible stories. Critical thinking is necessary to understand the impact of the news on the community and society.

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 there were no pilot assessments of the CTW courses in Journalism the previous year, this is the first data collection and analysis of CTW findings from Journalism majors. This year is being considered a pilot test for the assessment processes. The original assessment plan called for a random sample of five student submissions for each CTW course, but that was changed to nine from each course with the instructor providing several determined to be "superior," "average," and "below average." Because the AEJMC assessment standards do not allow for the instructors of a course to assess the same course, the CTW Ambassador assessed eighteen 20 – 25 page research reports for Jour 4040 and Jour 4800. A like number of stories were submitted by the Jour 4040 instructors, but the stories were much shorter, typical of stories for newspaper articles. The faculty provided the reports in a timely manner and, also in accordance with AEJMC standards, did not have instructor marks on them for the most part. Because of the results of this year's assessment, several changes will be discussed with the Journalism faculty to determine if next year's assessment processes should be changed. There are several questions to be addressed. Is missing the target average score of 80% for Jour 4040 and Jour 3010 (Jour 4040 met only the minimum target) a result of the non-random sample? Are the depressed critical thinking assessment scores in Jour 4800 due to a poor definition of critical thinking for the major? Should the assessment of critical thinking be changed to provide more detail about specific elements of critical thinking to determine if a part of the process is being taught inadequately? Should changes be made to improve the instruction of critical thinking elements before the other changes are implemented and the results of those changes known? Are the learning outcomes that AEJMC has set for a Journalism curriculum provide an appropriate framework for assessing the CTW courses? If not, then does a different set of learning outcomes have to be devised just for CTW assessment? Is there enough emphasis in Jour 3010 on researching to find diverse viewpoints and to include them in a logical way within the story's structure? Should earlier submissions be assessed besides the final reports and stories in the CTW 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.

Adding the CTW courses to the Journalism curriculum has been a difficult transition because wholesale changes to the curriculum were proposed that include elements other than CTW courses. Although those curricular changes have been approved by the
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### Mission / Purpose

"Critical thinking is a reflective process of acquisition, analysis, and evaluation of information and ideas that leads to the development and active implementation of reasonable and defensible solutions to problems, issues, and situations."

### Goals

**G 1: Gather, organize, classify, analyze and evaluate**  
Students should be able to gather, organize, classify, and analyze pertinent information, materials, and data and then evaluate assumptions, evidence, ideas, and information.

**G 3: integrate information, develop conclusions**  
Students should be able to consider and/or integrate new and disparate ideas, information, methods, systems, and beliefs and develop rational, reasonable, and informed conclusions.

**G 6: Present conclusions, apply to new problems**  
Students should be able to present a clear expression of derived conclusions, judgments, and solutions and apply understanding and knowledge to new and different problems and situations.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Exercise physiology journal summaries (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 3)**  
Students will examine five original research papers in exercise physiology in scholarly journals and write a concise summary of the important aspects of each paper. The purpose of this assignment is to examine original research papers in exercise physiology in scholarly journals and to write a concise summary of the important aspects of each paper. There are a total of five (5) papers to be reviewed, one in each of the following general areas of exercise physiology: Exercise Metabolism, Neuromuscular, Cardiovascular, and Pulmonary. The journal articles will be provided to you in pdf format on uLearn. The article summaries will be due at various times throughout the semester – please see the course schedule. The assignment for each topic area consists of two parts: 1) Citation - consists of each journal article citation in APA (American Psychological Association) format (see example below), 2) Journal article summary - a concise description of the major findings and important aspects of each study. Please turn in a single, typed page with the citation and summary - see example below. Each Journal Article Summary is worth a possible maximum of 10 points, 2 points for the Citation and 8 points for the Journal Article Summary: Citation – the article must be cited correctly in the specified format (APA 5th Ed.) Journal Article Summary – should be a concise summary of the major findings and important aspects of the study. It should be approximately 1-3 paragraphs in length, and should include the purpose of the study, important details of the study design and methods, and a summary of the results, conclusions, and practical application(s) or significance of the study. Writing the Citation A. Citation The citation must be written in American Psychological Association (APA) format – 5th Edition. Example: Birkeland, K. I.,
Students will learn and apply the concepts of measuring heart rate and blood pressure at rest and during exercise. Measuring Heart Rate and Blood Pressure KH 3650 Purpose: To learn and apply the concepts of measuring heart rate and blood pressure at rest and during exercise procedures. • Palpation • Sphygmomanometer • Auscultation • Systolic Blood Pressure • Heart Rate Monitor (HRM) • Diastolic Blood Pressure • Heart Rate Overview Students will locate pulse sites by feel (palpation) and will determine heart rate at rest and during light intensity exercise and will compare their results to a wireless heart rate monitor (HRM). Students will learn the proper placement and operation of the Sphygmomanometer, and will determine systolic and diastolic blood pressure at rest and during light intensity exercise. Specific Procedures: 1. Resting Heart Rate (RHR) a. Have your subject sit quietly for several minutes. Locate three pulse sites - radial, brachial, and carotid b. Measure resting heart rate by palpation counting the number of heart beats in 60 seconds. Record resting heart rate in beats per minute on the data sheet. c. Measure resting heart rate using the wireless Polar Heart Rate Monitor (HRM). d. Chest strap should be secure, but not restrictively tight e. Place the stethoscope head over the brachial artery and record heart rate directly from the watch screen. 2. Resting Blood Pressure (RBP) a. Placement of blood pressure cuff (Sphygmomanometer) • By palpation, locate the point of the brachial pulse • Select the correct size cuff based upon the arm size: small, medium, large • Wrap the cuff around the upper arm with the bottom edge of the blood pressure cuff. The cuff should remain on the arm throughout the procedure. b. Systolic blood pressure by palpation (without using stethoscope) • Palpate the brachial pulse • Inflate the cuff to approximately 200 mmHg • Slowly release cuff pressure • As cuff pressure declines, feel for the resumption of the brachial pulse while watching the pressure gauge on the sphygmomanometer • The pressure at which the brachial pulse resumes is a good approximation of the Systolic Blood Pressure (SBP) • Blood pressure by auscultation (using stethoscope) • Place the head of the stethoscope directly over the point of the brachial pulse. Do not put under the edge of the blood pressure cuff. • Inflate the cuff to approximately 200 mmHg • Slowly release cuff pressure • As cuff pressure declines, listen for the blood pressure sound • The first sound (loud, regular "thumping") is the Systolic Blood Pressure (SBP) • The point at which the loud thumping either becomes very muffled or disappears (no sound) is the Diastolic Blood Pressure (DBP) • Record resting SBP and DBP on the data sheet for each student. 3. Exercise Heart Rate and Blood Pressure a. Position your subject on a Monark cycle ergometer - proper seat height, handlebar position, toe strap tightness b. Have your subject pedal for a few minutes at a light to moderate exercise intensity - 60-90 rpm, 1-2 kg resistance (60 - 180 Watts) c. Measure Exercise Heart Rate • While the subject continues to pedal, lift 1 arm off of the handlebars and palpate the radial pulse • Count the number of beats in a 15 second period and convert to beats per minute (multiply by 4) • Compare to the HR obtained with the HRM. d. Measure Exercise Blood Pressure • While the subject continues to pedal, lift 1 arm off of the handlebars and place the blood pressure cuff correctly • Place the stethoscope head over the brachial artery and measure the blood pressure while the subject continues to pedal. e. Record the exercise HR and BP on the data sheet for each student discussion. f. Was there a difference between heart rates measured by palpation and by Polar heart rate monitor? If so, was the difference “significant?” g. During palpation of heart rate, what is being measured? How does the Polar heart rate monitor determine heart rate? h. What are the sources of error for determining heart rate by palpation and by heart rate monitor? Which method do you think would be the most accurate? i. What might explain the large range of resting heart rates obtained for the members of the class? The mean difference in heart rate measurements was 3 beats per minute (bpm), which does not appear to be a large difference. With a mean HR of 79.2, a difference of 3 bpm is less than a 4% difference, which would not seem to
be significant. During palpation, the pulse is felt in an artery that is close to the surface of the skin. Each time the heart beats a wave of blood flow (i.e. the pulse) progresses away from the heart and is detected during palpation. The Polar heart rate monitor detects the electrical activity of the heart (via the chest strap) and transmits this to the wrist watch which then displays a heart rate. With heart rate by palpation, most sources of error probably involve technician error. When counting for 60 seconds during palpation there is the chance that the technician may not feel the pulse correctly, miscount, or, more likely, have to miss a fraction of the heart rate at the very beginning or end of counting. With the Polar HRM, most sources of error would probably be related to the equipment. The chest strap may not pick up the electrical signal very well, the transmitter may not be working correctly, or the watch may not be receiving the signal correctly. In addition, some other equipment with electrical motors (e.g. treadmills) may interfere with the HR signal. Because it is able to constantly update to update its measurement from beat to beat, I would suspect that the Polar heart rate monitor is more accurate, if working correctly. The wide range of readings in resting heart rate obtained for the class could be because of a number of reasons. Resting heart rate can be influenced by heredity, exercise training status, current state of "restfulness," caffeine intake, etc. For example, a subject who had exercised recently or consumed a cafffeinated beverage would possibly exhibit a higher resting heart rate. Additionally, the fitness status of the students in the class is probably be different, with those that are physically active, and hence "fitter," displaying lower resting heart rates. In conclusion, it has been shown that measuring heart rate by different methods can provide similar results, but there can be minor differences. A Polar heart rate monitor could possibly be considered more accurate than a technique based on palpation because of reduced possibility of technician error.
SLO 4: Reflection papers (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 1)

Students will develop two reflection papers on school-based sexuality education. First Reflection: From class discussion, interviews, and assigned readings, reflect on the interaction among the parent, teacher, and child during the process of school-based sexuality education. Consider disparate values and needs that influence this process: discuss the influence of culture on this process; and develop rational, reasonable, and informed solutions for effective school-based sexuality education. The paper is limited to no fewer than three and no more than five pages single spaced. Second Reflection: From class discussion, interviews, and assigned readings, reflect on methods and materials you plan to integrate into your school-based sexuality education to effectively adapt information and activities for students with special needs. Present a clear expression of derived conclusions, judgments, and conclusions. The paper is limited to no fewer than three and no more than five pages single spaced. The Process of Reflection Reflection is a cognitive process that promotes self-awareness and encourages self-assessment. The cognitive process of reflecting on one's authentic knowledge, practice, and beliefs/attitudes is important to developing professionalism. Reflection allows one to think critically about one's ability to effectively join content knowledge with practice to reach diverse populations of learners. Self-reflection provides a means for practitioners to identify issues; state opinion, inferences, and predictions; and express feelings, beliefs, and attitudes. The practitioner's responsibility in self-reflection is to support personal opinion, inference, and prediction by inclusion of relevant content knowledge presented in published works. By asking the following questions prior to writing self-reflection, one will more effectively integrate the inclusion of relevant content knowledge from published works: • How has the published work either supported or changed your authentic knowledge, attitudes, and/or beliefs? Give specific examples from the published work. • What trends are apparent in the published work and how do these trends either support or negate your inferences and/or predictions? Give specific examples from the published work. • What new knowledge or new understanding of previous knowledge have you acquired from the published work that you perceive will influence your practice? Give specific examples from the published work. • Where did you disagree with the author of the published work? What is your counter argument? Give specific examples from the published work.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication
2. Collaboration
3. Critical Thinking
4. Contemporary Issues

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

Standard Associations
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 5: Fitness facility evaluation (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 2)

Students will visit one commercial, community, corporate, or clinical fitness facility and evaluate the facility against national standards. You are to visit one type of fitness/wellness facility. For example, it can be corporate, community or other type of facility. Expect to stay at the facility for about 2-3 hours in order to complete your work. You will write a paper no shorter than 10 pages double spaced, 12 font size on the facility. Your evaluation of the facility must include the following: 1. Flow of the front desk staff 2. Courtesy and helpfulness of the front desk staff 3. Health History, consent forms, medical clearance forms performed 4. Fitness evaluations – are they a part of the procedures? 5. Strength Training Consultations – are they a part of the procedures? 6. Billing of membership fees – what are the options, what are the prices, are the prices in range with other nearby facilities? What do you pay extra for, what is included in the membership? 7. Exercise Staff – qualifications, knowledge 8. Group Exercise Instructors – qualifications, knowledge 9. Nursery provided? Fees 10. Children's area provided? Fees 11. Locker rooms – are they accessible? Are they clean and neat? Are they centrally located? 12. Restrooms – are they handicap accessible? Are they clean and neat? Are they centrally located 13. Where do children change clothes? Are they allowed in certain areas of the facility? 14. Is the facility itself handicap accessible? If not, why? 15. Does the exercise staff supervise the exercise floor? 16. Is the exercise staff helpful? 17. Is the exercise equipment appropriate for the age and number of members? Is it handicap accessible? 18. Is the exercise floor too crowded with equipment? Is there not enough equipment? 19. Are there elevators in the facility? 20. Would you join the facility? Would you want to work here? Options on types of facilities (see attached list): 1. Corporate (Corporate Sports, Coca Cola, etc.) 2. Hospital Based (DeKalb Medical, Gwinnett Medical) 3. Community (YMCA, Gold’s, etc.) 4. Government (CDC, US Public Health) You MUST attach brochures, flyers, this page and the evaluation form to your paper. Failure to do so will result in an automatic 30 point deduction. Due: July 21st, 2008, FITNESS PROGRAM MANAGEMENT EXERCISE FACILITY/PROGRAM EVALUATION Name of Club/Facility Evaluated: Date of Evaluation: Club/Facility/Program Location: General Manager: Phone: INFORMATION COMMENTS Length of Operation (Club Age) Number of Members Club Size (square feet) Club capacity (members) Space sufficient Design/layout Membership Fee Hours of Operation Monday - Friday Saturday Sunday Qualifications of Staff/Exercise Instructors - certifications, etc. Cardiovascular Exercise Equipment (Types and Name Brands) Aerobic Exercise Classes Offered Strength Training Equipment (Types and Name Brands)

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1. Written Communication
4. Critical Thinking
5. Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.1 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.2 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.3.1 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.3.2 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Standard Associations
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Structured Academic Controversy (O: 3, 4)

Total # of students in course = 15

Performance on the Academic Controversy assignment:
Class mean = 91%; range was 83-98%
15 students made 83% or better
9 students made 90% or better

Reflection paper #1 assignment:
Class mean = 88%; range was 64-97%
12 students made 83% or better
7 students made 90% or better

Each student selected a class peer to read his/her draft reflection paper. Peer comments were shared with the student. Changes to the draft were made before grading.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O3: Structured academic controversy

Achievement target was set at a minimum of 73%

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All 15 students made the achievement target on the structured academic controversy project. 15 of 15 students made the achievement target for the reflection papers.

Target for O4: Reflection papers

Achievement Target was set at 83%

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
15 of 15 students made the achievement target for the reflection papers.

M 2: Fitness Facility Evaluation (O: 5)

Out of 56 students, 4 received zeros because they did not turn the required draft. For the final grade, one student received a 70 (he was also one of the ones who did not turn in a draft). The grade was based on grammatical errors and poor sentence structure. One student did not turn in the final version. So, out of 56 students, 11% (6) scored below 83% on the draft and 3.5% (2) scored below 83% on the final version

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O5: Fitness facility evaluation

Achievement target was set at 73%

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Out of a total of 56 students 6 (11%) scored below the target of 73% on the draft and 2 (3.5%) scored below 73% on the final version.

M 3: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments (O: 1, 2)

CTW Report 2009-2010 Fall 2009 Journal Article 01 Journal Article 02 Journal Article 03 Lab Report 67 10 20 20 10 Mean Score 9.3 19.2 19.6 9.0 Percentage Score 93.0% 96.2% 98.0% 90.4%
Number of students ≥ 83% 55 64 63 57 Percentage of students ≥ 83% 82.1% 95.5% 94.0% 85.1%
Spring 2010 Journal Article 01 Journal Article 02 Journal Article 03 Lab Report 61 10 20 20 10 Mean Score 8.0 17.6 18.5 8.9 Percentage Score 79.6% 87.8% 92.7% 89.1%
Number of students ≥ 83% 38 45 52 46 Percentage of students ≥ 83% 83.2% 73.8% 85.2% 75.4%
2009-2010 Total Journal Article 01 Journal Article 02 Journal Article 03 Lab Report 128 10 20 20 10 Mean Score 8.7 18.5 19.1 9.0 Percentage Score 86.6% 92.3% 95.6% 89.8%
Number of students ≥ 83% 93 109 115 103 Percentage of students ≥ 83% 72.7% 85.2% 89.8% 80.5%

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

Target for O1: Exercise physiology journal summaries

Achievement target was set at 73%

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
For the academic year out of a total of 128 students, all achieved the target for the journal assignments.

Target for O2: Measurement of heart rate and blood pressure

Achievement target was set at 83%

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
100% of students scored at the target of 83% or better.

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

Raise assessment target

Based on student performance, it appears as if the assessment target is too low. Target will be raised to 83% for the next review cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Fitness Facility Evaluation  
Outcome/Objective: Fitness facility evaluation

Implementation Description: Raise target.  
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
Additional Resources: None.  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

raise target
It appears that the current target measure is too low. Target will be raised to 83%.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Structured Academic Controversy | Outcome/Objective: Structured academic controversy
  Implementation Description: Raise target measure.  
  Projected Completion Date: 07/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
  Additional Resources: None  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
Based on student performance it appears as if the assessment target was set too low. Target will be raised to 83% for the next review cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Exercise physiology journal summaries
  Implementation Description: Raise target.  
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
  Additional Resources: none  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
Based on student performance it appears that the assessment target was set too low. The target for the next review cycle will be set at 83%

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Exercise physiology journal summaries
  Implementation Description: Raise target.  
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
  Additional Resources: none  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
Based on student performance it appears that the target measure was set too low. Target will be raised to 83%.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Fitness Facility Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Fitness facility evaluation
  Implementation Description: Raise target measure.  
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
  Additional Resources: None  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
Based on student performance it appears that the target measure was set too low. Target will be raised to 83%.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Fitness Facility Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Fitness facility evaluation
  Implementation Description: Raise target measure.  
  Projected Completion Date: 07/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
  Additional Resources: none  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
It appears as if the assessment target was set too low. New target of 83% will be set for the next academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Structured Academic Controversy | Outcome/Objective: Reflection papers
  Implementation Description: Raise assessment target.  
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010  
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.  
  Additional Resources: None  
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Raise target
It appears that the assessment target was set too low. Target will be raised to 84%

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Measurement of heart rate and blood pressure

Implementation Description: Raise target.
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.
- Additional Resources: none
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target measure
Based on student performance, the current target of 73% appears to be low. The target for next year will be 83%.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Structured Academic Controversy | Outcome/Objective: Structured academic controversy

Implementation Description: Discussion will occur that the department faculty retreat concerning raising the target measure.
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Student compliance
The students who scored below the target simply did not turn in the assignment. While this is rare, it does happen. No further action is needed.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Fitness Facility Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Fitness facility evaluation

Implementation Description: N/A
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Course instructor
- Additional Resources: none

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The department definition of critical thinking has evolved more towards and "outcomes" rather than process. More emphasis is placed on analysis, interpretation, and extrapolation of data.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
Major CTW accomplishments were that the vast majority of students were meeting the assessment targets. This has prompted a discussion about raising the assessment targets for next year. The department is using a wide variety of critical thinking projects and assignments which reflects the diversity of the students as well as the two undergraduate degree programs themselves. It is anticipated that this will continue.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
The workshops that I attended clarified the relationships between goals, objectives, measures and findings. The workshops also helped clarify how performance on national examinations can be used to help the CTW process.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
The CTW projects and assignments did not change significantly from last year to this year, however it was clear that the assessment target was set too low and will be changed for the next review cycle. The variety of assignments reflects the differences between the undergraduate degree programs (teacher-certification versus non-teacher certification). While no major changes to assignments is anticipated, we do intend to change the assessment targets.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
No major changes have been made to CTW implementation. Given the increasing student enrollments the use of CTW funded GRA's has been very beneficial.
**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 one degree program, results from national testing will be used to help determine the effectiveness of CTW assignments specifically, and program effectiveness in general for the coming review cycle.

**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 the B.S. in Exercise Science, some students are being required to take a national certification exam. It is anticipated that the results this testing will be used to assess program effectiveness.

**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 major operational improvements were made, the CTW data gathering process was improved.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The major finding from this year is that the assessment targets are set too low. They will be raised for the next review cycle.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

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

Major strategy for next year will be raising the achievement targets.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Marketing Department, with respect to the undergraduate major, is to produce students who can analyze business situations, define problems accurately based on their analysis; evaluate the options, and make sound recommendations regarding the best decision for their organization. This will be accomplished through the use of pedagogies designed to give students hands-on experience with marketing decision-making that goes beyond a simple descriptive knowledge of marketing to build skills that will permit the student to apply their knowledge of marketing and related business concepts.

**Goals**

**G 1: Making logical, coherent recommendations**

Students need to be able to define a specific recommendation and logically defend it based on the qualitative and quantitative analysis they have conducted.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Situation Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to conduct a situation analysis which identifies facts related to the industry, company and trends.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience
**SLO 2: Problem definition (M: 2)**

Students will identify the central marketing problem in a case study accurately and define the problem clearly and concisely in writing.

Relevant Associations: xxx

**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

**Standard Associations**

- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Alternative Evaluation (M: 3)**

Students will first identify and relevant alternatives and then comprehensively examine the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative using both quantitative and qualitative arguments. The quantitative analysis is a basic skill required to comprehensively evaluate the various alternatives.

Relevant Associations: XXX

**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

**Standard Associations**

- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**O/O 4: Recommended Action (M: 4)**

Students must select a course of action from among the relevant alternatives that they have identified and evaluated and defend their choice. They must be able to explain their recommendation both orally and in writing. They must also be able to argue for their position and explain why they consider their recommendation to be the best course of action. They should be knowledgeable of all the relevant alternatives and be able to argue for their recommendation by identifying weaknesses and strengths of other options. They must be able to effectively incorporate quantitative arguments into their recommendation.

Relevant Associations: XXX

**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

**Standard Associations**

- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Rubric for Situation Analysis (O: 1)**

The rubric for the situation analysis breaks the situation down into three dimensions: Industry, Company and Trends.

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

**Target for O1: Situation Analysis**

The average student score as measured by the rubric for problem definition will be 75% or greater out of 100%.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The average score on the situation analysis was 80%.

M 2: Problem Definition Scores from Rubric (O: 2)
The rubric for the problem definition assesses the student's understanding of the problem in the case and their ability to completely and accurately define it.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O2: Problem definition
The average student score as measured by the rubric for problem definition will be 75% or greater out of 100%.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The average score across all sections for problem definition was 82% out of a possible score of 100% thus exceeding the target of 75%.

M 3: Alternative Identification and Evaluation (O: 3)
The rubric that measures students' knowledge of the alternatives in the case evaluates their understanding of the options available and their understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O3: Alternative Evaluation
The average score on the rubric items related to alternative identification and evaluation shall be 75% or greater out of a total of 100%.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The average student score across the sections was 82% out of 100% on alternative identification and evaluation. The target was met.

M 4: Recommendation (O: 4)
The rubric that assesses the students' recommendation requires that the students select one of the alternatives and then produce a coherent and compelling set of arguments that support their recommended solution to the case problem.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O4: Recommended Action
The target mean for all students on the recommendation measure is 75% out of 100%.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The average on the recommendation related rubric items for all students was 77% out of 100%, thus the 75% target was exceeded.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition of critical thinking has changed significantly in the undergraduate marketing degree in the last two years in that there is a greater emphasis on quantitative analysis and the ability of students to write about their quantitative analysis.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The major CTW accomplishments for this year have been to utilize rubrics to assess different components of critical thinking. This is a direct result of the action plan created last year. Going forward there will be a stronger effort to coordinate among all instructors so that a common set of rubrics is used rather than different instructors using different rubrics.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
Two instructors teach this course. One of them has resisted falling into step regarding CTW complaining that they had no communication regarding the program. However, when they were invited to meeting to permit them to learn more about the CTW program they failed to attend. It has been a very frustrating experience for the ambassador trying to encourage my colleague to participate. This could change in the future. Since there are only two people in the department teaching the course, the meetings were not formal and were, in fact, very informal. Perhaps the informality created a mistaken impression that this was all voluntary.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?
The number of low stakes CTW assignments has been decreased from 5 last year to 3 in AY 2009-2010. The reason is that the percentage that each small assignment was weighted was too small as indicated by the large number of students who failed to submit one or more of those assignments. It is clear that 2% per low stakes writing assignment is too small. The proportion of papers completed grew dramatically when the percentage was raised to 5% per assignment. The other major change is the use of a standard set of rubrics for the sections of the course that I taught. These rubrics permit quantitative analysis of the student's performance on the different components of critical thinking in case analysis: situation analysis, problem definition, alternative
CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

We have started offering a brand new course "Marketing Metrics" which was added based on the experiences in the capstone course. The objective for the new course is to better prepare students for the capstone by exposing them to the quantitative aspects of marketing decision-making. It is still too early to determine what the impact on the students will be but the addition of the new course to the marketing curriculum should better prepare students for the quantitative analysis that is required in the capstone course and it should also serve to better prepare them for working in business. It is still too early to ascertain the impact since the metrics course was only added in the fall and only a very small number of students that had the metrics course have taken the capstone. The students who had declared their major prior to Fall 2009 were grandfathered and most elected to not take the marketing metrics 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 formed a committee to examine the undergraduate curriculum. That committee is looking at a number of things including conducting interviews with our majors, surveying employers, examining curriculae at other schools, etc. The focus is on the required courses in the major and changes to those courses, however, a number of other outcomes are anticipated including a better advising system with regards to courses to take if one wishes to pursue specific careers in marketing such as advertising or marketing research. These tracks have already been roughed out and new elective courses will likely result. The undergraduate marketing curriculum is likely to undergo considerable revision as a consequence of the work begun by the ad hoc committee. These changes will be accelerated by the addition of new faculty who will join us in the fall and who have unique skills that we currently do not have. Gradually people are starting to get the understanding that more of what we do in the classroom needs to be amenable to measurement. Documenting effectiveness is slowly coming to be understood by most faculty as the wave of the future. People are beginning to discuss teaching portfolios and other things related to 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.

This has been addressed above.

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?

I am not sure what this is asking.

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 implications are clear: more courses need to be assessed than just the capstone. Colleagues are beginning to understand that this will be something that will have some impact on them. The wheels of change turn slowly. Like so many initiatives people assumed this would simply run out of steam and go away if they just ignored it. I think there has been a widespread realization that this will impact almost everyone in some way. That is actually a big deal.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will work hard to revise the content of the various required courses in the major and update out curriculum. I expect a great deal of resistance from colleagues who will not want to change what they do and will begin talking about how their academic freedom is being abridged. Ultimately some changes will result but some people will have to be forced to make a change. I believe that the improvement will be significant in terms of our curriculum. I believe that the building a culture of assessment will be a long, slow process and that the only way it will be fully realized is when some senior faculty retire and no longer can impede the progress.

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Implemented rubrics and began to collect objective data.

Challenges for Next Year
Changing the curriculum will result in push-back from faculty that own certain courses. They will not want to change what they do without a fight.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
None at this time.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
The rubrics can always be tweaked and improved. I am not sure about the ones that I created despite investing a great deal of time and energy learning about rubrics. I would be willing to change the ones I am using if I could find something better.
University-wide Committee Participation
I serve on the Undergraduate Assessment Committee and I am a CTW Ambassador.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking in math usually means (1) analyzing and evaluating mathematical arguments, (2) formulating and presenting a proof or a counterexample in support of conclusions, and, (3) deriving an abstract claim from examples and solving a problem by applying known results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 1: Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to analyze and evaluate mathematical arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2: Deductive reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to formulate and present a proof or a counterexample in support of conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3: Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to derive an abstract claim from examples and solve a problem by applying known results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/O 1: Giving proofs (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A proof is a complete explanation of why a claim is true. Most assignments in Math 3000 ask students to prove or disprove (i.e., give a counterexample) a mathematical claim. For example, Prove that the sum of any two odd integers is divisible by 2 but not divisible by 4. To prove this claim, students need to use a direct proof together with a proof by contradiction. In math 4991 students need to give proofs to more complicated claims (e.g. Intermediate Value Theorem in Calculus). They also need to present proofs by Latex, a high-quality typesetting system designed for scientific documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Solving problems by math softwares (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In math 4991, students need to solve a computation problem by using math softwares, e.g. Maple.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Reviewing papers (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In math 4991, students choose an article from an undergraduate math journal (e.g. Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology Undergraduate Mathematics Journal), write a report (20 pts) including: • Section 1 (5 pts): Introduction. Minimum 1 page. It contains a brief introduction to the problem, background, and history. You should not simply copy from the paper; you should read related textbooks, references, or online materials. • Section 2 (5 pts): Main results. Minimum 1.5 pages. It contains the main result(s) in the paper with proofs. Similarly you should present the proof in your own words, instead of copying form the paper. • Section 3 (7 pts): Remarks. Minimum 1 page. Your mathematical comments, answers to open problems, and discussion on possible generalization of the results. This section usually differentiates an excellent report from other reports. • References (3 pts) should be given at the end (but not included in the page count) and be cited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Rubric for simple assignments (O: 1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: Student fully understands the logic required to do the proof. Flow of logic is correct (or very nearly so). Correct notation is used throughout. Satisfactory: Student understands the logic required to do the proof, but has one major flaw in the argument. Marginal: Student somewhat understands what is to be done. There are several flaws or a major hole in the argument. Notational errors may or may not occur. Poor: The argument is fundamentally incorrect and/or uses incorrect notation throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O1: Giving proofs |
60% of students score at least satisfactory based on our rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Below is the distribution of total 31 students took Math 3000 in 09-10 based on the rubric. 9 Excellent, 6 good, 11 marginal, and 5 poor. So 48% of the students met out goal.

**Target for O2: Solving problems by math softwares**

At least 70% of students obtain correct or nearly correct answers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In fall, all five students solved the problem correctly. In spring, after the second attempt, only one out of 10 students could not solve the problem correctly. So our goal is met.

**M 2: Rubric for 4991 projects (O: 3)**

Excellent: students understand the background and history of the problem, give a detailed introduction, present the main result and and its proof correctly, give valuable comments, and cite related references. Satisfactory: students give a reasonable introduction and a list of references, present results and proofs correctly but can not give good comments. Marginal: give no or very brief introduction, present results with some proofs. Poor: give no or very brief introduction, can not present results and proofs.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Reviewing papers**

At least 70% score satisfactory or excellent.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In fall, out of five students, 1 excellent and 4 satisfactory. In spring, out of 10 students, 8 excellent, 1 satisfactory, and 1 marginal. So our goal is met.

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

**Improve student scores on proofs**

First I will work with the instructors of Math 3000 to learn how to improve students’ scores on proof. Second the prerequisite of 3000 is Math 2420. The technique of giving proofs is mentioned but usually not emphasized in 2420. I plan to work with the department chair and 2420 instructors to make sure that this technique is covered well in 2420.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Rubric for simple assignments
- **Outcome/Objective:** Giving proofs

**Redesign 4991 projects**

Last year some 4991 students complained about the amount of writing. This year we redesign 4991 projects so that they require less writing. We will continue working on this action plan.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

No change.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Students realize and acknowledge the importance of CTW. There are still complains about the projects in 4991 though the instructor has simplified one big project into two small projects. To help 4991 students on projects next year, an instructor may help students to find a faculty or fellow students to work on the projects together.

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Dr. Mariana Montiel and Dr. Yongwei Yao taught Math 3000 in fall and spring, resp, and I myself taught Math 4991 for two semesters. I met with each of Mariana and Yongwei twice discussing CTW requirements and their responsibilities. The meetings went well.

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

No change on Math 3000 in the past two years because all CTW assignments are simple proofs. There are some changes on Math 4991. In spring 2009, there were a project on a difficult proof and a project on paper review. In fall 2009, the project on the proof was made easier. In spring 2010, the project on the proof was removed and the project on paper review became two projects, one is to
CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Only 4991 assignments have been changed. Students see more challenges on their assignments: have to write more carefully, think deeper, and work harder. Faculty members who teach 3000 feel little change but it requires more work (e.g. more students came to office hours) to teach 4991.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
MISSION: To engage preservice teachers in assignments, activities, and field experiences that enhance critical thinking skills. To create teachers who can apply critical thinking skills to their current and future practices.
PURPOSE: The Middle Grades Education BSE program, in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, considers the development critical thinking skills to be one of the most important goals of the program. For middle grades teachers, critical thinking skills are essential in the design of and reflection on selected teaching strategies, the analysis of student work and assessment data, and the adjustment of instruction based on local socio-cultural contexts. For the purposes of our program, and in conjunction with our Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework, we define critical thinking as "(1) the ability to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development, (2) the ability to identify and critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan context, and (3) the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning."

Goals
G 1: Critical Thinking through Recursive Data Analysis
To enhance middle grades preservice teachers’ ability to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing, and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

G 3: Critical Thinking through Argument Development
To enhance middle grades preservice teachers’ ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Book Groups (G: 3) (M: 1)
In groups of 3 or 4, students will read one of the professional books outlined in the CTW syllabus. The groups will meet three or four times across the semester to discuss book ideas, make reasonable decisions about teaching and learning based upon the book, and challenge assumptions and bias across group members. Students will then synthesis their own ideas, other group member ideas, and information from the text as it relates to being a classroom teacher.

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
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 2: Research Groups and Paper (G: 3) (M: 1)
Collaborative groups will be formed to research in-depth one critical issue in education (i.e. assessment, gender and education, technology, NCLB, parent communication, tracking, etc). Each group will be responsible for conducting student-led discussions focusing on assigned readings from journal articles of their choosing (found through library databases). Group members will serve as group leaders on subtopics of interest within the larger topic being researched and will share information with the group. At the end of
each session, group members will evaluate the effectiveness of the session and make plans regarding what to include in their final presentation to the class based on their research topic. Students will be evaluated on their group research presentation and on their final research paper.

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

**Standard Associations**

4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs  
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 3: Critical Reflection (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Deep and meaningful reflective practice is essential as you enter into the field of education. Every week, students will be asked to submit a response to the following questions: What was the best moment this week? Why? What was the most difficult moment this week? How can you work to improve it? Respond to the feedback/comments/questions from your instructor or field supervisor from your reflection from last week. In addition to questions related to the weekly readings and practicum experiences, students may also use the following questions as a guide: How can you improve your relationship with students? How have your readings confirmed what you see in the field? How do your readings contradict what you see in the field? How do you make sense of this in your work? What is the purpose of classroom management? What is the purpose of education within your content area? What 3 things do you want your students to walk away with this year?

**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  
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff  
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)  
5. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: CTW Rubric (O: 1, 2, 3)

We have no assessment data to share as we have not yet offered any CTW courses (first course to be offered Fall 2010). We will use the following rubric sections to evaluate all CTW writing assignments beginning Fall 2010: Reading Comprehension (0-4 points): It is clear that all material was carefully read and processed. Depth of Response (0-4 points): Written responses indicates critical consideration of issues and concepts presented in the readings. Connections (0-4 points): When possible, the written response includes significant text-to-text and text-to-life connections. Depth of Thinking (0-4 points): Written responses include significant writings about what squared the authors thinking, what pointed them in new directions, and what questions are still circling. Content Knowledge (0-4 points): Students demonstrate full content knowledge in a deep and connected way. Organization (0-4 points): Information is in a logical, interesting sequence which the reader can follow

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

**Target for O1: Book Groups**

80% of students score 3 or better on rubric

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

We have not yet offered this course (and associated assignment). We will offer the first course in Fall 2010.

**Target for O2: Research Groups and Paper**

80% of students score 3 or better on rubric

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

We have not yet offered this course (and associated assignment). We will offer the first course in Fall 2010.
Target for O3: Critical Reflection
80% of students score 3 or better on rubric

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
We have not yet offered this course (and associated assignment). We will offer the first course in Fall 2010.

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

Assignment Outcomes
80% of students will receive a 3 or better on all CTW rubric sections.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: CTW Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Book Groups
- Implementation Description: During Fall 2010, Dr. Yarbrough and Dr. Cross will work on fleshing out rubric descriptions and determining appropriate assignment outcomes and target goals.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and Course 2 instructor)

CTW Course Plan to Implement Fall 2010
The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started in Spring 2010, will take their first CTW course this Fall 2010 and their second CTW course in Spring 2011. Because our program is new, this action plan relates to what we have done and will continue to do related to course development. Assignment Development:
During Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, our BSE MLE faculty developed course assignments for the two CTW courses. Both courses include informal writing assignments (such as journals and weekly reflections) and formal writing assignments (such as research papers and text development). Rubric Development:
During Spring 2010, we developed rubrics for specific writing assignments, in addition to an overall CTW assignment rubric included in this report. Faculty Development:
The CTW coordinator has met with the other CTW instructor (a reading/writing specialist) three times over the past two semesters to refine our program CTW definitions, write program goals, and create course assignments. We will continue to meet in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 to evaluate CTW course assignments and make adjustments for future courses. Collection/Analysis of Student Work:
During Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, the CTW instructors will work to evaluate CTW assignments based on our included rubric. With student permission, we will share assignments across instructors in order to evaluate student work and the overall effectiveness of assignments.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: CTW Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Book Groups
  Measure: Critical Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Research Groups and Paper
- Implementation Description: see above
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and CTW instructor for course 2) and Gladys Yarborough (CTW Instructor for course 1)

Additional Resources:
Because our first BSE Middle Level Education cohort will have 34 students, we will need the help of a graduate teaching assistant to grade CTW assignments.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
For the 2008-2009 academic year, our CTW definition was simply the University Senate definition. Starting the year (Fall 2009), we worked on editing the definition to better fit our Middle Grades BSE program. We utilized our own program goals, along with the newly released Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework document, to rewrite our CTW definition. All assignment goals and outcomes follow out of this definition.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
Our major accomplishments for this year include developing CTW assignments and a rubric. We will continue to flesh out the rubric (but adding more detail in particular) and modify assignments. We did not have an action plan last year, so we are not able to compare.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
Because we are a small program (with only 4 faculty!), our CTW meetings were generally very small. We met three times across the year to discuss CTW assignments and develop rubrics. The most substantial decisions related to assignment restructuring/rewriting. I believe these meetings were somewhat successful, but I plan to provide more written documentation for CTW participants in the future.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
Most changes to assignments included the addition of multiple drafts and layered feedback to critical writing assignments. Because we have not yet had the chance to implement any assignments (first CTW course to run in Fall 2010), I do not yet have feedback for my faculty.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Because there was no report submitted last year, the first part of this question is not relevant. So far, through assignment development, I believe the CTW initiative has opened up significant dialogue in our program about what constitutes "critical analysis" in written and oral work. We will continue to discuss what this "critical analysis" means for our faculty and 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?
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.
N/A

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
2009-2010 CTW Music
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of Critical Thinking in the School of Music is to provide students the skills to identify, analyze and evaluate arguments and claims about music. Because the School of Music offers curricula in a variety of areas of concentration in music, critical thinking has been approved as the desired method of learning and writing in the following areas: 1) the theoretical understanding of music, 2) music in historical and cultural contexts, 3) the use of technology in creating, performing and listening to music, 4) the individual and collective performance of music, 5) the composition and improvisation of music, 6) the conducting of music, 7) the processes of educating others about music, and 8) the development of careers in music. Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) about music involves written interpretation and evaluation of the knowledge, the performance, and the creative, technical and instructional skills associated with music.

Goals
G 1: CTW Methods in Music
The goal of CTW courses in music is to provide students with the cognitive skills to be able to use analyze critically data from the perspective of synthesis, analysis, evaluation, application, comparison, contrast, and inference and to present these findings in written form about a selected topic in music of their choice.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Proposal for Research Paper Assignment (G: 1) (M: 1)
This research paper should be based on fieldwork conducted on some aspect of music discussed in class or on the music of a culture of the student's choice, with the instructor's approval. The "Critical Thinking through Writing" component of the research paper will be graded on a rubric that will be provided to each student. The first part of this three-part assignment is to write a
proposal for a research paper, an outline for the paper, and an annotated bibliography.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 3: Central Position and Primary Objective
Evidence that the central position and primary objective can maintained throughout the research of a topic of music from a cultural or historical perspective.

SLO 3: Revised Draft of Research Paper (G: 1)
The final part of this three-part assignment is to revise the draft of the research paper. Students must make the recommended changes to the graded research proposal draft that will be returned to them. Next, students should revise the draft and amend it to reflect a development, analysis, and application of “critical thinking.” Students will present a synopsis of the findings of the revised draft paper in the form of a 7 to 10 minute power point or multi-media presentation in class. The presentation should include two audio-visual examples of music and a handout of relevant terms for other students in the class.

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

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Draft of Research Paper (G: 1)
The second part of this three-part assignment is to a draft of a 7 to 10-page research paper that includes a one-page transcription (word-for-word) or a synopsis of an interview with a person (musician, music historian, etc) knowledgeable of the music from the culture about which the paper. The transcription or synopsis of the interview should contain at least 6 interview questions pertinent to the research topic.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

O/O 4: CTW Objectives in Music
An analysis of findings from the Fall CTW World Music class of 20 students reveal that on a 0 to 12 point scale, with 12 being the highest, the average score for the entire class of twenty students was 9.15. The average score for the Special Topic Spring CTW World Music class of 3 students was 10.8. This shows an increase in the average assessment student score of 1.65 from the Fall course to the Spring I attribute this to the improvements (more detailed description) to the rubric for the draft and a better explanation of requirements of each of the three assignments. Please see the three attached tables: CTW Final Course Findings Fall09, CTW Final Course Findings Sp10, and Comparison Fall 2009 & Spring 2010.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubric for Research Paper (O: 1)
The "Critical Thinking through Writing” component of the Revised (or final) Research Paper will be graded on a rubric. The rubric is composed of eight components, each of which has been identified as significant to critical thinking for this assignment. These components are (1) Central position and primary objective, (2) Methodology, concepts, and theories of inquiry, (3) Organization of data, (4) Context of data and scholarly support, (5) Analysis of data, (6) Personal findings with scholarly support, (7) Relevance and implications in concluding thoughts, and (8) Writing style and quality of communication. Up to four (4) points can be earned in each of the eight sections. A maximum of one hundred points (100) can be earned for the revised critical thinking research paper.

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

Target for O1: Proposal for Research Paper Assignment
Target: 85 percent of students will receive an average of 9 out of a possible 12 in each of the 8 categories of CT research components on the rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
See attached rubric with information.

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

Determining the Effectiveness and Value CTW Assignments in Music
The School of Music believes that these CTW assignments will lead to improvements in the quality and depth of student critical thinking and writing. Professors for CTW courses will collect examples of research papers exhibiting effective, less effective, and ineffective critical thinking for students to view. (Of course the anonymity of student's work will always be maintained.) The action plan
for the School of Music is to determine the effectiveness and value of the assignments and rubrics in the two CTW courses currently taught. In World Music (MUS 4820), anonymous samples of student papers of each component of the three part assignment (1. the proposal, outline and annotated bibliography, 2. the draft of the research paper, and 3. final revised research paper) will be placed online through ULearn to serve as reference guides.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Plans are to review and compare student work in each component of the three part CTW project assignment. The purpose of this comparison is to determine if the objectives of each assignment were clear to the majority of students and if the student papers adequately reflected the use of critical thinking. A student survey will be administered to students concerning the value of the assignment and rubrics in music research. Students will be allowed to make suggestions for possible changes to both.
Responsible Person/Group: The departmental ambassador with the assistance of the additional faculty member who is teaching a CTW course will be responsible for gathering student responses and compiling the results.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
Because School of Music offers curricula in a variety of area concentrations, the department has found it necessary to define broadly define critical thinking in music in such a way that it is inclusive of the following approaches to music: performance and conducting, analysis, interpretation, composition, improvisation, teaching, technology, and historical and cultural study. Therefore syllabi for both CTW music courses include the following statement: "Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) about music involves written interpretation and evaluation of the knowledge, the performance, and the creative, technical and instructional skills associated with music. For the purpose of critical thinking such skills are needed to identify, analyze and evaluate arguments and claims about music."

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The major CTW accomplishments for the School of Music for the academic year was the revision of the draft rubric and final revised paper rubric. The greatest improvement was in the revision of the rubric for the draft of the research paper. Brief explanations of each component of the draft were added to the draft rubric. These included explanations of the following: Thesis Aim, Secondary objectives, Methodology statement (including critical thinking approaches such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, and etc.) Section 1: the historical overview, Section 2: presentation of data with CTW approaches: analysis, synthesis, scholarly documentation and interpretation, Section 3: the conclusion: restating the thesis and aim, summarize findings, state relevance of findings, and imply or infer related topics for future study. These were objectives of the action plan for last year. The quality of the drafts of research papers improved significantly from one semester to another, revealing a better understanding of the requirements for the assignment by students. Small revisions were also made to the rubric for the final revised paper. In addition to continuing to use the revised draft and final rubrics, I will also continue to provide written comments in the form of specific suggestions for changes on the draft of student research papers.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
I attended CTW workshops on rubrics, definitions, assignment construction, using CTW for research, and reporting on WEAVE. I found each of the workshops to be very helpful. The workshops on rubrics provided me ideas concerning the revision of the rubrics that were being used for both CTW courses at the School of Music at the time. The workshop on assignment construction provided me with models for a diverse range of CTW assignments. Though I decided to continue using the assignments previously employed in CTW music courses, I gained a wealth of information concerning options for assignments that could be used in the future. The workshop on CTW for research demonstrated how specific GSU faculty have used the CTW initiative in the area of professional development in the form of creating articles on critical thinking for publication. The final session on reporting on WEAVE online was extremely helpful. The facilitators demonstrated how ambassadors are to report on WEAVE and helped us input sections of the report during the workshop session. This type of hands-on approach eliminated personal apprehensions toward reporting on WEAVE.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?
Relate to the general requirements of the project, the three-part CTW assignment for both courses in music (World Music MUS 4820 and Music History MUS 4810) have remained the same. However, the specifics of each assignment have been revised for the purpose of clarity and better comprehension for the students. Though a comparison of the students' work in World Music from the 2008-2009 academic year to the 2009-2010 year show marked improvement in the quality of drafts and final revised papers, students expressed some concerns about feeling limited to using one format (based on specifics of the two rubrics) for writing the draft and final revised paper. I informed them that the single rubric and uniform format were necessary for consistency and objectivity in grading and assessment. Concerning changes or improvements to the assignment, I am considering developing additional rubrics that would allow students to write their draft and final revised versions of the paper in another format. However, this must first be discussed with the instructor of the other CTW course in music. Changes will only be made if the quality and integrity of the assignments are not compromised and with the input and approval of the other instructor. This will be addressed in the coming weeks and months.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
The only changes made concerning the implementation of CTW initiative since last year's assessment report have been the scheduling of an additional offering of the CTW course in World Music. This addresses the demand for the course for music majors while staying within the 25 student maximum enrollment for courses in the College of Arts and Sciences. This has been a challenging issue to resolve because of the limited number of sections (one for each of the two approved CTW courses in music) and the number of instructors (2) qualified to teach such courses. Additional offerings of the the CTW course in Music History are being strongly considered. These challenges are of particular concern since both are core courses required of all music majors and the offering of
additional sections of the course each year would result in teaching overloads. The challenge of hiring and training additional instructors for both courses are also major concerns, especially in light of budget restraints, furloughs and other cutbacks at the university as mandated by the Board of Regents at the University System of Georgia. The impact of the CTW initiative has been expressed by faculty and students alike. The instructor for the other CTW in Music History expressed that he found the rubric, including the delineated format for writing a research paper, to be extremely helpful. Students of my world music class have collectively stated the same and have personally expressed appreciation for the detailed remarks and specific suggestions for improvement that I write on the drafts of their research papers. In general, students seem to be grasping a better understanding of the differences between critical thinking research and writing a paper that is solely a synthesis of the research of published scholars.

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

No major changes in the assessment process have been made in music since last years assessment report. Efforts will made to continue to use revised rubrics for drafts and final versions of research papers as assessment tools in world music and music history. I will continue to encourage the instructor of the CTW course in music history to provide more written comments on the final revised papers in music history. This will help me complete the required CTW assessment report at end of each 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.

No significant changes have been made in the School of Music based on last year’s assessment data. Additions and proposed changes to the curriculum are discussed in CTW Reflection #5.

**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?

Operational improvements in music consist of changing the semester in which the CTW course in world music was offered from spring semester to Maymester. However, I offered the CTW course in world music during Spring 2010 in the form of a special topics course because the course did not make during summer semester 2009 and spring semester 2010 based on projected low enrollment. This CTW special topics course was offered to three students who were scheduled for graduation and who would not be eligible to reapproval of scholarships and other forms of financial assistance after spring semester 2010. In previous years world music was offered each spring semester in the evening to accomodate masters and certificate students in music education. The course has been traditionally offered as a crosslisted course for undergraduates (MUS 4820) and graduate students (MUS 6820) with additional research requirements for graduate students. Because the course was offered in the evening, resulting in decreased enrollment from undergraduate students and because there has been a decline in music education masters and certificate students in recent years, the course was discontinued for spring semester. Furthermore, the CTW course in music history, MUS 4810 (Music from Mozart to the Present), is a sequential course with one prerequisite. Therefore it is only offered annually during the spring semester. It was also necessary to move the CTW course in world music from spring semester to Maymester, because there is only one section of each of the two CTW courses offered during the past 12 months. Keeping the world music course during the spring semester might have have resulted in students being enrolled in both CTW courses during the same semester.

**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 from this year’s assessment show a marked improvement in understanding how critical thinking can be employed in research in music. The delineation of specific components of writing a research paper from thesis statement to conclusion was also extremely helpful in providing students the tools to organize and present their findings and thoughts. The use of specific components of critical thinking—namely, analysis, comparison, interpretation, synthesis, and inference—also provides music students, most of which are performance, education, and music technology majors, the tools to approach the preparation and performance of music in their individual majors. This information will be shared with the director and other administrators in the School of Music to show how effective the CTW initiative in music has been.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Strategies for improvement for the 2010 - 2011 year will include: 1) a survey on the meaning and applicability of critical thinking to be administered before the first of the three-part CTW assignments. 2) a survey/questionaire on the applicability and value of each of the three assignments to be administered at the end of the semester. The final survey/questionaire will also include inquiries on how the entire assignment might be improved and on the projected value of the entire assignment relative to major area of study for each student.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
The most important accomplishments of the year included: 1) A proposed annual schedule of offerings of both CTW courses in music 2) The revision of the rubric for the draft and final revised research paper.

**Challenges for Next Year**
Challenges for next year include: 1) The potential development of an additional rubric for the draft and the revised final research paper that would allow students options concerning the type and format of CTW research paper they might submit. 2) Trying to encourage the fellow CTW course administrator to complete the draft and final paper rubrics in more detail so that the annual assessment report reflects findings on both courses.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**
Because the three-part CTW assignment for both classes in music will remain the same, I do not foresee additions or modifications to
the outcomes in annual the report The outcomes and students papers should reflect an improvement in the quality of student writing.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**
No modifications have been made to the measurement methods for the purpose of the annual report. Based on changes to the numerical values of each of the individual sections in each of the two rubrics, the total points possible on each of the rubrics has changed slightly. Changes to the revised rubrics that were used this past year will not affect overall assessment and reporting.

**University-wide Committee Participation**
I am a member of the university-wide Coordinating Committee for CTW.

**Publications and Presentations**
No publications in or presentations related to critical thinking or teaching during the past year.

**Academic Teaching Activities**
MUS 4820 World Music - CTW MUS 6150 Music History Pers 2001 - Comparative Music Cultures (Ethno-Pop Music) - Popular music of Africa and the Middle East Pers 2001 - Comparative Music Cultures - Carnival in Trinidad & Tobago and Brazil

**International Activities**
No international activities or trips related specifically to the teaching or administration of critical thinking courses occurred during the past academic year.

**Contributions to Student Retention**
To date a total of 51 students were enrolled in three CTW courses this year: 26 in MUS 4820 (World Music) and 25 in MUS 4810 (Music History). Of the 23 students enrolled in world music during fall semester 2009, 19 students passed the course, 3 failed and 1 received an "incomplete". All 3 of the students enrolled in the CTW world music special topics class during the spring semester 2010 passed the course. This reflects an 85 percent complete rate in world music for the 2009/2010 academic year. To my knowledge the three music students who took the special topic CTW course in world music graduated in May 2010. Currently I do not have course completion statistics for the music history CTW course.

**Service to the External Community**
There was no service to the external community associated with CTW during the past year.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**
Critical Thinking is defined by the School of Nursing as, "a process of reflective and cognitive thought that involves systematic, rational, and creative thinking. Critical thinking leads to the formation of accurate inferences, conclusions, appropriate alternatives and strategies in the process of clinical and non-clinical decision making".

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Problem Solving**
The students will become better problem-solvers in the care of their clinical patients.

**G 2: Critical Thinking**
The students will demonstrate critical thinking skills necessary to interpret patient data and formulate appropriate nursing interventions in the care of their clinical patients.

**G 3: Making plausible generalizations and explanations**
The students will be able to make plausible generalizations regarding patient disease processes and be able to give explanations.

**G 4: Analysis and Evaluation**
The student will be able to analyze existing leadership styles and evaluate their effectiveness.

---

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Written Clinical Narratives (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
NURS 2080 Basic Concepts in Nursing Care The CTW activity will focus on a clinical patient that is assigned in NURS 2160. The activity will entail four writing assignments that will reflect the student's ability to critically think. With each activity, there are opportunities for students to receive feedback from a Graduate Teaching Assistant working as a writing consultant. The goal of all feedback will be to enhance students' ability to express their viewpoints in writing and to demonstrate in-depth critical thinking. Critical Thinking will be assessed by the Written Clinical Narrative. Each student will be given the opportunity to complete one narrative during each week of clinical in NURS 2160. Critical Thinking will be measured by utilizing the Critical Thinking in Patient Care Rubric. The Written Clinical Narrative will include the following: Reflect on your clinical experience with your assigned patient this week. Answer the following questions: 1. Why was the patient admitted to the hospital; Discuss their primary problems. 2. Why do you think these problems were occurring? 3. Write the assessment that you performed on this patient; What other assessment data from the patient's chart indicates that their primary problem exists? 4. What nursing interventions did you perform? Give rationale for each intervention. 5. What conclusions can you make regarding the patient's state of health. What other treatment may be available to the patient?
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: NURS 2080 Rubric (O: 1)**

Georgia State University School of Nursing Critical Thinking in Patient Care Rubric 1. Identifies, summarizes and completely presents history of the problem or issue(s). Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Does not attempt to identify and summarize accurately using available data. No history of problem presented. No detail provided. Summarizes problem, some aspects are incorrect, confusing or narrow in scope. Overlooks key aspects. Incomplete history presented. Clearly identifies implicit aspects and history of the problem. Identifies integral relationships when analyzing the problem. Comments: 2. Develops, presents, and communicates own perspective of the existing problem. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Perspective is clearly adopted with little original consideration. Does not justify own opinion. Position is unclear or simplistic. Perspective includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes other assertions. Presents own position though inconsistently, is generally clear although gaps may exist. Perspective demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge and integrates objective analysis and intuition. Identifies own position on the problem, draws support from experience. Clearly presents and justifies own view and integrates contrary views. Position demonstrates integrative thought and is clearly developed. Comments: 3. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate assessment data and supporting evidence. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 No evidence of evaluation skills. Repeats information without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification. Inadequate interpretation of data and evidence. Assessments incomplete. Demonstrates adequate skill in evaluating. Selectively uses evidence. Interpretation of data may be flawed or may show some inaccuracies. Assessments show some relevant data, lack thoroughness. Evaluation skills are thorough. Examines evidence for relevance and completeness. Accuracy appropriate interpretation of data. Assessments complete and demonstrate relevant data used to support diagnosis. Comments: 4. Identifies nursing interventions and rationale for implementation. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Selection of interventions may be inappropriate or of little value for problem resolution. Does not provide sound rationale for nursing interventions. Interventions may be appropriate but may not provide sound rationale for implementation. Implements appropriate interventions that address the problem(s) and provides accurate rationale. Comments: 5. Identifies and formulates conclusions regarding patient state of health; identifies treatment options. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Fails to identify conclusions or treatment options, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. May attribute conclusion to external authority. Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other issues. Vague description of options. Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions. Considers assumptions, data and evidence. Treatment options are clearly developed. Comments: 6. Critical thinking is evident in the Clinical Narrative and during the decision making process. Outcomes: Makes accurate inferences; defends an interpretation; explains the cause of a problem. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 No evidence of decision making. Decision making process is not clearly evident. Thinking is basic and unreflective. Does not make accurate inferences, defend an interpretation or explain cause of problem. Contributes only marginally to the decision making process. Thinking is in-depth but may lack creativity. Inferences are marginally accurate. Some interpretations are defensible. Cause of problems may be identified but not in entirely. Understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the decision making process. Thinking is systematic, rational and creative. Makes accurate inferences. Stated interpretations are thoroughly defended. The cause of problems is explained thoroughly and accurately. Comments: 7. Contributes effectively. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Language obscures meaning and thought. Work is unfocused and poorly organized. Lacks logical connection of ideas. No proofreading. Numerous problems with grammar, sentence structure, spelling. In general, language does not interfere with communication. Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Errors are not distracting or frequent. Some problems with style and voice. Minor problems with grammar, sentence structure and spelling. References, Margins, Use of abbreviations, etc. Overall Rating Assignment Completeness a. Which questions were unanswered? b. Rate how thorough/complete the student answered each question: 1………….2 …..…...3 ….

........4…………5 not at all very thorough c. Which questions lacked thoroughness? d. Total Score for Sections 1-5 e. Average Score for Sections 1-5 f. Score for Section 6 - Critical Thinking g. Score for Section 7 - Contextualizing

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

**Target for O1: Written Clinical Narratives**
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The following student achievements were obtained: 1. Total Score: We found that 76% [51 of 67] students had an improvement in their total score by the 4th clinical narrative assignment; 4% [3 of 67] total scores remained the same; only 19% [13 of 67] total scores decreased. 2. Critical Thinking Ability Score: We found that 61% [41 of 67] had an improvement in their critical thinking score; 26.8% [18 of 67] scores remained the same, however, 4.4% [3 of 67] were at the maximum achievable score - 6 of 6, and 13.4% [9 of 67 students] were at very high achievable scores - 5 of 6. 11.9% [8 of 67] had a decrease in scores.

M 2: NURS 4600 Rubric (O: 2)
For each of the seven criteria below, assess the work by: a) circling specific phrases that describe the work, and writing comments b) circling a numeric score, identifies strengths and weaknesses (and appropriately reformulates) the issue. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately. Summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over. Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue. Comments: 2. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, or position. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Position is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration. Addresses a single source or view of the argument, fails to clarify the established position relative to one's own. Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward. Position is unclear or simplistic. Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted. Presents own position though inconsistently. Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially. Position is generally clear, although gaps may exist. Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition. Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing supporing evidence and information not available from assigned sources. Clearly presents and justifies own view while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations. Position demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout. Comments: 3. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 No evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills. Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification. Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments. Confuses cause and conclusion; presents evidence and analytic, source out of sequence. Data/evidence are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic. Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need. Use of evidence is qualified and selective. Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, although attribution is inappropriate. Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed. Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine. Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of relevant sources. Examines evidence and its source, questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias. Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Sequence of presentation reflects clear organization of ideas, subordinating for importance and impact. Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment, course or personal interests. Comments: 4. Integrates issue with OTHER (disciplinary) perspectives and positions. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others' perspectives. adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little integration. If more than one idea is integrated, Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas. Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them. Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others' views. No evidence of reflection or self-assessment. Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis. Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way. Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily. Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate. Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing. Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment. Addresses others' perspectives and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information to qualify analysis. Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogies are used effectively. Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others. Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful. Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological frameworks of knowing. Considers and communicates responsibilities. Evidence integrates concepts and self-assessment. Comments: 5. Identifies and assesses conclusion, implications, and consequences. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority. Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues. Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions, Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance. Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed, and consider ambiguities. Comments: 6. Communicates effectively Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 In many places, language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate, Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent or distracting. Few sources are cited or used correctly. In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors are not distracting or frequent, although there may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice. Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent. Most sources are cited and used correctly. Language clearly and effectively Communicates ideas. May at times be nuanced and eloquent. Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience. Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. General use of appropriate format. Few problems with other components of presentation. All sources are cited and used correctly, demonstrating understanding of economic, legal and social issues involved with the use of information. Comments: Overall Rating Criteria Score 1. Identify problem, question, or issue 2. Develop own position or hypothesis 3. Present and analyze supporting data 4. Integrate other perspectives 5. Identify conclusions and implications 6. Communicate effectively Comments: Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Critical Thinking Leadership Paper
60% of students will score over 29 points on the overall rating (rubric 1-6) by the last graded assignment. Sixty percent of students will score over 4 on rubric sections 1-5.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
51 of 58 students (88%) of students achieved the target of 60 percent. 7 of 58 students (12%) of students did not achieve the target. 88% of student's scores improved.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

actions for improvement
For the next academic year to target students who may have difficulties with the last graded assignment, the following actions will be taken by faculty in that course: 1. review the paper guidelines and grading criteria prior to due date 2. provide an example of a good paper for the students 3. encourage students to seek assistance from the writing center of course faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</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>Measure:</td>
<td>NJRS 4600 Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Leadership Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvement in rubric scores
Those students who show a decrease in total scores and critical thinking ability scores as identified on the rubric will be required to set up a meeting with the CTW consultant to enhance their learning experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</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>Measure:</td>
<td>NJRS 2080 Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>Written Clinical Narratives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition of critical thinking was revised in Fall 2009 to reflect the critical thinking outcomes that were adopted by the BFLSON. The new definition includes the essential keywords of those outcomes.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The major accomplishments for the department of nursing were the continued implementation of the changes made to the assignments and rubrics for the 2080 course that occurred initially in 2008. Other accomplishments were the training of new CTW consultants, reconstruction of the Definition of Critical Thinking for the school of nursing. Very positive remarks were received from faculty in other courses in regards to the improvement of the critically thinking skills of the students in their clinical courses. These positive things can be attributed to the major changes in CTW assignments for the 2080 course. We will continue to implement the CTW assignments for upcoming academic years.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
I had a CTW meeting at the beginning of the school year on August 31st for those faculty involved in the other CTW course [4600], the 2160 faculty, the CTW consultants, and Spencer Middleton. We discussed redefining the definition of critical thinking for the SON, 2080 requirements for CTW and further discussed the role of the consultants. Based on our Critical Thinking Outcomes that were selected at the end of the previous academic year, we redefined our definition to include some of the crucial outcomes. At the October faculty meeting, I presented to the school of nursing faculty, our progress with the CTW initiative and the involved courses, and the newly defined definition. It was later voted to use the new definition at a later faculty meeting. This meeting was successful. I also provided one-to-one training for our newest CTW consultant, Ms. Beth Hundt, a nursing graduate student. Beth was assigned to assist with the 2080 Basic Concepts course. Beth has a strong background and many years of experience in critical care. Her expertise was such as asset in providing direction for the students regarding the 2080 assignments. Again this year, all the CTW consultants attended their respective courses on three occasions during each semester to provide one-to-one guidance with the students.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
As you know from last year’s report, in 2008, I changed the entire assignments, rubrics for the 2080 course. This change has shown to be a very positive change and approach for CTW. This academic year, I tweaked the wording of the questions involved in the assignment, to provide a clearer understanding. A slight decrease in the number of required assignments was also made to facilitate better coordination with the 2160 clinical course that the assignment is linked to. For the next academic year, no further changes are foreseen. In the 4600 Leadership course, the assignment was modified to include an addition of peer review of the second assignment.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
No changes were made to nursing as far as the CTW initiative. The impact continues to be the improvement of the student's ability to critically think in the clinical setting. There are only 2 faculty involved in the CTW courses for nursing. We both have been involved since 2007. I personally see a tremendous impact on critical thinking of the students. I do not have an opinion of the other faculty member.
Mission / Purpose
The Division of Nutrition defines critical thinking as the ability to identify a nutrition or dietetics-related question and to select, critique, analyze, synthesize and communicate information that address the question. To function effectively as future nutrition and dietetic professionals, dietetic students must be able to access and accurately interpret the scientific literature and make practice-related decisions based on strength of evidence and evidence-based guidelines.

Goals
G 1: Interpretation
Students will demonstrate the ability to translate information from the nutrition literature without altering the intended meaning.

G 2: Analysis
Students will demonstrate the ability to access and accurately analyze the scientific literature and make practice-related decisions based on strength of evidence and evidence-based guidelines.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Unknown (M: 1)
Unknown

O/O 2: Unknown (M: 1)
Unknown

O/O 3: Evaluation (M: 1)
NUTR 4950 Research Paper Students evaluate evidence (research articles) to reach conclusions and recommendations. Assignment: NUTR 4950: Each student writes a position paper or review paper incorporating articles based on a research question. Each student selects at least 30 articles addressing her/his research question using evidence-based guidelines to reach logical and justifiable conclusions. The student critically examines the evidence and sources of such evidence, questioning accuracy, relevance and completeness.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Research Paper Grading Rubric (O: 1, 3)
NUTR 4950: Grading Rubric for Paper

Target for O1: Unknown
We expect 75% of the students to score 5 or better on the rationale and content sections of the rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
This goal was reached - 15 of the 19 students scored 5 or better.

Target for O3: Evaluation
We expect 75% of the students to score 5 or better on the content section of the rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
This goal was reached - 15 of the 19 students scored 5 or better.

M 1: Unknown (O: 2)
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition:  How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition for critical thinking has remained the same. What has changed is the perception that critical thinking only belongs to the two CTW courses - one at the beginning (NUTR 3010) and the other at the end of the degree curriculum (NUTR 4950). In order for students to achieve a high level of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information, they need many opportunities to develop and practice the skills. This means that all courses serve as building blocks to mastery achievement.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:  What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The major CTW accomplishments for the 2009-2010 academic year include revision of rubrics for NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 and changing the research paper assignment from group paper to individual paper for both courses. The action plans identified in last year's report include: 1) revise rubrics and assignments for NUTR 3010; 2) determine effective data collection to evaluate advancement from basic critical thinking skills (NUTR 3010) to competent/mastery levels (NUTR 4950); and 3) develop faculty workshops to facilitate critical thinking and writing in all undergraduate nutrition courses for majors. We successfully completed action plans 1. For action plan 2, we decided to compare critical thinking and writing scores from the research paper written in NUTR 3010 to the scores in NUTR 4950. The rubrics for both courses have a content section addressing CTW skills. Unfortunately, the paper for NUTR 3010 fall semester 2008 was a group paper and the paper for NUTR 4950 spring semester was an individual research paper. We could not compare individual scores, but we were able to compare total class scores. In NUTR 3010, the class average was 71.8% (43/60 points) for the CTW section of the rubric. For NUTR 4950, the class average was 78% (47/60). Next year, the individual scores and total class score will be compared. For action plan 3, we discussed the need for critical thinking and writing in all undergraduate courses. The faculty decided to defer responsibility to the undergraduate curriculum committee. The committee is currently evaluating and revising the undergraduate curriculum; each course syllabus is under review to determine if critical thinking and writing are included in the course and how the curriculum can reflect advancement from basic level in the first semester of the program to mastery level by the last semester of the program. NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 will continue with individual class activities that strengthen critical thinking and writing.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:  How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
Training: Spencer Middleton attended a faculty meeting to discuss CTW with faculty. Discussions on CTW occurred during faculty meetings but no formal workshops were held. The best discussion and review of CTW occurred during the undergraduate curriculum committee meetings. More effort will be placed on weaving critical thinking throughout the entire curriculum; CTW will be one of the foci of the committee’s efforts to improve the curriculum.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:  How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
NUTR 3010 and 4950 assignments changed from group papers to individual papers. NUTR 3010 eliminated the annotated bibliography but incorporated more in-class activities. NUTR 4950 kept the annotated bibliography assignment.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
The faculty are very supported of CTW initiatives. Faculty agree that two courses cannot serve as the only vehicle for critical thinking and writing. This is a huge undertaking but should help strengthen the critical thinking abilities of our students.
Mission / Purpose
Managerial Sciences adapts 1987 definition of the National Council on Excellence in Critical Thinking for the Department's different foci: Critical thinking is an intellectually disciplined process that has three main components. First is skillfully and broadly gathering or generating data. Second is analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating the information in that data through the use of systematic, logical reasoning processes and the applications of relevant decision assisting tools developed ex ante. And third is the ability to reach conclusions and make recommendations for action that are logical, supported by evidence, and devoid of pre-existing individual bias or preference. Operations Managers should be able to use rational problem solving techniques and be able to express in a cogent manner what the problem is, set criteria for evaluation of potential solutions, establish alternatives to the problem and analytically evaluate the alternatives based on the established criteria.

Goals
G 1: Business Plan Vision
Ability to organize, develop and advance a service operation business plan vision using critical thinking through writing at a business level, as opposed to an academic level.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Executive Summary (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will decide on a service company concept and develop an "Executive Summary".

SLO 2: Execution of First Draft - Business Plan (G: 1) (M: 1)
Contains portions of all 8 sections of the Business Plan.

SLO 3: Development of Final Paper (Business Plan) (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will complete the eight point suggested Business Plan for the Final Paper.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Rubric for Service Operations Management (O: 1, 2, 3)
This rubric is designed for the benefit of the student as a guide for the development of the CTW Final Paper with respect to content and grammar.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Executive Summary
80% of student population will score a "3" or better out of a "4" on the rubric. This scoring is based on the first category of the rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
18 out of 19(95%) scored a "3" or better on the first category of the syllabus rubric.

Target for O2: Execution of First Draft - Business Plan
80% of student population will score a "3" or better out of a "4" on the rubric. This scoring is based on the 2nd through the 5th category of the syllabus rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
15 out of 17 (88%) scored a "3" or better based on the rubric.

Target for O3: Development of Final Paper (Business Plan)
80% of student population will score a "3" or better out of a "4" on the rubric. This scoring is based on the 1st through the 5th category of the syllabus rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
16 out of 17 (94%) scored a "3" or better based on the rubric.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Executive Summary
Ensure that the service company selected is practical and will be appropriate for the Service Company vision.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Rubric for Service Operations Management | Outcome/Objective: Executive Summary

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
Managerial Sciences Department adopted the 1987 definition of the National Council on Excellence in Critical Thinking for the Department’s different disciplines. I added this Spring, 2010 the following: “Operations Managers should be able to use rational problem solving techniques and be able to express in a cogent manner what the problem is, set criteria for evaluation of potential solutions, establish alternatives to the problem and analytically evaluate the alternatives based on the established criteria.”

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
Not applicable to 2010, as there were no action plans established in 2009.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
I did not direct any training workshops this year as I am the only instructor teaching the MGS 4770 CTW course. I did attend several workshops presented by Jennifer Lawrence and George Pullman.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
I am teaching the same Service Operations Management course as last Spring 2009. The course is basically the same, with more emphasis on the “Executive Summary” and getting the graded CTW components back on a timely basis during the semester. I worked with the students to ensure each saw the final comments on their paper and gave them an opportunity to discuss the results on a one-on-one basis.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
No changes have been made to the degree major regarding the implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW assessment. As of this date, there is not enough data to say what the primary impact of CTW has had on our degree major. I have a better insight into what the objectives of the CTW program are now having several semesters of teaching the course. I have made improvements to the use of the syllabus rubric and educating the students in the use of the rubric. I have also improved the turnaround of the graded components of the CTW paper.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Philosophy
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Goals
G 1: Critical Thinking
Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy 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 and does do both. This first goal is to foster critical thinking.

G 2: Writing Skills
Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy 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. Of course, especially in the contemporary world, much of this reasoning is distributed in written form, whether in books, journals, or in some digital media. 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 and does do both. This goal is to foster good writing skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 1)
Instructors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4900 give each student’s final paper draft a score for critical thinking. (In the future, we may
use papers from earlier in the semester from Phil 3000 in order to better compare beginning and completing students.) These scores are given on the A-F scales with +/- using the rubric provided below. These scores are not student grades (neither grades on particular assignments nor semester grades). The scores use the same scale as course grades in order to enhance inter-grader reliability.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O2: Writing Skills (G: 2) (M: 2)
Instructors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4900 give each student's final paper draft a score for writing. (In the future, we may use papers from earlier in the semester from Phil 3000 in order to better compare beginning and completing students.) These scores are given on the A-F scales with +/- using the rubric provided below. These scores are not student grades (neither grades on particular assignments nor semester grades). The scores use the same scale as course grades in order to enhance inter-grader reliability.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical Thinking (O: 1)
Instructors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4900 give each student's final paper a score on critical thinking. These scores are given on the A-F scales with +/- using the rubric below. These scores are not student grades (neither grades on particular assignments nor semester grades). The scores use the same scale as course grades in order to enhance inter-grader reliability. We expect to see lower scores in Phil 3000 that in Phil 4900 as those in 3000 will be in the beginning of their philosophy studies (and again, these are not student grades). We can compare the scores merited in Phil 4900 to those merited in Phil 3000 to assess how well the Department is teaching Critical Thinking and Writing. Critical Thinking A: An A paper provides a charitable and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to its thesis. It presents an insightful and compelling argument for its thesis, and it considers and responds to viable objections to this argument. The paper presents an original argument, one that goes beyond what was said in class and in the readings. B: A B paper provides a fair and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to its thesis. It presents a compelling argument for its thesis and considers possible objections to its argument. However, the paper's argument is not original, in that it does not go much beyond what was said in class and in the readings, and/or the paper does not develop some important points fully enough. C: A C paper provides an explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to its thesis, but this explanation is inaccurate in some important ways. The paper presents an argument for its thesis, but the argument is not original or compelling. The paper fails to consider possible objections and/or leaves important points undeveloped. D: A D paper provides little or no explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to its topic. It does not have a thesis even if it does have a unified topic. The paper asserts views but there is little or no attempt to use arguments to defend those views. F: An F paper provides no coherent explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to its topic. It does not have a unified topic. Views are asserted but there is virtually no attempt to defend those views. It reflects a lack of understanding of the assignment.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Critical Thinking
Papers of 3000 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in critical thinking

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Papers of 3000 students in the Fall of 2009 were, on average, evaluated as 2.89 in critical thinking. Papers of 3000 students in the Spring of 2010 were, on average, evaluated as 3.12 in critical thinking.

M 2: Writing Skills (O: 2)
Instructors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4900 give each student's final paper draft a score for writing skills. These scores are given on the A-F scales with +/- using the rubric below. These scores are not student grades (neither grades on particular assignments nor semester grades). The scores use the same scale as course grades in order to enhance inter-grader reliability. We expect to see lower scores in Phil 3000 that in Phil 4900 as those in 3000 will be in the beginning of their philosophy studies (and again, these are not student grades). We can compare the scores merited in Phil 4900 to those merited in Phil 3000 to assess how well the Department is teaching Writing. Writing A: An A paper is well-organized, and its paragraphs do not have a coherent structure. It contains numerous grammar and/or spelling mistakes. It is a polished paper that reflects excellent self-editing through multiple drafts. The paper also displays a sense of personal writing style and is written in clear prose that is readable to the reader. B: A B paper is well-organized, and its paragraphs do not have a coherent structure. It is a polished paper that reflects excellent self-editing through multiple drafts. The paper also displays a sense of personal writing style and is written in clear prose that is readable to the reader. C: A C paper is not well-organized, and its paragraphs do not have a coherent structure. It is not a polished paper. It contains so many grammar and/or spelling errors that the very meaning of some sentences becomes ambiguous and hard to understand.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Writing Skills
Papers of 3000 students should, on average, be evaluated as 2.50 in writing.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Papers of 3000 students in the Fall of 2009 were, on average, evaluated as 2.89 in writing. Papers of 3000 students in the Spring of 2010 were, on average, evaluated as 3.12 in writing.

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

Monitor, Discuss, Refine
The Department will continue to monitor the progress of the program. As teaching students to use critical thinking skills in writing is
Goals

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Physics & Astronomy prepares students in the B.S. in Physics program for a wide variety of career paths including scientific research, high technology commercial, military, and education. In all these paths, physics majors are expected to exhibit scientific critical thinking and to be able to communicate in writing using appropriate formats. The department incorporates these expectations in its definition of critical thinking which follows the basic scientific method: a. Students develop research questions appropriate for research. b. Students appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions. c. Students analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions. d. Students use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions. In addition, since the ability to communicate this critical thinking in the forms appropriate in a scientific context, the department adds the following aspects of critical thinking that are important to successful scientific writing: e. Students choose appropriate ways to communicate information in words, graphs, and figures. f. Students communicate correct kinds of information in each section of scientific report. g. Students understand and reflect an understanding of the appropriate audience.

Goals

G 1: Scientific Thinking

Students will follow the scientific process in developing and testing hypotheses, drawing conclusions, and formulating future research.
### G 2: Scientific Writing

Students make appropriate decisions to communicate scientific information effectively in the accepted format. This includes the particular requirements of scientific publications such as journals. In particular, students will decide when the most effective way to communicate technical or quantitative information involves words, graphs, table, or figures.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Laboratory Experiment Reports (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**

In Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory, students write reports for three laboratory experiments. These reports follow the standard format of scientific journal articles and include a title, abstract, background, experimental methods, results, discussion, conclusion, and foot-noted references. Unlimited revisions are allowed until the end of the semester. Students are encouraged to revise one report multiple times in order to learn the scientific writing skills before working on the remaining reports.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Written Communication
2. Critical Thinking

**SLO 2: Research Project Report (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**

In Phys4900, Research project, students write a long-form report for their research project. The report is written in sections over the course of the semester as their project proceeds. This report follows the standard format of scientific journal articles and include a title, abstract, background, experimental methods, results, discussion, conclusion, and foot-noted references. Unlimited revisions are allowed for each section until the end of the semester.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Phys3300 Physics Rubric (O: 1)**

The rubric used to evaluate laboratory reports is linked. It contains four elements of critical thinking and three elements of scientific writing skills necessary to write a high-quality report. Each element is evaluated on a four point scale indicating mastery, competency, developing competency, or lack of competency.

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

**Target for O1: Laboratory Experiment Reports**

Students in Phys3300 write three lab reports. They are encouraged to revise the report for their first lab until it is scoring high marks in each area before writing their remaining two reports. Our first target is that at least 80% of students in Phys3300 will achieve 3 out of 4 (competency) on each criterion of the rubric for their first laboratory report after all revisions are completed. In addition, at least 50% of the final evaluations will be 4 out 4 (mastery) for each criterion.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Nine students (all physics majors) took Phys3300 in the Fall of 2009. They achieved scores for the initial version of their first lab report averaging 2.4, 1.9, 2.1, 1.9, 2.0, 1.9, and 2.3 out of possible 4.0 for the seven criteria in the rubric, respectively. After revising the first report multiple times, students achieved scores averaging 3.9, 3.7, 3.6, 3.8, 3.8, 3.7, and 3.6 for the seven criteria in the rubric, respectively. Scores for all nine students were either 3 or 4 on all criteria for the final versions of the first report except for one student receiving a 2 for criterion C (Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 students choose appropriate ways to communicate information in words, graphs, and figures.)

**M 2: Phys4900 Physics Rubric (O: 2)**

The rubric used to evaluate project reports is linked. It contains four elements of critical thinking and three elements of scientific writing skills necessary to write a high-quality report. Each element is evaluated on a four point scale indicating mastery, competency, developing competency, or lack of competency.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Research Project Report**

At least 80% of students will achieve 3 out of 4 (competency) on each criterion of the rubric after all revisions are completed. At least 50% of the final evaluations will be 4 out 4 (mastery) for each criterion.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

No findings were obtained for 2009-2010. This course was offered for the first time in Spring 2010. However, since this course is newly created and was added to the degree requirements for the Fall 2009 catalog, there were no students under the new program requirements that were ready to take the research course. We expect a sufficient number of students to be prepared to take this class in Spring 2011.

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

**Adding Electronics training into Phys3300**

In Phys3300 in the Fall of 2009, students ability to perform experiments was often hindered by a lack of practical knowledge on electronic circuits even though basic circuits were covered in an earlier course (Phys2212K). Phys2212K is not a course for just physics majors but has a number of different majors who take it. Therefore, to give physics majors the proper preparation for the experiments we want them to perform in this class, we will add content in electronic circuits.
Increased time on analysis and graphing in Phys3300

In Phys3300 for Fall 2009, the lowest areas of performance according to the assessment were in performing data analysis and presenting graphs and tables. The amount of time spent in before the first lab on data analysis and graphing will be increased.

Revised class structure for Phys3300

In the first offering of Phys3300, students performed all three experiments in close succession. However, they were encouraged to perform revisions of the first lab report and delay writing the second and the third until they received feedback and improved the first report to a high level. The delay in writing the remaining two reports made it harder for the students to write those reports since they were not fresh in their minds. Furthermore, the student learning from the writing and revising process may have had benefits in the performance of remaining labs (knowing how you will analyze and report the results affects how you obtain the results). So for Fall 2010 the lab schedule will be changed so that the performance of the three labs is more spread out giving time for writing and revising the first lab report before the second and third labs are performed.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
No, we have kept the same definition.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The first accomplishment is offering the new Advanced Physics Laboratory courses (Phys3300) for the first time. The course had many different elements and was co-taught by two faculty members, so there were plenty of logistical issues to deal with. The course was generally received well by the students. They seemed to appreciate being treated more like physicists and researchers. They want to gain the research and writing skills and appreciated the more intentional plan compared with our earlier lab class structure. Since this was our first time offering the class, we had no action plan last year. Most elements of the course worked well and will continue. We identified a few weaknesses that showed up in either the student’s ability to perform the experiments (e.g. their electronics knowledge) or their ability to write high quality reports (data analysis and graphing skills).

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
We had no workshops or training. Our CTW ambassador is one of the two instructors for the Phys3300 course and he did all the assessment of lab reports. When Phys4900 is taught in the spring of 2011, he will be the instructor and will be again evaluating all the student work.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
The CTW assignments in Phys3300 have not changed. However, the performance on the assignments has allowed us to identify a few weaknesses that showed up in either the student’s ability to perform the experiments (e.g. their electronics knowledge) or their ability to write high quality reports (data analysis and graphing skills). We will be changing several aspects of the course that prepare students to perform the CTW assignments (see action plan items on electronics, data analysis, and graphing) as well as the schedule of the course to allow students to get the most benefit from the assignments (see action plan item on experiment schedule).

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
This was the first time we offered our first CTW course, Phys3300, and we have not yet taught our second CTW course, Phys4900. So we did not make any changes between last year and this year. The first offering of Phys3300 was effective in giving our students a more coherent preparation for the research project all physics majors must complete. Overall, I think that the major impact of implementing the CTW courses so far is in the way the new courses present different expectations to the students. They make explicit our expectation that physics majors will be able to perform high quality research and to be able to communicate their work as part of a professional community.
Mission / Purpose
The Department endorses the definition of Critical Thinking proposed to the Faculty Senate. Political Science courses will be designed to train students to “develop the wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” The political science CTW courses will be designed to develop and practice the following specific critical thinking skills - identification of a question or issue, consideration of assumptions and/or context, formulation of a testable hypothesis, collection and presentation of facts/data, analysis of facts/data, integration and synthesis of other perspectives and presentation of conclusions.

Goals
G 1: Identifying the Issue
Students will be able to identify a question or issue to investigate

G 2: Consideration of assumptions and context
Students will be able to consider assumptions and/or context of the issue

G 3: Formulation of testable hypothesis
Students will be able to formulate a testable hypothesis

G 4: Collection and presentation of data
Students will be able to collect and present of facts/data

G 5: Analysis of Data
Students will be able to analyse facts/data

G 6: Integration of perspectives
Students will be able to integrate and synthesize of other perspectives

G 7: Presentation of Conclusions
Students will be able to effectively present conclusions of their research

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Effective Formulation of Research Question (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate through a paper or oral presentation the effective formulation of a research question. The central question, embedded and subsidiary issues, as well as relationships needed for effective analysis will be clearly identified, underlying assumptions will be identified and analyzed, and a clearly stated and testable hypothesis with a clear understanding of its drawback developed

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
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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

O/O 2: Effective collection and use of data (G: 4, 5) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate effective collection and use of data through a paper in which they will identify most relevant facts, show evidence of search, selections and source evaluation and using appropriate methodology subject the data to complete analysis including an examination of possible shortcomings of the data

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
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

Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Effective Communication of results (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper and/or oral presentation of conclusions by providing clearly stated conclusions with examination of implications or consequences of conclusions. Students will also integrate other perspectives thoughtfully and respectfully.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1 Written Communication
2 Oral 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
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

Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

M 1: Rubric for Political Science 3800 (O: 1, 2, 3)

In Political Science 3800, we used a rubric which measured the following CT skills (see Rubric): 1. Identification of research question
2. Formulation of a Testable Hypothesis 3. Analysis of facts/data 4. Presentation of Conclusions Student achievement was scored on a three level scale - Absent (0), Developing (1), Competent (2) - on each of the four CT skills above. For descriptions of each level of scoring see rubric POLS 3800

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

Target for O1: Effective Formulation of Research Question

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the hypothesis portion of the rubric

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
On the Research Question assignment 76.6% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 22.3% scored a 1 (Developing) 2.1% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off.

Target for O2: Effective collection and use of data

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the analysis portion of the rubric

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
On the Research Question assignment 75.5% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 21.3% scored a 1 (Developing) 3.2% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off.

Target for O3: Effective Communication of results

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the presentation portion of the rubric

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill 79.9% of our students scored 2 (Competent), 18.1% scored 1 (Developing) and 2.1% scored 0 (Absent)

M 2: Rubric for POLS 4900 (O: 1, 2, 3)

In Political Science 4900, we used a rubric which measured the following CT skills (see Rubric): 1. Identification of research question
2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context 3. Formulation of a Testable Hypothesis 4. Collection and Presentation of facts/data 5. Analysis of facts/data 6. Integration and synthesis of other perspectives 7. Presentation of Conclusions Student achievement was scored on a four level scale - Absent (0), Developing (1-2), Competent (3-4), Sophisticated (5) - on each of the four CT skills above. For descriptions of each level of scoring see rubric POLS 4900 Items 1-3 above are related to the outcome of effectively formulating a research question Items 4-5 above are related to the outcome of effective collection and use of data Items 6-7 above are related to the outcome of effective communication of results
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Improving CT skill in Formulation of testable hypothesis**

Though the learning outcome target for this item on the rubric was met in both POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 the assessment data shows some weakness in this CT skill. This was specially the case in POLS 4900 where students had to meet a much higher standard of sophistication to earn a score of 3 or more on this item in the rubric. In POLS 4900 student scores on the rubric were as follows - 34.4% scored 5 (Sophisticated), 37.5% scored 3-4 (Competent) 9.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). The plan is to devote more time and learning to developing this skill in POLS 4900. In particular differences between a thesis, a hypothesis and a conclusion and developing a hypothesis that is testable and not leading to a single conclusion

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubric for Political Science 3800</td>
<td>Effective Formulation of Research Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric for POLS 4900</td>
<td>Effective Formulation of Research Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: The Plan requires the following enhancements to the teaching of POLS 4900: 1. A review session on developing a testable hypothesis early in the semester. 2. An in-class or online peer review session devoted to discussion of research hypothesis developed as part of the research paper requirement of the course. 3. A minimum of three iterations of the hypothesis development process as part of the research paper requirement of the course

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador and faculty teaching POLS 4900 in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011

**Improving CT skill in integration of other perspectives**

While the assessment data shows that our first CTW course POLS 3800 is comfortably meeting the CT learning outcome targets, our second CTW course POLS 4900 while meeting its learning outcome target shows clear gaps in student CT skills in the area of integration of other perspectives into their work. Though students showed marked improvement in this area between pre-course and post-course performance and target of 80% of students scoring 3 or higher on this item on the rubric was met only 34.4% had a score of 5 (Sophisticated), whereas 37.5% scored 4 (higher end of Competency) and 21.9% scored 3 (lower end of Competency). The plan is to give added stress to developing this skill in POLS 4900.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubric for POLS 4900</td>
<td>Effective Communication of results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Three actions will be implemented as part of the plan to improve CT skills in this area: 1. Students will be assigned readings reflecting a wide spectrum of viewpoints as part of the course. 2. The course will include one exercise devoted exclusively to the development of this CT skill. 3. Greater weight will be given in grading to the ability to show competence in this area.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador and Faculty teaching POLS 4900 in Fall 2010 and Spring 2010

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

**Target for O1: Effective Formulation of Research Question**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 3 or better out of 5 on Items 1-3 of the rubric

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

On the effective formulation of the research question portion of the rubric (items 1-3) the scores were as follows 1. Identification of question or issue - 53.1% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 43.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 3.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off) 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 53.1% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 43.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 3.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off) 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 34.4% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 62.5% scored 3-4 (Competent) 3.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off)

**Target for O2: Effective collection and use of data**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 3 or better out of 5 on the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

On the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric (items 4-5) the scores were as follows 4. Collection and presentation of facts/data - 53.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 37.5% scored 3-4 (Competent) 9.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off) 5. Analysis of facts/data - 43.75% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 46.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 9.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off)

**Target for O3: Effective Communication of results**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 3 or better out of 5 on the effective communication of the results portion of the rubric

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

On the Effective communication of results portion of the rubric (items 6-7) the scores were as follows 6. Integration and synthesis of other perspectives - 34.4% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 59.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 6.2% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off) 7. Presentation of conclusions - 46.9% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 39.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 9.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off)
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

So far the original definition of CT developed by the department has held up very well. There has been some discussion about the rubric for POLS 4900 and if it is the best way to assess student achievement in the identified CT skills for the discipline. All the instructors who have taught POLS 4900 have successfully used the rubric and found it useful as an assessment tool.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

This was the first year of the full implementation of the CTW plan for the department and all indications are that the roll out went smoothly and well. The two CTW courses that have been developed work well together. POLS 3800 (a pre-requisite for POLS 4900) builds CT skills in four of the seven CT areas identified by the department as essential CT skills for the discipline (Identification of question or issue, formulation of a testable hypothesis, analysis of facts/data and presentation of conclusions). POLS 4900 builds-on these CT skills and in addition develops CT skills in the other three areas identified by the department as essential CT skills for the discipline (consideration of assumptions and/or context, collection and presentation of facts/data, integration and synthesis of other perspectives). Students successfully completing the two course sequence will have systematically been exposed to exercises designed to develop and sharpen their CT skills.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

In Political Science a number of faculty are/will be teaching POLS 3800, and eventually almost all full-time faculty members will participate in teaching sections of POLS 4900. Under the department plan the training for faculty teaching the CTW courses is to be delivered on an as-needed basis. The first time a faculty member teaches POLS 3800 or POLS 4900 she/he will be trained by the ambassador. In the Fall 2009 4 sections of POLS 3800 were taught by 3 different faculty members of the faculty. The Ambassador trained these faculty members on CTW course requirements and departmental goals in the Spring of 2009 (Please see agenda for the training). One section of POLS 4900 was offered in the Fall of 2009 and this was taught by the ambassador himself. In the Spring of 2010 4 sections of POLS 3800 were taught by 3 different faculty members, one of whom was a new member who was trained during the Fall of 2009. Two sections of POLS 4900 were taught by 2 faculty members who were trained in the Fall of 2009. In the Summer of 2010 4 sections of POLS 3800 are being taught by three faculty members all of whom have already been trained. One section of POLS 4900 is being taught in the Summer of 2010 by a faculty member who was trained in the Spring of 2010. The training sessions went well and ensured that all faculty members who were teaching the CTW courses had buy-in into the objectives of the CTW program, were on the same page with regard to assessment, use of the rubrics for the courses and reporting on assessment.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

For POLS 3800 the assignments have remained very close to the original ones. The tendency is to have a series of small or medium weight assignments that develop specific CT skills that the class addresses. For POLS 4900 some faculty have moved from the idea of three or four small projects to the development of a major research paper through the course of the semester developing each of the seven CT skills in the process.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

This was the first year of the implementation of the CTW program in the department and last year we did not have a CTW assessment report. However in the process of developing the CTW plan and related courses the department has developed a clearer understanding of the desired learning outcomes as well as a more coordinated effort to develop the CT skills identified in the plan among our 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?

Since this is the first year of the implementation of the CTW plan in the department this is the first assessment report. Based on the experience of this year we plan to spend more time during training on assessment and develop some general standards for scoring the rubrics used for assessment in both the 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 outcomes of this years experience is that we will communicate to all faculty the areas of relative weakness in CT skills identified by the CTW program. The aim is to encourage faculty to devote more time to the development of these CT skills in all the courses that they teach. The end result should be better assessment results for students when they are taking POLS 4900 the capstone seminar for Political Science majors. In particular future sections of POLS 4900 will stress two CT skills - Formulation of a testable hypothesis and integration and synthesis of other perspectives as these have been identified as areas needing special attention among our students.

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?

Not applicable

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful
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 data for the CTW courses shows that the Department is doing an excellent job in developing CT skills among our majors. All the target goals of CT skills were met with large margins in the assessment. The assessments did however draw attention to weaknesses in some CT skills. This data will allow the department to pay special attention to development of CT skills these areas in all upper division courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

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

The main strategy for improving performance in the coming year will be to stress the development of all CT skills in all upper division courses in the Department. Special attention will be paid to the two areas of relative weakness identified by the assessment - developing a testable hypothesis and integrating and synthesizing other perspectives into analysis and conclusions. Assessment in these two areas should see an improvement over the next two years.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

1. Successful roll-out of the CTW program in the Department.
2. Successful training of 8 faculty members on teaching CTW courses.
3. Achievement of all CT target goals by large margins in both the CTW courses.
4. Identification of two areas of relative weakness in CT skills - formulation of testable hypothesis and integration and synthesis of other perspectives into analysis and conclusions.

**Challenges for Next Year**

Two main areas for improvement. 1. Better assessment results for the areas of relative weakness identified this year. 2. Ability to successfully staff enough CTW courses to meet demand from seniors.

** Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

None

** Modifications in Measurement Methods**

None

**University-wide Committee Participation**

Publications and Presentations

**Academic Teaching Activities**

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Psychology**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

In addition to meeting the requirements of the University's CTW policy, the proposed CTW courses are designed to address recommendations by the American Psychological Association (APA) related specifically to the development of critical thinking skills in undergraduate psychology majors. For this reason, we shall operationally define and assess critical thinking in terms outlined by the APA, such as students' ability to "evaluate the quality of information, including differentiating empirical evidence from speculation," "use reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals," "demonstrate an attitude... of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, and intellectual engagement," and "use scientific principles and evidence to resolve conflicting claims" (APA, 2007, p. 15).

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical thinking skills in psychology**

Respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1) (G: 1) (M: 1)**

a. Evaluate the quality of information, including differentiating empirical evidence from speculation and the probable from the improbable b. Identify and evaluate the source, context, and credibility of information c. Recognize and defend against common fallacies in thinking d. Avoid being swayed by appeals to emotion or authority e. Evaluate popular media reports of psychological research f. Demonstrate an attitude of critical thinking that includes persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, and intellectual engagement g. Make linkages or connections between diverse facts, theories, and observations

**SLO 4: Grammar and Mechanics (M: 1)**

The language clearly communicates the author's intentions.

**SLO 5: Organization (M: 1)**
Elements are thoughtfully and effectively arranged in a manner appropriate to the purpose and audience for the assignment (including consistency with APA style, as appropriate)

**SLO 6: Development (M: 1)**
The author offers complete, relevant, and accurate details.

**SLO 7: Use of sources (M: 1)**
Uses information from sources ethically according to APA guidelines.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3) (G: 1) (M: 1)**

- a. Identify components of arguments (e.g., conclusions, premises/assumptions, gaps, counterarguments)
- b. Distinguish among assumptions, emotional appeals, speculations, and defensible evidence c. Weigh support for conclusions to determine how well reasons support conclusions d. Identify weak, contradictory, and inappropriate assertions e. Develop sound arguments based on reasoning and evidence

**O/O 3: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4) (G: 1) (M: 1)**

- a. Intentionally pursue unusual approaches to problems b. Recognize and encourage creative thinking and behaviors in others c. Evaluate new ideas with an open but critical mind d. Recognize ill-defined and well-defined problems e. Articulate problems clearly f. Generate multiple possible goals and solutions g. Evaluate the quality of solutions and revise as needed h. Select and carry out the best solution

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Final research project (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
For their final project, students write a research proposal. Each student submits a primary and secondary draft of each required section for the research proposal, including the GSU Informed Consent Form, Introduction and Literature Review, Method, and Analysis Plan. The primary draft of each section is worth 75 points toward the final grade. The final draft of each section, incorporating feedback from the primary draft, is worth 25 points toward the final grade. The CTW rubric is used to rate each draft. Final draft ratings are used for CTW assessment. In the rubric, instructors rated students’ integrative writing and critical thinking skills on this assessment on a rubric from 0 to 5 in which scores of 0 & 1 represent 'emerging' skills in each outcome, scores of 2 & 3 represent 'developing' skills in each outcome, and scores of 4 & 5 represent 'mastery' of each outcome. Competency on these outcomes is defined as a score in the 'developing' range for students completing the junior level CTW course and in the 'mastering' range for students completing the senior CTW course.

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

**Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)**
In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The median score for critical thinking skills in psychology was 4, which is in the mastering range, and 94.4% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher.

**Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)**
In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
The median score for critical thinking skills in psychology was 4, which is in the mastering range, and 94.4% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. (The rubric used this semester did not differentiate Outcomes 2 and 3 from Outcome 1, so it is not possible to tease apart performance on the three aspects of critical thinking in psychology.)

**Target for O3: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4)**
In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
The median score for critical thinking skills in psychology was 4, which is in the mastering range, and 94.4% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. (The rubric used this semester did not differentiate Outcomes 2 and 3 from Outcome 1, so it is not possible to tease apart performance on the three aspects of critical thinking in psychology.)
Target for O4: Grammar and Mechanics

In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The median score for grammar and mechanics was 3.0, which is in the 'developing' range, and 86.5% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher.

Target for O5: Organization

In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The median score for organization was 4.0, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 94.4% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher.

Target for O6: Development

In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The median score for development was 3.4, which is in the high end of the 'developing' range, and 96.6% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher.

Target for O7: Use of sources

In this year we assessed learning outcomes in the junior CTW course, sections of which started being offered in the Spring semester. The department's goal is that, by the end of the junior CTW course (Psyc 3530), the majority of students will score in the 'developing' range.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The median score for use of sources was 3., which is in the high end of the 'developing' range, and 93.3% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher.

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

Action Plan 2010

Next year, CTW goes full scale as we offer for the first time a full complement of both junior- and senior-level CTW courses. A main goal is to staff and train instructors for all sections. To that end, faculty are being strongly encouraged to submit proposals for senior-level CTW sections. Another goal is to provide additional supports for students who are struggling with their writing; findings from this year's outcomes show that a number of them still struggle after completing the junior CTW course. To that end, the department began to pilot a writing support center staffed by Psychology GRAs this past semester. Budget permitting, this program will be expanded next year. Additionally, the definition of critical thinking will be revisited, and the CTW rubric will be revised (see separate "revise rubric" action plan) so that the goals and objectives better align with the measures.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final research project | Outcome/Objective: Grammar and Mechanics

Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassadors and faculty
Additional Resources: Money for the writing center would be nice.....

Revise rubric

The CTW rubric will be revised to be able to independently assess this facet of APA's critical thinking in psychology definition and to be more useful and less confusing to students and faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final research project | Outcome/Objective: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4)
- Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The department's definition of critical thinking has not changed over the past two years, but faculty have voiced some confusion about the definition recently, and there were inconsistencies between the definition and the rubric used to assess it this past
CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Our major accomplishments for this academic year are that we (a) started offering CTW sections and (b) hired three lecturers to help staff CTW sections. In the Fall, we offered one section of Psyc 4800 (the senior CTW course) on Neurobiology of Music. Because we had not yet offered the junior CTW course, getting this pilot section of Psyc 4800 to make was a challenge, but the students who did take it rated it favorably. Student survey results indicated that students thought the course help them think better and think more critically. Students did indicate some confusion about the CTW rubric though. (Plans to offer another pilot section of Psyc 4800 were put on hold out of concern that it would not make.) In the Spring, we offered 7 section of Psyc 3530 (the junior CTW course), and all of them filled up. (Psyc 3530 was not offered until the Spring because another new course Psyc 3510, which is the prerequisite for Psyc 3530 did not get added to the schedule until the Fall.) These accomplishments largely met the goals of the action plan specified last year. The new courses appear to have accomplished their own goals, although both students and faculty found the challenges. In addition to the goals laid out in the action plan last year, an additional achievement has been the piloting during Spring semester of a departmental writing support center staffed by Psychology GRAs designed to provide extra help for students in the junior CTW course with their writing.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

CTW training this year was a multi-pronged approach: Training for Psychology faculty began at the annual faculty retreat in August 2009, where Kim Darnell and Chris Henrich provided attendees with background on the CTW initiative and introduced them to the guidelines for preparing CTW courses in psychology. Dr. Darnell reviewed the recommendations for the development of critical thinking and communication skills in undergraduate psychology majors put forward in 2007 by the American Psychological Association (APA). She discussed how the APA learning goals must be at the core of each CTW course in psychology, providing specific examples of concepts, assignments, and activities that would relate to each goal. Dr. Darnell also introduced the faculty to the approved CTW writing assessment rubric and discussed how the rubric could be effectively used to give students' immediate feedback on the quality of their work and serve as a mechanism for assessing students' progress on CTW learning goals during a single course and across introductory and advanced CTW courses within the department. Electronic copies of the handouts for this presentation are attached, including: “Critical Thinking through Writing for Psychology,” "APA Learning Outcomes for Critical Thinking and Communication," "General Assessment Rubric for Writing Assignments," and "Additional Materials: Tools for Critical Thinking (Levy, 1997)." All of Dr. Darnell's training materials are available for faculty on the department's shared drive. Additionally, all instructors teaching Psy 3530 met with Dr. Darnell prior to the start of Spring semester for training specific to that course. For the senior CTW course (Psyc 4800), faculty propose sections individually tailored to their interests and expertise. Throughout the school year, individual faculty members met with Dr. Darnell or Dr. Henrich to discuss their plans for CTW courses, evaluate proposed activities and assignments in the context of the CTW learning goals, and review the course curricula to ensure that they fulfilled departmental requirements for CTW content. The majority of faculty who have submitted CTW course proposals to the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) for approval and those who have notified the UPC that they have specific course plans in progress have participated in these one-on-one feedback sessions. Faculty then submit proposals to Dr. Henrich, who assigns members of the Undergraduate Program Committee to review them. (Either he or Dr. Darnell serves on every proposal review subcommittee.) Dr. Henrich then sends faculty feedback based from the subcommittee review. Faculty then revise their proposals, and Dr. Henrich reviews them one last time before forwarding them to the department chair. The multi-pronged approach to CTW training has been successful. The group training introduced faculty to the general principles of CTW, and most of their questions have been answered by the training materials and through the individual meetings with the CTW ambassadors.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

Because this is the first time that we have taught the CTW assignments, they have not had a chance to evolve. The Psyc 3530 instructors met after the end of the semester, and based on the discussion it seems that the assignments worked well this first time out. The only changes discussed for next year would be to the timing of the assignments throughout the semester. Additionally, based on the CTW learning outcomes assessment, it appears as if students are weakest in their mechanics of writing, which should receive increased attention in the revision process next year (see Action Plan).

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The main change that has been that we started offering the CTW courses this year. It is too early to assess the initiative's impact on the degree major or on the students and faculty involved in it. We will offer 24 CTW sections per year, so it is clear that there will be an impact on faculty's workload assignments. Hopefully there will also be impacts on students' perceptions of the undergraduate curriculum being more structured and sequenced and on infusion of CTW principles throughout the curriculum, although it is too soon to tell.
G 1: reflection
Students will be able to reflect on their experiences in public and non-profit organizations related to readings and class discussions.

G 2: Critically analyze scholarly readings
Students should be able to express their analysis and thoughts orally in class and through written memo assignments.

G 3: Understand links between theory and research
Students must demonstrate the ability to connect theoretical issues involving policy with empirical assessment techniques.

G 4: Select appropriate methods for assessment
Students must be able to select appropriate methods for an assessment design. Options might include interviews, experiments, survey research, qualitative research, and document reviews.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Discussion of assignment (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
There are seven (7) memos due over the course of the semester. Each memo is worth 5 percent of your final grade. Due dates for each memo are noted on the syllabus. In each case, memos are due on the date noted and must be posted on uLearn no later than the time listed. For each memo, I will provide a question relating to that day's topic, readings and discussion. To receive full credit, each student should write a one-page memo - approximately 250 words and must include a word count. The memo should be free of spelling and grammatical errors, proofread and well organized. The memo should respond to the question based on reflection and analysis of the assigned readings or class discussions and should include insight and critical analysis from the student's own perspective. We will discuss in class the difference between summary and analysis and examples will be provided.

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

O/O 2: Unknown (M: 3)

Unknown

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: rubric (O: 1)
Description of rubric. See repository.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Discussion of assignment
70% of students score 3 or higher on rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
81.45% at least partially met objective Measurement: Weekly memos, ULearn Discussion Board, Presentations, Classroom presentation on Service Learning Activity, Weekly Memos, Classroom Discussion, and Final Written Paper o 33.00% Exceeds objective/skill by substantial margin o 37.11% Fully demonstrated o 11.34% Partially demonstrated o 5.15% Barely demonstrated o 4.12% Did not demonstrate

M 2: Weekly Memo Assignments (O: 1)
There are seven (7) memos due over the course of the semester. Each memo is worth 5 percent of your final grade. Due dates for each memo are noted on the syllabus. In each case, memos are due on the date noted and must be posted on uLearn no later than the time listed. For each memo, I will provide a question relating to that day's topic, readings and discussion. To receive full credit, each student should write a one-page memo - approximately 250 words and must include a word count. The memo should be free of spelling and grammatical errors, proofread and well organized. The memo should respond to the question based on reflection and analysis of the assigned readings or class discussions and should include insight and critical analysis from the student's own perspective. We will discuss in class the difference between summary and analysis and examples will be provided.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Discussion of assignment
70% of students score 3 or higher on rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

Critical thinking in Public Management and Policy involves evaluating arguments and making and justifying claims based on theoretical understandings and/or empirical assessment. This definition of critical thinking has not changed during the past two years. The two CTW courses were initially selected because, in addition to course specific content, they address the following critical thinking skills: identification of a question or issue, consideration of assumptions and/or context, formulation of a testable hypothesis, development of an appropriate research design to test hypotheses, integration and synthesis of other perspectives and presentation of conclusions. What has changed is the feeling among PMAP faculty members that another course, PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues, is better suited than PMAP 3021, Citizenship, the Community and the Public Service, to be designated as a CTW course. This change will be voted on by the faculty this fall and implemented during the next academic year (2011-12).

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

We have a new representative selected as a CTW Ambassador, replacing Professor Shena Ashley, who left the university. Everyone teaching the CTW courses is now more familiar with the requirements, so that assignments are better tailored for the CTW courses. All those teaching CTW courses meet at the beginning of each semester, and assessment data are gathered at the end of each semester.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

CTW Ambassadors have received their training, and have, in turn, trained others such as the graduate students who are serving as Writing Consultants. This process has been successful.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

The CTW assignments in the BS in Public Policy degree have continued to evolve. In the Citizenship (PMAP 3021) course the CTW assignment was a set of weekly memos submitted to the instructor where students were asked to record their experiences from their service learning activity, describe their feelings about their experiences and draw insights from the course objectives and theoretical explanations in the course readings. The instructor evaluated the memos according to a scoring rubric and students got experience developing CTW skills by making improvements in the memos each week based on evaluations of memos from prior weeks. After using this format for several years, the CTW assignment has changed to consist of a set of exercises completed by the students in paragraph form every two weeks. The exercises are keyed to readings in each chapter of a textbook prepared for the course. In the
paragraphs for each question in the exercises, students begin by identifying the issue and describing the context of the required observations or experiences. Students next develop an argument based on their observations or readings. Finally, each response requires students to apply insights from the readings to their observations. In addition, the students also prepare a final paper reflecting on their experiences in a service-learning setting. New rubrics have been developed for the exercises and the final paper. There has been no change in the CTW assignments in the Evaluating Public Policy (PMA 4051) course. In PAUS 4051 the CTW assignment consists of an evaluation research proposal where students are expected to integrate research methods and evaluation theory and apply them to a real problem. The final evaluation proposal is due at the end of the semester; however, the instructor will review and evaluate drafts of earlier versions. The drafts and the final proposal will be evaluated using a scoring rubric that is typically used by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) when evaluating research proposals.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative? There have been no changes in the degree program since last year’s CTS Assessment Report. Changes in the initial required CTW course in the curriculum have been proposed and will be voted on by the faculty during the 2010-11 academic year and implemented the following year. Faculty members felt that the service learning emphasis of the PMA 3021 is not well suited for the CTW requirements, and a better fit would be PMA 3311, Critical Policy Issues. The major impact of CTW is the increased recognition by the faculty of the importance of critical thinking in the curriculum. The challenge is to communicate the importance of the CTW requirement to students. Faculty have the impression that students defer taking the CTW courses until near the end of their degree programs. Addressing this challenge will be a topic for the faculty of the department to consider this year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Real Estate
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The BBA real estate major 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. Critical thinking through writing in Real Estate is defined as using writing to assist in developing ability to select, analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and draw inferences about business situations and information, and apply problem-solving skills to formulate and communicate convincing reasons in support of conclusions and solutions.

Goals
G 1: Data evaluation
Students will demonstrate the ability to organize and evaluate data and information in a real estate business context.

G 2: Analytical skills
Students will become better analysts of verbal and mathematical data.

G 3: Evaluation of evidence
Students will demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate assumptions, evidence, ideas, and information from a variety of sources.

G 4: Integration of materials
Students will demonstrate ability to compare and integrate conflicting and competing ideas and information.

G 5: Conclusions
Students will demonstrate ability to write rational, reasonable, and informed conclusions.

G 6: Communication
Students will demonstrate ability to present a clear written expression of derived conclusions, judgments, and solutions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Case study 1 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 1)
Students will read, gather data, develop financial analysis, evaluate both financial and qualitative data, draw conclusions, and write a logical recommendation answering specific questions about the Fan Pier Case. (Questions attached in rubric.)

SLO 2: Case study 2 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 1)
Students will read, gather data, develop financial analysis, evaluate both financial and qualitative data, draw conclusions, and write a logical recommendation answering specific questions about the Anderson Street case. (Questions attached in rubric.)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Rubric (O: 1, 2)
See connected rubric. Rubric will be used to score responses on questions to each case. A score on each goal will be recorded along with a total score for each student. Students can use the scores on each item to learn where they have performed well and where they can improve. Faculty can use the scores to assess how well students are performing on each facet of the assignments.
CTW in Real Estate

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 06/2011

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years? It has remained the same.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The department chairman changed the planned instructor for RE4700. The new instructor used the proposal from last year and feedback from three instructors in other departments who used case analysis as their CTW assignments to clarify how the specific CTW case assignments will meet each CTW objective, organize the grading rubric and its relationship to those objectives, and develop a matrix showing the relationship. In addition, he settled how to incorporate the CTW assignments into the existing course materials (cases with questions written by the case authors). He planned how to make the administration of the feedback, resubmission, and grading a manageable task for the instructor. Our action plan specified that we wanted the faculty teaching the CTW course to interact directly with CTW teaching faculty in other departments. He has benefited from their experiences indirectly through their CTW reports. The Ambassador will continue to distribute any CTW materials to the instructor and invite the instructor for 2011-2012 to attend their meetings next year.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
I held two faculty workshops. All the full-time faculty and instructors (Diaz, Gallimore, Gibler, Rabianski, Ziobrowski, and Clements) attended the one on 9/17/2009. Dean Huss also joined the workshop for the first part of the discussion. We reviewed the 2-CTW course requirement. We discussed the 2008-2009 CTW effort and the evaluation of our report. We discussed the experiences of other majors and how we would modify our CTW assignments and administration based on those reports. The faculty reviewed materials from the CTW workshops. We agreed on modified plans for 2009-2010 and an Action Plan for 2010-2011. The department chair announced a change in the instructor for 2010 from the faculty member initially charged with designing the course and assignments. This new instructor would be invited to the next workshop. Overall, the faculty left the workshop better informed about the CTW program and its requirements. The second faculty workshop was held February 10, 2010. This time the faculty member originally charged with course design (Ziobrowski), the 2010 assigned instructor (doctoral student Tidwell), a doctoral student working as a writing consultant for BUSA3000 (Gyamfi-Yeboah) attended the workshop with the Ambassador (Gibler). The purpose of this hands-on workshop was to revise the course materials prepared last year, plan the course administration, and prepare materials for the CTW report. We examined the real estate definition for CTW and decided it did not need to be modified. We examined some of the cases that Ziobrowski currently uses in a graduate course and identified how the questions that come attached to the cases can be modified to ensure they match the CTW objectives listed in our plan and our rubric. We discussed having all students submit the same case write-ups for revise and resubmit versus having students submit different case write-ups. Gyamfi-Yeboah and Tidwell discussed their writing consultant experiences in other courses and how best to structure the assignments and grading to make the administration of the feedback, resubmission, and grading a manageable task for the instructor. We reviewed the case study approach experiences of CTW instructors in marketing and hospitality. We reviewed exercises the instructor could use in class to help students understand how they would be evaluated and what an outstanding submission would be. We reviewed the assessment plan to ensure the instructor would be prepared to provide a sample of outstanding, competent, and flawed work along with explanations of why each was classified that way; an average and range of scores on each part of the rubric; his ideas about how the course should be changed the following year based on CTW learning outcomes versus performance; and how the rubric should be changed to ensure it properly measures the objectives. The instructor, Tidwell, left the workshop with the materials needed to finish the revisions to the course materials to identify how the selected case write-ups will meet specific CTW learning outcomes and to match the rubric to the specific outcomes. Overall, the workshop answered questions for the instructor and ensured he understood the specific tasks that needed to be completed during this year.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the
initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

We did not teach a CTW course this year because it is a new capstone course and no students who are required to take the course have reached that stage yet. We have improved the materials to more clearly demonstrate how the questions associated with the cases can be used to measure the achievement of the CTW objectives. These changes are driven by required assessment, not by course content or student learning.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The changes we have made to implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report are in administration and documentation. A new instructor was assigned, so he took over course design. The department chair identified the planned instructor for 2011 as well, so that instructor will now be included in any training workshops a year in advance of teaching the course. Because we have not taught the course, the only impacts have been in advising, scheduling, administration, and course preparation. The faculty used the initiative to add a capstone case course to the major requirements. Because of the prerequisite structure, the undergraduate program director has spent time attempting to identify students who are required to take the course, contact them, and advise them on the importance of proper scheduling to avoid having to delay graduation because of the lack of a proper CTW substitute for this specific course. The faculty and instructors have spent time on preparation of CTW assignments, rubrics, and a matrix showing how the writing assignments will address each CTW objective.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Religious Studies
As of 12/12/2010 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Critical thinking as applied to the field of religious studies consists of the valid and fact-based analysis, understanding and comparison of religious phenomena in their varied contemporary and historical contexts. It emphasizes the individual's ability to grasp, assess, and comment with scholarly insight on religious texts--both primary and secondary--theories, rituals, beliefs, and actions.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Implement scoring via rubric of assignments and collection of final papers
As explained above, the key players in the CTW program within Religious Studies have met and developed a plan for 2010-2011. We will continue to use the series of progressively more advanced assignments developed in the departments' CTW offering during Spring 2010 (described in detail above), and we will implement the other aspects of the existing CTW plan. Specifically: (1) the CTW instructor will use the departmental CTW rubric to assess all CTW assignments in the course and will collect and preserve these scores; (2) the CTW instructor will collect and preserve 10 randomly selected final papers from each section taught; and (3) the department assessment committee in conjunction with the CTW Ambassador and CTW instructors will assess the collected final papers based on the rubric and will use these assessments as the basis for a departmental discussion of student learning in CTW during the Spring 2011 semester.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: (1) The CTW instructor will use the departmental CTW rubric to assess all CTW assignments in the course and will collect and preserve these scores; (2) the CTW instructor will collect and preserve 10 randomly selected final papers from each section taught; and (3) the department assessment committee in conjunction with the CTW Ambassador and CTW instructors will assess the collected final papers based on the rubric and will use these assessments as the basis for a departmental discussion of student learning.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador, and CTW Instructors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
Because the CTW section was canceled due to a lack of enrollment during the Fall 2009 semester, Religious Studies offered its first-ever CTW section during the Spring 2010 semester. As a result, central definitions and other aspects of the departments' initial CTW proposal have not yet undergone major changes. This summer, I am meeting with the course instructor (who will also teach the department's CTW offering during the Fall 2010 semester) to discuss her challenges, successes and failures in the course. She already has indicated that she will make certain changes in her approach for the Fall.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The department enjoyed a major accomplishment in offering its first CTW section during the Spring 2010 to a very positive response form the students. The department used the implementation of the CTW requirement as the opportunity to take an existing course in “Theories and Methods” and require it of all majors. One of the challenges in implementing CTW in Religious Studies has been to get instructors— who in fact teach critical thinking and writing in every upper-level course—to implement new ways of tracking and assessing assignments which may not, in fact, be all together new. This remains a work in progress—and we say more about this
issue below. Nonetheless, the Spring section of "Theories and Methods" saw the introduction into the existing "Theories and Methods" course of several new requirements: that students complete 5 in-class "quick write" assignments, an outline notebook in which they include outlines of 8 reading assignments, and a 6- to 8-page out-of-class paper in which they compare and contrast two of the major theories explored in the course. In addition to these new assignments, students also continued to complete a take-home final., as had previously been required in the course. What was novel about the take-home final in the CTW version of the course was that it required students to take the worst of their 5 quick-write assignments and revise, edit, and expand it into polished form. The assignments represent a thoughtful progression towards the display of increasingly complex thinking and writing skills. The combination of these various assignments can rightfully be deemed as a success based on the positive accounts of the instructor, the very favorable course evaluations, and the results of the students' written work, samples of which are included in the document section of this report. A disappointment and an area for change during the coming academic year surrounds the fact that, although the department created and approved a rubric (inculded in this report) for the rating of various aspects of all assignments, the instructor of the spring CTW course did not use this rubric in her own grading. She merely shared it with students so that they might know the aspects of their written work that she would be examining. The instructor, who will again teach the CTW course this fall, now realizes that it is the wish of the department that the approved rubric be used for assessing and providing feedback to students with regard to the various assignments, and she has committed to using the rubric in this way this fall. This should serve to provide a great deal of additional data on how students work progresses in specific areas over the course of the semester.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
The workshops have been most useful to me in helping with the technical aspects of the CTW program--such as navigating WEAVE. The WEAVE system remains, in my opinion, a huge stumbling block to the success of CTW. It is cumbersome, non-intuitive and full of bugs. The system has crashed multiple times as I have tried to upload documents to the new document feature. Worse, the system does not provide a context for departments to be able to discuss and to display what they have done--a real loss. Instead, through a increasingly complex and obscure series of terminology of distinctions, WEAVE requires that the reporter adapt his or her message to the arcane dialect of the assessment system. In contrast, in producing their annual retention reports, the university provides departments with some very general questions to consider--all written in plain English rather than assessment jargon--and allow them to write a free-form report. The results are far more coherent, creative, and useful than anything that WEAVE allows. For the success of CTW, which I have worked on since its inception and have a large stake in seeing succeed, I really hope that the use of WEAVE will be discontinued and departments will be given the opportunity to write true annual reports. We do not benefit from the university community to fill in boxes about the obscure distinctions between goals, outcomes, measures, targets, assessments, and findings. I appreciate how these distinctions can be meaningful to those who spend their professional lives in the world of assessment. Those who spend their professional lives in assessment, on the other hand, have to appreciate how genuinely meaningless such distinctions are to those who have not been properly indoctrinated, i.e., to 99% of the academic community. The WEAVE reporting trivializes the significance and obscures the accomplishments of the CTW program.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?
See questions 1 and 2, above. the assignments have not evolved since Spring 2010 was the first term during which Religious Studies offered a CTW course.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
As described above, the major changed through CTW in that an elective course, "Theories and Methods," became a required course. This will have important impact on the students and program, as will the time of new and creative assignments described in question 2, above, but these impacts cannot be measured since the first CTW course only concluded a few weeks ago.

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?
I am a little confused by this question: it reads as if it is asking for an assessment of the major overall, not of CTW and its impact on the major. The department will supply a report on the changes to the degree program and its assessment procedures during the past academic year--but that will be written and submitted by the department's Director of Undergraduate Studies (in conjunction with its Assessment Committee), not by the CTW Ambassador. She merely shared it with students so that they might know the aspects of their written work that she would be examining. The instructor, who will again teach the CTW course this fall, now realizes that it is the wish of the department that the approved rubric be used for assessing and providing feedback to students with regard to the various assignments, and she has committed to using the rubric in this way this fall. This should serve to provide a great deal of additional data on how students work progresses in specific areas over the course of the semester. Nonetheless, the Spring section of "Theories and Methods" saw the introduction into the existing "Theories and Methods" course of several new requirements: that students complete 5 in-class "quick write" assignments, an outline notebook in which they include outlines of 8 reading assignments, and a 6- to 8-page out-of-class paper in which they compare and contrast two of the major theories explored in the course. In addition to these new assignments, students also continued to complete a take-home final., as had previously been required in the course. What was novel about the take-home final in the CTW version of the course was that it required students to take the worst of their 5 quick-write assignments and revise, edit, and expand it into polished form. The assignments represent a thoughtful progression towards the display of increasingly complex thinking and writing skills. The combination of these various assignments can rightfully be deemed as a success based on the positive accounts of the instructor, the very favorable course evaluations, and the results of the students' written work, samples of which are included in the document section of this report. A disappointment and an area for change during the coming academic year surrounds the fact that, although the department created and approved a rubric (inculded in this report) for the rating of various aspects of all assignments, the instructor of the spring CTW course did not use this rubric in her own grading. She merely shared it with students so that they might know the aspects of their written work that she would be examining. The instructor, who will again teach the CTW course this fall, now realizes that it is the wish of the department that the approved rubric be used for assessing and providing feedback to students with regard to the various assignments, and she has committed to using the rubric in this way this fall. This should serve to provide a great deal of additional data on how students work progresses in specific areas over the course of the semester.

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.
I am a little confused by this question: it reads as if it is asking for an assessment of the major overall, not of CTW and its impact on the major. The department will supply a report on the changes to the degree program and its assessment procedures during the past academic year--but that will be written and submitted by the department's Director of Undergraduate Studies (in conjunction with its Assessment Committee), not by the CTW Ambassador. She merely shared it with students so that they might know the aspects of their written work that she would be examining. The instructor, who will again teach the CTW course this fall, now realizes that it is the wish of the department that the approved rubric be used for assessing and providing feedback to students with regard to the various assignments, and she has committed to using the rubric in this way this fall. This should serve to provide a great deal of additional data on how students work progresses in specific areas over the course of the semester.

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?
I am a little confused by this question: it reads as if it is asking for an assessment of the major overall, not of CTW and its impact on the major. The department will supply a report on the changes to the degree program and its assessment procedures during the past academic year--but that will be written and submitted by the department's Director of Undergraduate Studies (in conjunction with its Assessment Committee), not by the CTW Ambassador. She merely shared it with students so that they might know the aspects of their written work that she would be examining. The instructor, who will again teach the CTW course this fall, now realizes that it is the wish of the department that the approved rubric be used for assessing and providing feedback to students with regard to the various assignments, and she has committed to using the rubric in this way this fall. This should serve to provide a great deal of additional data on how students work progresses in specific areas over the course of the semester.
**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?

Assuming that we are talking about the assessment of CTW, I think the major concern is that the assessment of individual assignment within the department's CTW courses was not done in a manner consistent with the intent of the department or the fine-grained analysis of student performance over the course of the semester. As already mentioned above, this will change next year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

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

We think the strategies for teaching CTW in the course via a multi-faceted set of assignments that build upon one another to produce increasingly more nuanced skills is a sound one. We will know better what weaknesses remain when a finer grained method of assessing individual assignments is employed, and we will implement this finer grained method this coming year.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Respiratory Therapy**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Division of Respiratory Therapy will merge the principles of logical reasoning, problem solving, judgment, decision making, reflection, and lifelong learning in respiratory therapy.

**Goals**

**G 1: Registered Respiratory Therapist**

Each student will be able to make acceptable clinical decisions to become a Registered Respiratory Therapist (RRT).

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: NBRC (M: 1)**

All students will pass the national certification and registration exams offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: NBRC Results (O: 1)**

The piloted group graduated May 2010. This class was the first to pass both national examinations provided by the National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC) at Georgia State University. The passage of these exams allows students to obtain a state medical practice license to practice respiratory therapy. We feel a correlation may exist with our CTW courses which stresses the need to critically evaluate material in order to correctly treat a patient successfully.

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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

It has remained the same, we continue to focus on making our students successful clinical, critical thinkers.

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Our piloted group (2009) will graduate this May. As of graduation, May 15, 2010, 100% of students have passed the national entry level exam to become a certified respiratory therapist (CRT) and the national advanced practice exam to become a registered respiratory therapist (RRT). Although our students have done well on the national exams, we have not had this high level of success. One of many possibilities may be the use of CTW courses in our program. RT 3027 The SOAP writing really seemed to allow the student to focus in the important detail of making a diagnosis. We will continue using the same assignment; however, we will work to differentiate what works and what does not work in respect to the assignment. RT 4085 The students were able to use creativity in assignments and make useful in helping them become better critical thinkers. Action Plans RT 3027 Continue to do case studies with SOAP. Will introduce CTW to our students at our required orientation each fall. RT 4085 Continue to assess the assignments and rubric to make sure we are measuring correct information needed by our students.

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

RT 3027 The ambassador and CHHS CTW academic professional, and professor for RT 3027 collaboratively worked to redevelop the rubric that would assess the writing assignment. The ambassador, professor, and additional part-time instructor for the course
Goals

Mission / Purpose

For the purposes of our courses, critical thinking is defined as the ability to evaluate a set of facts, use the facts in conjunction with a theory to develop a conclusion. Specifically, the structured assignments will be designed to train the student to: 1) identify relevant facts; 2) identify relevant issues; 3) identify which approaches are candidates to solve the problem; and 4) identify the appropriate approach and be able to explain why this approach dominates others.
G 1: Critical Thinking in Risk Management
Students will demonstrate how risk management adds value to an organization through the use of a case study.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Goal 1 Risk Assessment Process (G: 1) (M: 1)
A number (5) of mini cases are assigned throughout the semester. These mini cases will relate to a specific part of the risk management process. The final case will be a summation of the students’ efforts. The final case assignment will show improvement for 90% of the class based on the case rubric.

O/O 2: Goal 2 Value of Risk Management (M: 2)
Students should be able to describe the theoretical basis for risk management and distinguish it from risk minimization.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Final Case (O: 1)
Each student will choose a for profit (or non profit) company to analyze. The case study will have five main parts. Each part will be based upon exercises completed during the semester. First, the student will assess of the firm’s risk tolerance. Second, the student will develop qualitative and quantitative assessments of the firm’s risks. Third, the student will be able to describe the portfolio of risks held by the firm and its appropriateness given the firm’s risk tolerance. Fourth will be an assessment of the firm’s risk financing and its appropriateness given the firm’s strategy and risk tolerance. Fifth, will be assessment of the firm’s ability to manage risks.

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

Target for O1: Goal 1 Risk Assessment Process
The department of Risk Management expects that 75% of students will score 12 or higher out of 16 on the CTW rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In 2009-2010, I employed a different set of assignments. The goal for these assignments was the same as the current goal. Translating the previous year’s data to the current system, 80 percent scored 12 or higher out of 16 on the rubric.

M 2: Exam Question (O: 2)
Each student will be given a on the first exam and on the final exam which assess their understanding of value of risk management. The question should not be identical, but it should illicit the same answer in both cases. The question will be scored with a rubric and the scores compared at the end of the semester.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition has stayed the same over the last two years. The assessment of the student’s critical thinking, however, is continuing to evolve.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
I gave seven 3-5 page writing assignments this year. This was a bit much. However, I saw significant improvement in writing over the semester for about 50 percent of the students. Many were able to do the assignments from the very beginning, but even they became better at doing the assignments. One of the things I focused on was the student’s ability to make a conclusion back by some (critically evaluated) evidence. Almost every student improved in this area of analysis. In prior years, 10 percent or so were not able to do this as the end of the semester.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
I am the only one teaching this class this year. However, I will be ahsring it with another faculty member next year and I will meet with him to provide guidance for the class.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
For the first two years I had the students create a blog on risk management. They had to write about three-five paragraphs a week on anything related to risk (from class or something they read). I was just trying to get them to write. I do not think they thought it was valuable. This year (spring 2010) I had them undertake four company risk assessments. In addition, I assigned three cases. These were more focused, but created a great deal of work for the students and for me. I did not receive any negative feedback about the writing assignments. However, to reduce my workload just a bit, I am now going to have mini cases that will be cumulative so that the final project will be based on all the work the students did for the semester. The idea here is that the students will get feed back on portions of the final project during the semester.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW
on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
We have made no substantive changes (other than the changing in the assignments described above). The students, in the past, complained about the writing assignments. This semester (Spring 2010) I told them the employers have specifically told the Department of Risk Management that writing skills were important and the skills would make a difference in employment opportunities. The students took this to heart and performed well on this dimension compared to previous terms.

Annual Report Section Responses
Most Important Accomplishments for Year
I significantly changed the assignment format between 2008 and 2009. I changed from a weekly journal to 7 written assignments. The students did a pretty good job on the homework and my teaching evaluations actually increased. However, the grading burden was quite high, so I am changing the assignments again. This year I am going to use assignments that will build on each other and that will be used to create a final case study. I also introduced the students to a new type of software to develop predictive models. They seemed to enjoy this and did a passable job on integrating quantitative risk management with qualitative risk management.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
As mentioned above I am using a new set of homework assignments and a new rubric. It is only a minor change from previous years.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Social Work

Mission / Purpose
The critical thinking initiative in the School of Social Work supports the overall mission of the social work program by cultivating undergraduate students to conceptualize and write at a high level of ordered thinking in the context of social work generalist practice. Critical thinking, in a social work context, is viewed as a process to assess, critique, and evaluate theories and knowledge, varying modes of practice, beliefs and attitudes, and research. Social work practitioners always consider alternative or opposing view points to reach well-reasoned solutions and conclusions. Undergraduate social work majors may demonstrate their critical thinking abilities by: --raising important questions and problems, and articulating them concisely and precisely; --gathering and assessing relevant information, and showing the ability to interpret it effectively; --maintaining an open mind when considering alternative thinking/ideas, assessing and evaluating assumptions, implications and practical consequences; --developing well-reasoned conclusions and solutions to problems, using relevant criteria and standards; and --communicating effectively with others when articulating complex problems and possible solutions. The definition for critical thinking was adapted from Paul, R. Elder, L (2009).The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking – Concepts Tools (6th ed). CA: Foundation For Critical Thinking.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Unknown
Unknown

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Critical Thinking in Practice
SW3330 Critical Thinking Rubric: For Part III of the CTW Assignment, grading will be based on the following Rubric: Critical Thinking Understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the argument. 1 means: assumes the validity of unproven or ill proven assertions. 2 means: is skeptical but unable to explain why 3 means: perceives some of the flaws in an argument, but is blind to others 4 means: sees the argument for what it is, but has nothing useful to add 5 means: understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the argument Development Offers complete, relevant and accurate details. 1 means: no detail 2 means: flawed details 3 means: relevant and accurate detail 4 means: thorough, relevant, and accurate details 5 means: offers complete, relevant, and accurate details Knowledge Understands the subject matter fully. 1 means: misunderstands key concepts, draws false conclusions 2 means: understands the concepts but is unable to draw conclusions 3 means: understands the key concepts and draws valid conclusions 4 means: understands all related concepts and draws valid and in some cases insightful conclusions 5 means: understand the subject matter fully Structure Arranges elements in the best possible order for the intended audience. 1 means: chaotic 2 means: associative, digressive, elliptical, or circular 3 means: arrange elements in an order that makes sense to the author 4 means: arranges elements in a conventional order 5 means: arranges elements in the best possible order for the intended audience Originality Provides an original contribution to the subject. 1 means: entirely derivative 2 means: a pastiche of other people’s work on the subject 3 means: the author’s own expression of work already done on the subject 4 means: original, but contributes only marginally to the subject 5 means: provides an original contribution to the subject Creativity Highly creative approach to the problem. 1 means: routine, uninspired 2 means: unique but not entirely successful approach 3 means: unique, successful approach 4 means: unique, successful, and elegant or parsimonious approach 5 means: highly creative approach to the prompt Audience Recognizes and writes for the intended audience. 1 means: seems unaware of an audience 2 means: vague awareness of an audience 3 means: aware but disregards audience 4 means: considers most of the audience’s needs and objections 5 means: recognizes and writes for the intended audience Grammar The language clearly communicates the author’s intentions. 1 means: numerous different and disruptive errors 2 means: many different but less disruptive errors 3 means: a few primarily non-disruptive errors 4 means: a few inconsequential errors 5 means: the language clearly communicates the author’s intentions Citation Cites sources correctly and effectively, making clear distinctions between the writer’s ideas and sources 1 means: plagiarism 2 means: appears to be quoting at times but provides no documentation (inaudient plagiarism) 3 means: cites most sources but misses some and has some errors in citation mechanics 4 means: cites all sources with proper citation mechanics 5 means: cites all sources properly but doesn’t fully integrate or assimilate the cited material with his or her own 6 means: cites sources correctly and effectively, making clear distinctions between the writer’s ideas and sources Format of Papers: All papers must be typewritten and double-spaced using a 12 point font (either Times New Roman or Arial) and one inch margins. Use APA for your papers, including proper headings and citations. Note:
M 2: Critical Thinking Across the Life Span

CTW Rubric: Critical thinking skills are an important part of effective social work practice. Your ability to think critically about the situations in the assignments will have a significant impact on your grade. Therefore, in addition to your knowledge of the relevant theories and models, intervention ideas, intervention outcomes and the impact on people in the social environment, you will be evaluated on how well you are using critical thinking processes you illustrate in your responses. Written assignments will be evaluated according to Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric described below:

Part I (Application of Ecological and Systems Theory Concepts): Students will read a case study of Reggie Kelsey and identify 5 key concepts of Systems Theory or Ecological Theory illustrated in the story. Students will identify the key concept and the way that it is illustrated or applicable. Further they will identify the page number in the case study where the key concept and application identified can be found. Any of the key concepts used in the textbook cases may be applied. More than one or two word description of how a key concept is applicable is required. The application example must be written in the form of a short paragraph similar to the example provided:

Note: A key concept can be used more than once as long as the application is different. Each student may arrive at different conclusions about how a key concept is applicable in the case study. (Worth 20 points each)

Part IA (Application of Ecological and Systems Theory Concepts): Instructions: Based on the textbook, people’s involvement with multiple systems and the interactions between systems is discussed. Students must read how the textbook differentiates the three basic types of systems: micro, mezzo, and macro - and how they interact. In the case study of Reggie, numerous systems are identified. Identify 10 systems at the micro, mezzo, and/or macro level in Reggie’s case. In addition, using the ecomapping process, students will label each system identified in one of the circles in the ecomap and draw the appropriate line as illustrated in class handouts and exercises. For example, if a Mr. Smith is identified as a case manager at Hamilton House, the system should be identified as “Mr. Smith, Case Manager at Hamilton House” or “Case Manager at Hamilton House (Mr. Smith)” rather than simply “Case Manager”.

Part IB (Application of Systems Theory Concepts): Identify 20 systems at the micro, mezzo, and macro level in the final section of the assignment, critical thinking about value and ethical issues is discussed in a paper. Consider the final outcome in Reggie’s story. Analysis: What biological, psychological, or social aspect of development do you think is most relevant to the specific phase of development? (see pages 2-8 and Highlight 1.2 on page 9 for brief discussion of bio-psycho-social development)? Any biological, psychological, or social aspect of infancy, childhood, or adolescence that occurred this semester are eligible. Examples include (i) emotional/behavioral problems (for example, post-traumatic stress disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder, depression, mental retardation, low IQ); (iv) psychological issues such as self-esteem; and (v) social issues such as homelessness. Explain your reasoning. B. Literature Review: Select two to three articles from peer reviewed journals that address the issue you selected in section A. In three to five paragraphs, summarize what the literature says about this issue as it relates to children and/or youth. Is this aspect of Reggie’s development adequately addressed in your answer? C. Discussion 1- Ethics: Identify two ethical standards that were violated by individuals and/or organizations in charge of Reggie’s care that are evident in his story. How were they violated? Use the Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers. In your opinion, does Reggie bear any responsibility for his final outcome? Why or Why not? D. Discussion 2- Practice: Select one article that focuses on social work practice or treatment issues or options for the biological, psychological, or social aspect of development you selected in sections A & B. For example, a 2006 article in the journal, Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention, addresses treatment issues among homeless youth. Abstract 100 words in length. The unbiased and objective position adopted is a strength-based approach. In two to three paragraphs summarize the practice or treatment issues or options discussed in your selected article. E. Recommendations: What alternative actions could have been taken by the individuals and/or organizations that interacted with Reggie? Weigh the pros and cons of each alternative you identify? What is the most ethical decision that could have been made to possibly influence a more positive outcome in Reggie’s life? Note: The rough draft is to be typed and attached to an email sent through uLearn before the due date. The final draft may be submitted via email. However, please always first try to submit your assignment draft within uLearn. Feedback will be given prior to the due date for the full assignment.

Part II: Application of Systems Theory Concepts

Instructions: Based on the textbook, people’s involvement with multiple systems and the interactions between systems is discussed. Students must read how the textbook differentiates the three basic types of systems: micro, mezzo, and macro - and how they interact. In the case study of Reggie, numerous systems are identified. Identify 10 systems at the micro, mezzo, and/or macro level in Reggie’s case, including: (i) the consequences of gender and sexual identity in gay, lesbian, and/or transgendered adults; (ii) the cumulative effects of poverty across the adult life span; (iii) how depression affects the following: Sexual identity in gay, lesbian, and/or transgendered adults; the cumulative effects of poverty across the adult life span; sexuality from young adulthood to later adulthood; religious involvement at different adult life stages; how differences exist in alcohol use and abuse among sexual minority young adults versus heterosexual young adults; do differences exist in alcohol use and abuse among sexual minority young adults versus heterosexual young adults; Option 2: The second option is to explore a developmental issue or topic across the stages of adulthood. Examples include (but are not limited to the following): Sexual identity in gay, lesbian, and/or transgendered adults; the cumulative effects of poverty across the adult life span; sexuality from young adulthood to later adulthood; religious involvement at different adult life stages; how depression affects the following: Sexual identity in gay, lesbian, and/or transgendered adults; the cumulative effects of poverty across the adult life span; sexuality from young adulthood to later adulthood; religious involvement at different adult life stages; how differences exist in alcohol use and abuse among sexual minority young adults versus heterosexual young adults; do differences exist in alcohol use and abuse among sexual minority young adults versus heterosexual young adults; Option 2: The second option is to explore a developmental issue or topic across the stages of adulthood. Examples include (but are not limited to the following): Sexual identity in gay, lesbian, and/or transgendered adults; the cumulative effects of poverty across the adult life span; sexuality from young adulthood to later adulthood; religious involvement at different adult life stages; how differences exist in alcohol use and abuse among sexual minority young adults versus heterosexual young adults;
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The current definition of critical thinking as supported by the social work faculty, defined as: Critical thinking is a process to assess, critique, and evaluate modes of social work practice, beliefs, attitudes, and research while always considering alternative or opposing points of view in order to develop well-reasoned solutions and conclusions. The definition aligns with the School's mission for the BSW program, the purpose and professional values that serve as the foundation for the social work curriculum. In addition, our definition of critical thinking takes into consideration one of the core competences prescribed by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in their 2008 standards (which prescribes one definition of critical thinking as having the capacity for “judgment and reasoning in reasoned communication.”) The definition that has not been altered by the faculty; there presently is no necessity to modify the definition. However, it will be reviewed periodically by the faculty to ensure it continues to reflect the principles and values of the profession.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Following the piloted CTW program in 2008-2009, it was determined that the CTW initiative in the School of Social Work needed to enhance its support for the GRA writing consultants, as well as establish a process for communicating with faculty during the academic year. Five mechanisms were instituted that serve as the core process for communicating with CTW personnel: - Fall faculty meeting; - Fall orientation meeting; - Spring meeting, periodic “check-ins”, and the end of the year survey with CTW faculty and writing consultants. These four mechanisms work to help monitor the status of the 5 faculty teaching CTW courses, without overburdening them with meetings and/or paperwork. It also provides a means for the School ambassador to have a level of contact with CTW personnel during the semester. The Fall faculty meeting was designed to meet with all faculty teaching CTW-designated courses for the academic year. The meeting is facilitated by the CTW ambassador and the consultant for the College, and held in prior to the start of the academic year. The purpose of the meeting is to review course assignments, discuss any lessons learned regarding students’ reactions to assignments, teaching strategies specific to the CTW assignments, needed resources for faculty and student support, assignment of writing consultants, and communicating any scheduled events regarding CTW content workshops or training sessions. The Fall CTW orientation was planned and implemented on September 1, 2009 facilitated by the CTW ambassador for social work and the CTW consultant with the College of Health and Human Sciences. Both CTW writing consultants and faculty attended the meeting. The orientation included discussions/presentations on an overview of critical thinking, incorporating GSU objectives and SACS accreditation perspectives, a review of the designated CTW courses in the School, course assignments, lessons learned from the pilot year, roles and responsibilities of writing consultants. In January, 2010 a Spring meeting was held with the existing writing consultants, facilitated by the CHHS CTW consultant to discuss the Fall semester experiences and to prepare for the Spring semester. One new writing consultant was added during the semester; she was oriented to the CTW initiative by the School ambassador. Because the same writing consultants were used for the Fall and Spring semesters, the focus of the Spring meeting was to have the writing consultants discuss their experiences working with students, what they saw as their strengths/weaknesses as writing consultants, and any training needs required for the semester. The CTW ambassador conducted periodic “check-ins” with CTW faculty to determine the following: - students introduction to writing consultants during the initial weeks of the course; - planned time schedule, location, and/or process for writing consultants to meet with students; - faculty and writing consultants communication process to discuss CTW assignments, feedback on reviewed coursework, and other challenges/positive outcomes during the consulting process; - any challenges or needs of CTW faculty during the academic semester. - all CTW faculty and writing consultants were informed of special presentations/workshops sponsored by GSU CTW staff. Finally, the CTW ambassador provided end of the year surveys to CTW faculty to gain their perspective about their experiences, and what types of resources, training, or other support needed to continue the development of their CTW courses. Writing consultants were also asked to complete a short survey to help continue the development of support for upcoming writing consultants hired for the next academic year. The responses from the writing consultants were positive; no specific issue or concern was raised. Because consultants used email to communicate with students, it was noted that consultants need to have a good understanding how to use such features of Word programs as track changes. While it was noted that students did not utilize the consultants as expected, there were comments stating that it was gratifying to see how the writing skills progressed dramatically of students who took advantage of the consultants. Faculty also made similar comments about the progress of students who used the skills of the consultants; however, it was very clear that students who did not take advantage of the consultants did very poorly on the CTW assignment or their full writing potential was not realized, although acceptable. These four communication/information sharing mechanisms will become standard operating procedures for the School of Social Work, and it is believed it will help provide an ongoing opportunity to monitor and strengthen the CTW initiative in the School. These four communication/information sharing mechanisms will become standard operating procedures for the School of Social Work, and it is believed it will help provide an ongoing opportunity to monitor and strengthen the CTW initiative in the School.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

As noted under the section Major Achievements, the School of Social Work established a formalized orientation and training session for the GRA writing consultants. At the beginning of the Fall and Spring semesters, the writing consultants with the CTW faculty met
to discuss their roles, responsibilities and expectations for the academic semester. The general orientation was held in September, 2009 and Spring session was held January 2010. The CTW Consultant with the College of Health and Human Sciences was an important contributor to the sessions, and actually facilitating the Spring meeting. It is clear these sessions are important to ensure there is clarity and reduced risk of ambiguity by all parties. It was especially important for CTW faculty who have the primary responsibility of directing the work tasks of the writing consultants. While it was mandatory that the writing consultants attend 1-2 classroom sessions to meet the students and bear the assignment instructions with the classroom students, two of the CTW writing consultants took it upon themselves to attend classes on a weekly basis, allowing them to become fully engaged with the students, and have a strong understanding of the course writing assignments. Finally, all GRAs in the School of Social Work, which included CTW writing consultants, had to attend a mandatory library session with the Social Work librarian on how to conduct literature reviews and write annotated bibs, using social work bibliography resources, and the general uses of electronic materials in social work literature. This workshop not only helped the consultants in their own school work, but supported their work as writing consultants to social work students. This will continue to be done for all CTW initiatives in the future. Faculty members were encouraged to attend any CTW training sessions at the university level. Faculty noted that they learned essential information from the sessions, especially the session on developing and using rubrics in the courses.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

The general writing assignments for all three courses (SW3330, 3340, 3930) were altered following the pilot program in 2009. A brief description is presented below. SW3330: Students were required to write a case analysis of a family, incorporating both theory and practice methods. The writing assignment is in three parts: Part I: Application of Ecological and Systems Theory Concepts. Students were required to review a case study about a family and apply 5 concepts related to selected theories of practice, with supporting evidence/rationale. The information was presented in table format. In Part II of the assignment, students were required to present information on the multiple systems or institutions used by the family based on the case study, and developing an ecomap to illustrate the systems utilized. Again, the students presented the information in table format. Part III of the assignment was initiated as of this academic year based on previous discussions with faculty about strengthening the writing assignments in the course. This portion of the assignment required students to write a summary analysis of the case incorporating the following sections: Problem Statement, Literature Review, Ethics of Practice, Treatment/Intervention Strategy, and Recommendations. Using the information from Parts I and II, students were to write a case analysis to demonstrate their understanding of the case, as well as explain how they would use the knowledge gained in the case to support the development of the paper, as well as the final grading. The assignment rubric included the following sections: Critical Thinking, Development, Knowledge, Structure, Originality, Creativity, Audience, Grammar, and Citation. A template was provided to students on the structure of the final paper as part of the course syllabus, providing a brief overview of the structure of the paper including margins, text citations, spacing, fonts, etc. (See https://www.miracosta.edu/StudentServices/WritingCenter/Downloads/Health_nutrition_article_citation.pdf) Assignment Changes: There are two anticipated changes to this assignment. SW3330: Based on previous discussions with faculty, the CTW assignment for the course was once modified to enhance the writing skills of students. To complete the assignment, students were required to select a developmental issue or topic in adult life and examine/analyze the topic according to its relevance to the various stages of adulthood (young, middle, and late). The assignment required students to use peer-reviewed sources to support their assessments. The development of the paper is in three parts. Under Part I students develop a description of the proposed paper, including an explanation of the topic and its significance to understanding human development and social work practice. This section is viewed as the introduction to the final paper. Students are provided feedback from the instructor and/or writing consultant. The second part of the assignment is the development of a preliminary literature review on the selected topic. The section is designed to give students the opportunity to synthesize the literature on the topic, provided an overview of the significant research findings, as well as present a discussion of the assumptions, biases and limitations of the existing literature. Finally, the third part of the assignment is the development and submission of the final paper incorporating the introduction, literature review, critical analysis of research, time implications of findings to social work practice. A rubric was used to grade the assignment based on the following criteria: Critical Thinking, Development, Knowledge, Structure, Originality, Creativity, Audience, Grammar, and Citation. Assignment Changes: Faculty noted that students need additional support in identifying a topic for the CTW assignment. During the summer months faculty and the CTW ambassador will discuss how the assignment may be modified to provide additional support to students at the point of identifying a topic. Use of the writing consultants and the resources from the social work librarian will also be considered in the discussion to be a more intensive writing assignment experience. The social work profession is a practice intensive course based. The social work practice intensive writing assignment is part of the course and is required to track a state legislative bill during the legislative session. The assignment requires students to interact with a background research material on a social problem evident in the state of Georgia, interviews with state legislators and public representatives, as well as speak to persons/groups who may be impacted if the bill were to become state law. Students scheduled appointments with the writing consultant throughout the semester. In addition, the course instructors assigned one class date to meet with students to discuss the assignment with the assigned reading sections. A template was provided to students incorporating the assignment sections, including Problem Description, Policy Description, Policy Process, Personal Reflection. The grading criteria for the assignment is based on writing clarity, precision, relevancy, breadth, logic and mechanics. Other Possible Changes: A consideration that is being addressed by faculty regarding CTW assignments is students taking two CTW courses at one time. An observation by a faculty member regarding this issue is students seem to be overwhelmed with the writing assignments. Even though a course may have a paper assignment due, if this type of assignment is due in one or more courses it is very time consuming. As a result, it was noted that students may not focus on submitting a draft of a paper for a course, even if it provides a small percentage of the final grade, and only turn in the final paper. There is the sense that trying to meet the writing needs of each course moves students to make choices about what is submitted or how much attention is given to suggestions/recommendations about paper changes or other types of critical thinking assignments. It is not clear how the faculty may address this issue with students, but it will be a topic for discussion during a work session during the Fall faculty meeting prior to the start of the new academic year.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Instituting support services for the writing consultants has been an important step in the process of implementing the CTW initiative. As noted, Fall and Spring orientation and meetings were scheduled that provided an opportunity for CTW faculty and writing consultants to discuss their roles and responsibilities. Working in concert with the CTW consultant for the College, these sessions allowed faculty and students to share information on how best to engage students in the writing process, how to organize their thinking for assignments, and to identify the most appropriate resources for class assignments. Considering the impact the CTW initiative has had on faculty, there is a recognition by faculty that students are realizing the relevance of critical thinking and the necessity to have strong writing skills in social work practice. While the School has three CTW designated courses, all courses in the social work curriculum have an emphasis on critical thinking. The Council on Social Work Education, the accrediting body for schools of social work, has instituted core competencies for undergraduate social work programs. One mandated core competency is “apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgment” (CSWE, 2010). The specific practice behaviors for the competency include (1) distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom, (2) analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention and evaluation, (3) demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues. The CTW initiative supports
the CSWE mandate, giving faculty an opportunity to execute the standard in every course in the curriculum, not just the CTW designated courses. The results from the Fall semester CTW Student survey indicate how social work students relate to critical thinking through writing assignments. On a scale of 1-5, students responded to such questions as “The critical thinking through writing assignments in this course improved my ability to write like a member of my discipline”, “critical thinking is important in the field I plan to pursue beyond college”. Responses from students ranged from 3.4 - 5.0 with an average rating of 4.6. This score suggests students are beginning to recognize the importance of critical thinking and strong writing skills in social work practice, and incorporating them as part of their professionalization.

### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Most Important Accomplishments for Year

To support the CTW initiative, it was necessary to establish a process for communicating with faculty and GRA writing consultants during the academic year. Four mechanisms were established that serve as the core for the communication pattern for CTW personnel - Fall orientation, Spring meeting, and periodic "check-ins" with CTW faculty, and the end of the year survey with CTW faculty and writing consultants. These four mechanisms worked well for the 5 faculty teaching CTW courses, without overburdening them with meetings and/or paperwork. The Fall CTW orientation was planned and implemented on September 1, 2009 by the CTW ambassador for social work and the CTW consultant with the College of Health and Human Sciences. The agenda for the orientation included the following topics: Overview of Critical Thinking through Writing GSU Objectives - SACS Accreditation Designated CTW Social Work Courses & Faculty SW3330: Human Behavior in Social Environment I - CTW (Lewinson & Scott) SW3340: Human Behavior in Social Environment II - CTW (Ivery & Scott) SW3930: Social Welfare Policy – CTW (Beck & Breedlove) Responsibilities of CTW Consultants Attendance at CTW class sessions Familiarity with course assignments Meeting with students according to course requirements Completing student logs Attending Writing Consultant meetings In January, 2010 a Spring meeting was held with the writing consultants, facilitated by the CHHS CTW consultant to discuss the Fall semester experiences and to prepare for the Spring semester. Because the same writing consultants were used for the Fall and Spring semesters, the focus of the Spring meeting was to have the writing consultants discuss their experiences working with students, what they saw as their strengths/weaknesses as writing consultants, and any training needs required for the semester. The CTW ambassador conducted periodic "check-ins" with CTW faculty to determine the following: - students introduction to writing consultants during the initial weeks of course -planned time schedule, location, and/or process for writing consultants to meet with students - faculty and writing consultants communication process to discuss course assignments, feedback on reviewed coursework, and other challenges/positive outcomes during the consulting process - any challenges or needs the CTW faculty needed to support the CTW initiative during the academic semester. Finally, the CTW ambassador provided end of the year surveys to CTW faculty to gain their perspective about their experiences, and what types of resources, training, or other support needed to continue the development of their CTW courses. Writing consultants were also asked to complete a short survey to help continue the development of support for upcoming writing consultants hired for the next academic year. These four communication/information sharing mechanisms will become standard operating procedures for the School of Social Work, and it is believed it will help provide an ongoing opportunity to monitor and strengthen the CTW initiative in the School.

#### Challenges for Next Year

We will have more students in the BSW program, expanding the number of sections for CTW designated courses. Finding appropriate writing consultants will be a challenge as we move forward.

#### Modifications in Measurement Methods

Faculty teaching CTW courses will consider assignments for next academic year to determine if any changes or modifications are necessary. In particular, SW3340 CTW assignment may be modified to better support writing outcomes, building from SW3330. This issue will be discussed over the summer and fall semesters.

#### Publications and Presentations

An abstract was submitted to the 2010 Annual Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) to be held in Portland, OR in October. The abstract entitled Infusion of Critical Thinking in BSW Education: A Roundtable Discussion was accepted for a presentation. The roundtable will not only provide an opportunity to discuss how the School is incorporating critical thinking in the BSW curriculum, but to learn how other schools of social work are integrating it in their curricula.

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 CTW Sociology**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST)

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

#### Mission / Purpose

Assignments in CTW courses will be geared to develop students’ analytical, interpretive, and communication skills. Students will be assessed in terms of how well they are able, through their writing: to demonstrate their understanding of sociological research reports/articles/books/theories; to analyze and interpret these research reports/articles/books/theories; and to use results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions.

#### Goals

**G 1: critical understanding**

Students should demonstrate an understanding of the material presented in sociological research reports/articles/books/theories.

**G 2: critical writing**

Students should be able to write demonstrate they can critically analyze and interpret what they've read.

**G 3: original critical expansion**

Students should be able to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions in their writing.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: understanding (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Professors will evaluate students' demonstration of their understanding of sociological research/articles/books/theories on a four point scale, Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor (1).

**SLO 2: writing (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Professors will assess students' demonstration of their ability to analyze and interpret research/articles/books/theories on a four point scale: Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor.

**SLO 3: expansion (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Professors will assess students' demonstration of their ability to use results of analyses to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions on a four-point scale: Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor (1).

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: understanding (O: 1)**
Four professors reported on six CTW courses taught in the past academic year: three sections of "Sociological Methods"; one section of "Race and Urban Studies," and one section of "Crime and Punishment. Data were submitted on 115 students. Professors assessed 34% of students as "Excellent" in demonstrating their understanding of sociological material; they assessed 44% as "Very Good"; 14% as "Good"; and 9% as "Poor."

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

**Target for O1: understanding**
Our goal is to have a majority of students score "excellent" or "very good" (3 or 4) on this measure; 78% did.

**M 2: writing (O: 2)**
Four professors reported on six CTW courses taught in the past academic year: three sections of "Sociological Methods"; one section of "Race and Urban Studies," and one section of "Crime and Punishment. Data were submitted on 115 students. Professors assessed 33% of students as "Excellent" in demonstrating ability to analyze and interpret sociological material; they assessed 40% as "Very Good"; 17% as "Good"; and 11% as "Poor."

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

**Target for O2: writing**
Our goal is to have a majority of students score "excellent" or "very good" (3 or 4) on this measure; 73% did.

**M 3: expansion (O: 3)**
Four professors reported on six CTW courses taught in the past academic year: three sections of "Sociological Methods"; one section of "Race and Urban Studies," and one section of "Crime and Punishment. Data were submitted on 115 students. Professors assessed 37% of students as "Excellent" in demonstrating their ability to use results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions; they assessed 47% as "Very Good"; 20% as "Good"; and 11% as "Poor."

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

**Target for O3: expansion**
Our goal is to have a majority of students score "excellent" or "very good" (3 or 4) on this measure; 84% did.

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

**assessment tracking**
I will continue to gather and track assessment measures; our goal is that they (continue to) show a high level of achievement among students taking CTW courses. The data we gathered on this year's CTW courses show that students are achieving these goals well - professors rated 78% of students as "excellent" or "very good" in their ability to demonstrate "understanding"; 73% as "excellent" or "very good," in their demonstration of critical thinking in their writing (the "writing" measure); and 84% as "excellent" or "very good" in their ability to critically expand on ideas and research (the "expansion" measure).

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: I will communicate regularly with professors teaching CTW courses to inform them of the assessment process and to get their feedback on it.
- Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador

**CTW assignment development**
Faculty teaching CTW courses will have the opportunity to meet with me to discuss assignment development.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: CTW faculty will be invited to discuss curricular developments and assignment ideas.
- Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador

**development and promotion of offerings**
One goal of our CTW plan is to offer a diversity of offerings from our three specialty areas, "Gender and Sexuality," "Family, Health, and the Life Course," and "Race and Urban Studies," and general courses (in addition to our "Sociological Methods" course, which is now always a CTW course). Last year, we offered CTW courses in "Race and Urban Studies," "Crime and Punishment," and "Wealth, Power, and Inequality." Next year, we plan to offer CTW courses in "Social Psychology," "Sexuality," and "Sociology of the Family." The first CTW course we offered, in "Sociological Theory," did not make, because of confusion with the course numbering. (Our CTW courses must have different course numbers, and hence, different names, than our "regular" courses on the same subjects without the CTW component. This apparently confused students. We are using social networks to get the word out (listserv, facebook, twitter).)

We offered our first set of CTW courses, and have collected data on them. Everything seems to be going all right; there were some difficulties with students not understanding the course numbering system we had to adopt in order to separate our CTW courses from regular non-CTW courses with the same titles. I hope that the efforts we have taken to let students know about CTW courses this will not be as much of an issue in the future.

This year is the first year we are collecting data on CTW courses in a concerted way, because it is the first year we have run them officially. Our definition remains broad and effective, we think; but of course time will tell.

We strove to inform them, via a variety of social networking strategies, about the CTW courses, and had much greater success in the spring semester. We believe that as students come into the major knowing about the CTW requirement, this will cease to be a problem.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In concert with our Undergraduate Advisor and the Programming Committee, I will strive to diversify future offerings, and to monitor student satisfaction with the diversity of courses offered. We will also be attentive to any further confusion generated by the complexity of naming and numbering CTW courses to distinguish them from non-CTW courses.

Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador, Undergraduate Advisor, Programming Committee

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

This year is the first year we are collecting data on CTW courses in a concerted way, because it is the first year we have run them officially. Our definition remains broad and effective, we think; but of course time will tell.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

We offered our first set of CTW courses, and have collected data on them. Everything seems to be going all right; there were some difficulties with students not understanding the course numbering system we had to adopt in order to separate our CTW courses from regular non-CTW courses with the same titles. I hope that the efforts we have taken to let students know about CTW courses this will not be as much of an issue in the future.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

My contact with professors teaching CTW courses occurred informally and via email. I shared the general definition with them, made them aware of the assessment component of evaluation; and encouraged them to contact me with any specific questions. Since critical thinking is already a component of our courses, faculty did not need training about how to include it as a course component. Everything seems to be going pretty well except that there was some confusion among students over the course numbering of CTW courses (as mentioned in a previous answer).

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

I asked for faculty to submit examples of course assignments to me, and several did. I will not suggest changes to their assignments because I think they are doing a great job of designing assignments that elicit responses that indicate students' ability to engage in critical thinking.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

I think the greatest impact of our CTW program implementation has been twofold: that students have had greater opportunity to engage in writing revisions; professors have been able to focus on smaller groups of students (and conversely, students have enjoyed more attention from professors in these smaller groups). Critical thinking through writing was already a focus of these professors (and, indeed, of our faculty as a whole).

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

We collected data on CTW courses for the first time.

**Challenges for Next Year**

The main challenge will be to get the word out about the difference between CTW courses and regular courses with the same title. We are using social networks to get the word out (listserv, facebook, twitter). This situation should improve as students enter GSU with awareness of the CTW program and its requirements. The data we collected show that, over all, professors rate approximately 10% of students as doing poorly at demonstrating critical thinking and writing skills. This means that 90% are doing work that demonstrates this well (14-17%, depending on the measure), very well (40-44%, depending on the measure), or excellently (32-34%, depending on the measure). Roughly three quarters of our students demonstrate "very good" or "excellent" critical thinking skills, according to professors' assessments. We hope to maintain these statistical results in coming years.
**Mission / Purpose**

Following lengthy discussions among the faculty in our section, we decided on the following definition, which allows each instructor some room for customization: The writing assignments in our CTW courses will enable students to gain a better understanding of (choose one or more from the following options: commercial, financial, economic, literary, linguistic, cultural, social, historical, etc.) trends in the Spanish-speaking world, and equip students with the tools necessary to query their intellectual and personal positions with respect to the long and complex tradition of Hispanic cultural production, which at times intersects with other traditions with which students may be familiar, and at times diverges from them. Ultimately, students in our CTW courses will be able to comprehend Hispanic (see previous blank) within their cultural, intellectual, (commercial) and historical contexts, and engage these (texts?) in ways that are both intellectually rigorous and [personally meaningful].

**Goals**

G 1: CTW courses in the Spanish section will prepare students to engage fully with Hispanic societies and ideas.

- **a)** Contextual analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to identify and analyze cultural and historical traditions related to Hispanic culture.
- **b)** Textual analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to understand Hispanic literary texts and to analyze them with respect to basic literary concepts.
- **c)** Scholarly analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze scholarly arguments related to Hispanic culture and literary traditions.
- **d)** Effective written communication skills: students will demonstrate an ability to present their ideas and arguments corresponding to goals a-c in clear and persuasive prose.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Active reading skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**

SPAN 3307 Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts - One possible informal CTW assignment would require students to read all but the final paragraph of a story. Students will then be asked to write down the ending of the story as they imagine it; they will be intrigued if not shocked by the actual ending; at the very least, students will need to think of the story from an unusual vantage point and will need to pay very close attention to the story's subtleties, including the way it engages with cultural motifs.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Historical analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**

SPAN 3307 Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts - In another possible informal assignment, students would be asked to imagine in writing how one of our authors (a female poet/nun from late 17th-century Mexico) would respond to a contemporary feminist treatise by a Puerto Rican writer. Doing so will require students to process and compare currents of thought expressed by authors writing in very different times and places, but who actually have much in common intellectually.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Assessment Rubric (O: 1, 2)**

Score of 6 – Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view. Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event. Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. Makes ethical judgments. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas and is often nuanced and elegant. Errors are minimal to non-existent. Score of 5 – Does most of the following: Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. (Thinks through issues by) Identifying relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Offers analysis and evaluation of obvious alternative points of view. Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event. Justifies (by using) some results or procedures, explains reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons leads. Language clearly communicates ideas. Errors are minimal. Score of 4 – Does most of the following: Describes events, people, and places with some supporting details from the source. Makes connections to sources, either personal or analytic. Demonstrates a basic ability to analyze, interpret, and formulate inferences. States or briefly includes more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences, and points of view of others. Takes some risks by occasionally questioning sources, or stating interpretations and predictions. Demonstrates little evidence of rethinking or refinement of one's own perspective. Style is appropriate to genre of work. Score of 3 – Does most or many of the following: Responds by retelling or graphically showing events or facts. Makes personal connections or identifies connections within or between sources in a limited way. Is beginning to use appropriate evidence to back ideas. Discusses literature, experiences, and points of view of others in terms of own experience. Responds to sources at factual or literal level. Includes little or no evidence of refinement of initial response or shift in dualistic thinking. Demonstrates difficulty with organization and thinking is uneven. In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors in grammar and syntax are not frequent; there may be some problems of style. Score of 2 – Does most or many of the following: Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest and/or preconceptions. In many places language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax or other errors are distracting with little evidence of proofreading. Score of 1 – Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

When the Spanish section met on a number of occasions a couple of years ago in our attempt to establish a working definition of critical thinking for the section, there was quite a bit of vigorous intellectual debate and disagreement. This debate stemmed, in large part, from the very nature of our section, which is characterized by several fundamental (but perhaps necessary) disciplinary divisions. In order to have a definition that would be suitable for the entire section, we (as a section) decided to leave it deliberately open to customization. This is why our definition has so many blanks (with several corresponding terms available for insertion based on the needs and preferences of each instructor). Perhaps because of our lengthy debates and the resulting "open" definition we established, there has been no disagreement (or evolution) on it during the last two years.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

The most important CTW-related achievement for our degree program is that we now have a system in place to measure and promote the acquisition of relevant skills among our students. Although our students did not reach the target of 75% competence based on the rubric that we established last year in our action plan, we now have a measuring tool. Particularly useful this past year has been the streamlining of our CTW offerings from nearly a dozen courses at the capstone level, to just two.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general
impressions of the success of the meetings. Since there are only a couple of us per term who teach CTW courses, I decided to meet individually with the instructors. Although some of these meetings were planned in advance, most were ad hoc and were meant to respond to very particular CTW-related issues (oftentimes of a very practical nature: for example, syllabus requirements, quantity and scope of writing assignments, etc.). That stated, a significant percentage (at least half) of my contact with CTW faculty in the Spanish department involved short Q & A dialogues via email. I would say my meetings and other forms of contact with CTW faculty was effective/successful. There were few lingering problems that we had trouble addressing, and faculty have a sound, basic understanding of what CTW is and what their duties are. This understanding will only increase over the years, both for them and for me.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

My initial understanding (and the one I conveyed to the instructors in my section) on CTW assignments was colored by my earlier exposure to GSU's WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum) initiative. As a result, I promoted for CTW class a larger quantity of brief, low-stakes writing assignments. As I've learned more about CTW, however, I have come instead to promote less numerous and more targeted, substantive assignments that pay particular attention to our assessment rubric.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

The primary change within our major pertains to the organization and scope of our CTW course offerings. Because the Spanish section was reluctant at first to create a CTW capstone course (which would have greatly streamlined our CTW program), we decided instead to give the CTW designation to nearly a dozen of our 4000-level courses. These would complement our sole "gateway" course: SPAN 3307. Eventually, however, we realized how unwieldy such an arrangement (i.e., with so many CTW courses) could be, and decided instead to replace all the 4000-level courses with two at the 3000 level; it so happens that all of our majors are required to take either of the additional 3000-level courses. I am confident that our new arrangement will increase the efficiency and clarity of CTW program for everyone involved: given its simple organization, students, participating faculty, and the CTW ambassador in our section will more easily know the steps toward compliance with CTW requirements, and reporting on our CTW activities will become much more manageable than in our initial arrangement.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Speech
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

In Speech “critical thinking” is the art of actively producing and analyzing arguments for particular audiences in specific cultural and historical contexts. Critical thinkers are able to construct and assess arguments in their cultural situatedness; evaluate stated or unstated claims and their supporting forms; recognize the creation of knowledge through symbol systems; and converse and pose question about the production of knowledge through the communicative process.

Goals

G 1: Understand Cultural Context
Since the cultural context of any communicative act is critical to the understanding of that act, students should be able to recognize the cultural context, construct arguments clearly, and adapt those arguments to that cultural context.

G 2: Evaluation
Students should be able to evaluate supporting materials and conclusions effectively in their own analyses.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Analytical Reaction Essays (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
The purpose of an analytical essay is to demonstrate what students have learned from the textbook and apply those concepts elsewhere. These are to be based on articles, handouts, or videos provided to students throughout the semester. Essentially, students must analyze an outside text from a persuasive perspective.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

SLO 2: Essay Exams (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Two essay exams are given, one at the 1/3 point of the semester and the other at the 2/3 point of the semester. These exams require the students to summarize, analyze, and synthesize a large body of texts. They are graded rather strictly on argumentation and grammar.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Critical Thinking Rubric (O: 1, 2)**

Two assignments (in one section of the course, essay exams, and in the other section of the course, analytical essays) were given at two different points in the semester so that instructors could report improvement across time. The rubric enables calculation of two types of scores, Cultural Context and Evaluation scores. See the attached rubric. The Cultural Context score sums the first three items (recognizes cultural context, constructs arguments clearly, and adapts arguments to that cultural context). The Evaluation score sums the last two items (evaluates data/supporting materials effectively and evaluates claims/conclusions effectively).

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

**Target for O1: Analytical Reaction Essays**

Two targets were sought: First, students should improve their Cultural Context and Evaluation scores from Time 1 to Time 2. Second, 80% of all students should score 4 or 5 on each individual rubric item as measured at Time 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

18 students completed Analytical Reaction Essays. Target One: For the Cultural Context score, 15 students improved their score from Time 1 to Time 2, and 3 maintained the same score. For the Evaluation score, only 8 students improved their score from Time 1 to Time 2, but 9 students maintained the same score. Target Two: 88% of the students earned a 4 or 5 on four of the individual rubric items at Time 2. The four rubric items include: "constructs arguments clearly," "adapts arguments to that cultural context," "evaluates data/supporting materials effectively," and "evaluates claims/conclusions effectively." For the first rubric item, "recognizes the cultural context," 94% of the students earned a 4 or 5.

**Target for O2: Essay Exams**

Two targets were sought: First, students should improve their Cultural Context and Evaluation scores from Time 1 to Time 2. Second, 80% of all students should score 4 or 5 on each individual rubric item as measured at Time 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

17 students completed two essay exams. Target One: For the Cultural Context score, 11 students improved their scores from Time 1 to Time 2, and 5 students maintained their same scores. For the Evaluation score, only 6 students improved their scores from Time 1 to Time 2, but 10 students maintained their same scores. Target Two: On the item "constructs arguments clearly," 82% of all students earned a score of 4 or 5. On all of the other items, less than 80% of all students scored 4 or 5; specifically, 65% on item "recognizes cultural context," 76% on item "adapts arguments to that cultural context," 59% on item "evaluates data/supporting materials effectively," and 70% on item "evaluates claims/conclusions effectively."

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

**plan for next year**

how to improve process for next year - how to update, change, etc...

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Reaction Essays
- | Essay Exams

**Revise Rubric**

The rubric may need to be expanded or tailored more directly to individual assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: The speech faculty will review these results and the rubric in the fall to determine how the rubric should be revised.

Responsible Person/Group: All speech faculty

**Rubric Revision**

The rubric may need to be expanded or tailored more directly to individual assignments. The speech faculty will review these results and the rubric in the fall to determine how the rubric should be revised.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Reaction Essays
- | Essay Exams

Responsible Person/Group: All speech faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The definition remains the same, but mostly because we have only taught 3 sections of our CTW courses (one Spch 4800 in Spring 2009 and two Spch 3250 sections in Spring 2010). Because the courses have not had strong enough enrollments previously, they were canceled. Discussions in the fall will include conversations about the definition and our satisfaction with it. Feedback from the Spch 3250 instructors may be particularly helpful.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
The major CTW accomplishments this year involve two major issues: 1) having CTW courses "make" and 2) creating and utilizing a rubric for assessment. In our department, we have struggled to get enough enrollment in our newly created CTW courses. The speech major, as well as the other majors in our department, have been significantly revised, and most of those revisions have been approved by the appropriate university bodies. Even so, the department has struggled to inform students of some important changes. For example, students not yet required to take CTW courses did not realize that Spch 4800 Communication & Diversity could count as an elective. This course did not appear on any information provided to speech majors, but our undergraduate advising office and various faculty have sought to correct this. The course is being offered in Fall 2010 and currently has enough students enrolled to keep the course on the schedule. This past spring, we were able to teach 2 sections of our other CTW course, Spch 3250 Persuasion. Having our courses "make" should be easier as the requirement is explained AND as the new curriculum is clearly delineated for our majors. Our second accomplishment has been the creation and utilization of a new rubric measuring critical thinking for speech majors. The rubric needs further development, and discussions in the fall will include a thorough and critical discussion of the rubric.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
The workshops and trainings in the past year were minimally successful. The Department of Communication was involved in a self study, and that intensive project interfered with the ability to conduct workshops for the entire speech faculty. As a result, I held one-on-one meetings with the CTW instructors for spring 2010. Only 3 faculty were involved, but the rubric was created and adopted. The discussions in these meetings were productive, but we agreed that a fall meeting for all speech faculty will help tremendously. At this meeting (or preferably, a series of meetings), the speech faculty will review our definition of critical thinking, the rubric being used to assess our students, and the assignments offered in the past.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
We have a few different assignments now, but saying they’ve "evolved" would be inaccurate. Our former CTW ambassador left the university and he taught a different CTW course than the ones we taught this past spring; thus, the assignments have simply been different. Based on my observations and assessments, I will suggest we create a menu of assignments that faculty could choose among AND that we create assignments specifically geared toward particular pieces of our definition for critical thinking. A larger, final project might be able to include all elements of our definition, but the assessment and follow-up discussion with the two instructors indicate that parts of the rubric may have been irrelevant to particular assignments. Consistency of assignments across sections of the same CTW course is another issue we will need to address.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
It is really too soon to say much here. The faculty are excited about our new capstone course, Spch 4800 Communication & Diversity, but only the Persuasion course was taught this past year. (Spch 4800 was offered in the fall, but lack of enrollment caused two sections to be canceled.) Although persuasion is now Spch 3250, it was originally part of our speech major curriculum as a 4000-level course. This is the first year, then, that it has been taught as a CTW course. The instructors were very concerned about their students' ability to write effectively, let alone to provide evidence of critical thinking skills. These faculty felt the course made them and their students more aware of the students' problems with writing.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 CTW Women’ Studies
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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 the 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. These courses will help students develop cognitive and analytical skills necessary to fulfill our learning outcomes: they will be able to identify and analyze arguments, they will be able to demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives pertinent to women's studies, they will be able to demonstrate their writing skills as defined by the ability to organize material, provide sufficient evidence, and formulate new research questions.

Goals
G 1: Process of constructing arguments
These courses will help students develop cognitive and analytical skills necessary to fulfill our learning outcomes: they will be able to identify and analyze arguments, they will be able to demonstrate their writing skills as defined by the ability to organize material, provide sufficient evidence, and formulate new research questions.

**G 2: Demonstration of knowledge**
Students will be able to demonstrate both their knowledge of the field(s) and ability to use feminist/womanist perspectives in their work.

**G 3: Critical thinking through reading**
Students will demonstrate their ability to critically interpret texts, including finding main points and outlining arguments.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Identify main points and arguments (G: 3) (M: 2)**
In 3010, Students will identify and analyze main points and theoretical arguments in their readings for class, as shown in their weekly papers.

**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

**Standard Associations**
- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**SLO 2: demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives (G: 2) (M: 1)**
In 3010, students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate feminist and womanist theoretical perspectives, as demonstrated by writing assignments.

**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

**Standard Associations**
- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**SLO 3: writing skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
In 3010, students will demonstrate writing skills through their ability to organize material, provide sufficient evidence, and articulate a coherent thesis in their final papers.

**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

**Standard Associations**
- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**SLO 4: Demonstrate writing skills (G: 1) (M: 3)**
For 4920/4950, students will demonstrate writing skills through their ability to formulate new research questions, organize material, provide substantial evidence, and formulate clear and concise sentences.

**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

**Standard Associations**
- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**SLO 5: Theoretical Perspectives (G: 2) (M: 3)**
In 4920/4950, students will demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use appropriate feminist/womanist perspectives.
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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 6: Apply skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)
In 4920/4950, students will show that they can apply interdisciplinary women’s studies knowledge and skills to a particular project, such as the final paper.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

SLO 7: Connect to lived experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students will be able to demonstrate that they can connect what they have learned to lived experiences; in other words, they can demonstrate the implications of their project beyond the university, as shown by their papers and journals.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: In 3010, Final Paper (O: 2, 3)
Students will prepare their own question for this assignment. Rather than answering the questions the teacher has posed, the student will formulate a question that calls for an engagement with multiple authors. Learning to construct a meaningful question and then answering it will provide students with the basic skill needed to write longer research papers and reflective essays. Formulating research topics and questions upon which to build a research paper is one of the most difficult exercises for students. This step-by-step approach is designed to build on earlier writing/analytical skills developed in the weekly papers. By the end of the term the student will be able to identify relevant theoretical questions or paradoxes within a range of texts and will be able to construct a short essay (5-6 pages) that is coherent, logical and persuasive. Cite at least three authors from class. Total number of citations must be at least three. Note this paper will be peer-reviewed.

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

**Target for O2: demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives**
We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The average for this topic is 4.3. All Students achieved at least a satisfactory, and in fact all achieved a 4 or 5. In this outcome, we achieved our target.

**Target for O3: writing skills**
Again, on each item of the rubric associated with writing skills, our target is for 75% of students to achieve a 4 or 5, and for all students to receive a 3.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
On the first item in the rubric, clearly lay out main argument, the average is 3. While that meets our target for 75% of students to achieve a 4 or 5. On the second item in the rubric, clearly identify the body of literature, students did worse than on any other aspect. As the average was 2.7 here, neither of our targets were met. On the third outcome in the rubric, clear and detailed examples to support points, the average result is a 4. While there was a single score of 3, both targets were met. On the fourth aspect, the writing style is appropriate for an academic, scholarly paper, student average was 3.7 This score is actually very close to the target, although technically not met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Unknown (O: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Identify main points and arguments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We found that the average score on student papers for this is a 4.3, where all students received at least a 4. Students seem to be doing well in terms of their ability to identify main points and arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Writing skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students received an average score of 3.3 on this outcome. While all students met the sufficient category, we do hope that we can help more students receive a 4 or 5 on this aspect of the measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: In 4920/4950, Final Paper (O: 4, 5, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrate writing skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both students enrolled in this capstone did an excellent job in terms of demonstrating their writing skills. In general, we are encouraged to do more of the same here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Theoretical Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both students did an excellent job in demonstrating theoretical perspectives. In both papers, students could have gone further in exploring the implications of their research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Apply skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Connect to lived experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hope that 75% of students will achieve at least a good (on a 1-5 scale where 1 is poor, 2 is needs improvement, 3 is satisfactory, 4 is good, and 5 is excellent), and all students will achieve at least a 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the students also met this goal, with excellence. It is very hard to generalize from such a small sample size, and I look forward to reading these with the future papers to see if our assessment is effective or if it is more a question of circumstance in the past year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Explore ramifications**

One thing that we noticed in assessing the results of the capstone class is that students could explore the implications of their research in more detail. In particular, we would like to help students work on how to use their research to contribute to the theoretical perspectives they are utilizing, in order to increase the integration of theory and results.
Peer Review
While we established a revisionary process for the 3010 class this year, we realized that we could strengthen the process through providing more stringent guidelines for peer review and establishing ways to hold students accountable for their participation in the process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: In 3010, Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: writing skills

 Responsible Person/Group: Julie Kubala and Amira Jarmakani

The main accomplishments, again in both classes, have to do with the revision component. As part of our CTW plan, we decided to formalize a revision component in the writing process for both 3010 and the 4920/4950. For 3010, we integrated a peer-review process in order to allow students to revise their final paper; in the upper level courses, we required a revision based on a draft submitted to the faculty adviser. Here is Dr. Sinnott's response to the question about peer review for 3010: Reading other student work can be an enlightening experience that transforms the way students approach their own writing; they have an opportunity to see both models of well crafted and successful essays and essays that are not as successful. Both types of papers are analyzed by the students giving them a chance to critically explore the techniques and strategies for writing effectively. At its best, peer review can transform the experience of writing that most students have had in which the student writes for a teacher and the teacher judges and grades the student work. Peer review allows for students to understand writing as a tool of communication rather than just a means for the student to be evaluated and graded by a teacher. However, for this dynamic to be transformed students must be willing to step outside of the role of the student as a graded and evaluated subject and see themselves as an equal participant in an exchange of ideas. The overall assignment had mixed results. The assignment required that students have a working draft prepared one month before the end of the semester and this required that they begin working on the paper early in the semester. This deadline helped avoid the problem of last minute paper writing in the last week of class. The students continued to revise their papers after they turned them in for peer review since they already had a working draft. However, the actual peer review process had limited success. Many of the drafts were not polished enough to adequately review. The students were told to make constructive comments to help improve the papers, and therefore “yes” or “no” answers to the questions on the peer review sheet were not useful. They were also instructed to write comments on the paper itself. I noticed that many of the peer review sheets had minimal comments and students did in fact respond with “yes” or “no” responses. A few of the students took the assignment seriously and gave extensive comments on the papers they had to review, but felt that their fellow students did not adequately review their papers. The students who turned in very rough and unfinished drafts usually did a poor job in reviewing other student papers. A solution may be to conduct the peer reviews in class and to model for the students what a useful peer review might look like. There also needs to be a way to make students accountable for the effort they put into reviewing other student papers. In 4920, the revision component proved especially useful this last year. Both students enrolled in the class are strong students who are deeply invested in their grades, so they were willing to work and revise until they had top-notch papers. In order for this to be so successful, though, they also both took incompletes in the fall and finished the paper in Spring semester. While there is no doubt that the extra time allowed them to successfully revise their projects, it is also true that they needed incompletes because both their projects involved completing IRB.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Once again, most of these are small and informal since our entire department is deeply committed to CTW. Also, much of this involved individual meetings with Megan Sinnott, since she is the other teacher of a CTW class. Before the beginning of fall semester, we will expand our discussion to include Amira Jarmakani, who is teaching 3010 this upcoming fall.
**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...
An understanding of multiple factors in offering, adoption and usage of UPIS services · An awareness of emerging trends and development in UPIS

**O/O 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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**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

**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

**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 not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources.

**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. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 1: 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. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.
## 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, 4)**
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
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Critical Thinking
- Quantitative Skills
- Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
- Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

### Strategic Plan Associations
- Interdisciplinary Programs
- 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
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues
- Quantitative Skills
- Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
- Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

### Strategic Plan Associations
- New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

**SLO 2: Effectively plans for instruction (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Critical Thinking
- Contemporary Issues
- Quantitative Skills
- Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

---

**SLO 2: Plans effectively for instruction (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**

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
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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 3)**

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
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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**SLO 3: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 2, 3) (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.

**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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

SLO 4: Fosters relationships with school and community (G: 4) (M: 1)
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

SLO 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)
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
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
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 3, 4)
Teacher candidates 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. They know and use ethical and professional guidelines related to educational practice. Teacher candidates foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being. 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

Institutional Priority Associations
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Supported Reading Project (O: 1, 2, 2, 3, 4)**

Teacher candidates have multiple opportunities in their course and field experience 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. Candidate based on her/his teaching performance, assignments and professionalism as demonstrated during student teaching, outcomes and the rubric is aligned to the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. The university supervisor rates the teacher candidate using a 5 point scale rubric (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 practice. The Final Student Teaching Evaluation contains an overall evaluation of the candidate's competencies across all 5 learning outcomes. The candidate uses content knowledge to plan and implement the integrated thematic unit, motivate and manage students, and assess 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 for 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 achieve 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

**M 2: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM) (O: 3, 4)**

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 KWL 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 achieve 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 O4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve at least a rating of 4 (“adequately met”) on a 5 point scale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.65 and a modal score of 4. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 3.7 and a modal score of 4. Fall 2009 data was collected manually as raw scores were converted to mean scores. Spring 2010 data was collected using the new assessment management system, LiveText, that converted rubric ratings to mean scores. Thus, data reports in the repository appear in different formats.

**M 3: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Teacher candidates in the ECE BSE Traditional and Dual Certification Programs are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performances 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 (“not met”).
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**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 3 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 4.67. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 4.73.

**Target for O2: Plans effectively for instruction**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 3 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 4.56. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 4.52. Two to four students did not achieve the target in the area of planning a learning module in their initial submission. Candidates are required to work closely with their cooperating teacher and university supervisor to revise and resubmit the sections of the module that were below the target. Subsequently, all candidates achieved the target of 3 ("satisfactory") on their final student teaching evaluation.

**Target for O3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 3 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 4.63. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 4.77.

**Target for O4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 3 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score 4.53. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 4.68.

**Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 3 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 4.72. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 4.89.

**M 4: Dispositions (O: 5)**

The new Dispositions Survey (implemented fall 2010 and forward) called Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals is a university supervisor rating of candidates’ dispositions (values and actions) as observed in clinical practice in the following areas: Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful Purpose and Vision. Data presents mean scores across these five areas.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 4.0 on a 5 point scale at the completion of student teaching (clinical practice). A rating of 5.0 is expected one year post graduation.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 4 with a mean score of 4.44. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 4.26. These ratings are based on spring 2010 data. Fall 2009 data is not available.

**M 4: GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood & Special Education (O: 1)**

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 O1: Demonstrates content knowledge**

A passing score determined by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission on initial teacher certification is required for teacher certification Early Childhood and Special Education.
### Findings 2009-2010

Target: **Met**

All program candidates recommended for teacher certification received passing scores on the GACE. Score reports are not available for the repository.

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** 2009-2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** BSE faculty and student teaching supervisors
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-STEP Standard 5.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010, fall and spring semesters
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: BSE Faculty and Student Teaching Supervisors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

ESOL Endorsement: Assessment Methods
Current data from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation indicate "met" targets in all areas; however, it was noted that the lowest ratings were identified in the areas of planning and assessment. 08-09 assessments also showed lowest ratings in these areas. In follow-up to these results, the BSE program has been revised beginning fall 2010 to require the ESOL Endorsement for all "traditional – non dual certification" program students. This decision was made in an effort to address the changing demographics and pupil needs in metro Atlanta as noted in the ECE strategic plan and to improve preparation of pre-service teachers in the areas of planning for differentiated instruction and assessment. Faculty will closely monitor these areas and note any differences in data.
The mission of Birth Through Five (B-5) is to provide an exemplary, interdisciplinary teacher preparation program for early care and education professionals, in order to positively impact the quality of programs for very young children in the urban metropolitan Atlanta region. The program prepares new teachers, current teachers or career changers for employment in varied settings with very young children (birth through Kindergarten) both typically developing and those with special education needs. Graduates of the program are well prepared for jobs as certified teachers, administrators, or early education specialists in the Birth Through Five and Preschool Special Education fields. Our program is committed to principles and practices that are respectful of the unique characteristics of the children, families, and teacher candidates with whom we work.

The new B-5 program (opened Fall, 2008) provides a unique collaboration with the Georgia System of Technical Colleges (formerly DTAE). A USG-DTAE articulation agreement allows a pathway to the bachelor's degree completion for students with an Associates Degree in Early Care and Education from an accredited technical college program. (As of May, 2010 nineteen (19) students have been admitted to the B-5 program, with 44 identified as B-5 majors).

**Goals**

**G 2: Candidates Will Use Standards-Based Practices**

Candidates will be 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 the Education of Young
Children (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 BSQ program provides coursework and field experiences with diverse age groups and with children who have varied educational abilities and developmental needs. Candidates will graduate with strong competencies for working with children with disabilities and their families and be awarded the Preschool Education Endorsement. Course 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 year olds; 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, 3) knowledge of the child's cultural background.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Promotes child development and learning (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
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, 2, 3)**
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

**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
### Strategic Plan Associations

| 3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery) |
| 3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs |
| 6.1 Recruitment |
| 6.2 Undergraduate Experience |

### SLO 3: Uses assessments to support learning/development (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)

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: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)

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, 2, 3)

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
### 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 (5) 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 which is taken early in the program. They submit “practice” artifacts and rationales and receive feedback based on a “formative rubric.” A B-5 Portfolio Review Schedule divides up the 15 total standards and shows the semester each standard must be addressed during an end of semester benchmark conference. Candidates develop a variety of artifacts each semester (Fall, Methods I- Infant/Toddler), Spring, Methods II (Preschool/Pre-K/ Kindergarten), and Student Teaching, and submit these artifacts for summative review by course instructors/field supervisors. The artifacts include assignments from college courses, work setting or field placements. Examples of artifacts are lesson plans, child case studies, research reviews, and classroom project photo documentation. The assessment rubric (summative) allows the reviewer to assign a rating of NA (not applicable or not due at this time), 0 (not met), 1 (meets expectations) and 2 (exceeds expectations) to each standard. Candidates must revise and resubmit any rationales/artifacts assessed as 0 (not met).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Promotes child development and learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will obtain a rating of &quot;met standard&quot; for the artifact (work product) and rationale (written reflection) linked to understanding child development and learning (NAEYC 1, CEC 2, 3, as assigned). A rating of &quot;met&quot; demonstrates that the candidate produced a high quality artifact, can explain how their artifact relates to the standard and can justify how the artifact displays their competence in this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates obtained the achievement target. 75% (9 candidates) received a rating of "met standard" and 25% (3) received a rating of "exceeded standard." This finding is consistent with the emphasis placed on child development knowledge and application in B-5 coursework and field settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Builds family-community relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will obtain a rating of &quot;met standard&quot; for the artifact (work product) and rationale (written reflection) linked to family and community relations (NAEYC 2, CEC 8, 9, 10, as assigned). A rating of &quot;met&quot; demonstrates that the candidate produced a high quality artifact, can explain how their artifact relates to the standard and can justify how the artifact displays their competence in this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

No e-portfolio artifacts or rationales were assigned this assessment cycle for standards linked to family and community relations. This is an unintended flaw in the assessment design! By the time these candidates are "completers," this measure (e-portfolio) will have addressed all standards/outcomes and data for this specific achievement target will be available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Uses assessments to support learning/development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of teaching candidates will obtain &quot;satisfactory&quot; or &quot;exceeds expectations&quot; on the portfolio rubric rating for &quot;impact on student learning.&quot; This rating includes scores on the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project from 73 - 92 (satisfactory) or 93 - 100 (exceeds).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

No e-portfolio artifacts or rationales were assigned this assessment cycle for standards linked to assessment. This is an unintended flaw in the assessment design! By the time these candidates are "completers," this measure (e-portfolio) will have addressed all standards/outcomes and data for this specific achievement target will be available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Demonstrates effective teaching methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of candidates will obtain a rating of &quot;met standard&quot; for the artifact (work product) and rationale (written reflection) linked to instruction and planning (NAEYC 4, CEC 4, 5, 7, as assigned). A rating of &quot;met&quot; demonstrates that the candidate produced a high quality artifact, can explain how their artifact relates to the standard and can justify how the artifact displays their competence in this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates obtained the achievement target. 41% (5 candidates) received a rating of "met standard" and 58% (7) received a rating of "exceeded standard." This finding is consistent with the emphasis of developmentally appropriate teaching practices in the four methods courses. Additionally, candidates have over 900 clock hours of field experiences throughout the B-5 program to practice effective teaching methods with children age birth through five.
Target for O5: Exhibits professional and ethical conduct

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of "met standard" for the artifact (work product) and rationale (written reflection) linked to understanding child development and learning (NAEYC 5, CEC 9, 10, as assigned). A rating of "met" demonstrates that the candidate produced a high quality artifact, can explain how their artifact relates to the standard and can justify how the artifact displays their competence in this standard.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

No e-portfolio artifacts or rationales were assigned this assessment cycle for standards linked to professional and ethical conduct. This is an unintended flaw in the assessment design! By the time these candidates are "completers," this measure (e-portfolio) will have addressed all standards/outcomes and data for this specific achievement target will be available.

M 2: IEP/IFSP Project (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Birth-Five candidates will receive the Preschool Special Education Endorsement upon program completion. This project will provide the opportunity to develop a sample IFSP or an IEP for a young child with special needs. An IEP is the formal plan that teachers, parents and specialists develop to meet the educational needs of a student ages 3-21 who is eligible for special education services. An IFSP is the formal plan that describes a child's and family's needs and the services to be provided for children with disabilities from birth through age three. Candidates will develop the formal plan during enrollment in the method course for exceptional children EXC 4530. Content for the IEP and IFSP will be covered in the two methods courses for children with disabilities EXC 4530 (Infants/Toddlers) and EXC 4530 (Preschool/PreK). A 32 point rubric aligned with NAEYC and CEC standards will be used to rate/score the candidate's project on eight (8) indicators. Ratings include: mastery (4), accomplished (3), developing (2), and beginning (1). Candidates are expected to receive a rating of at least "developing" on each indicator at this point in the program since it may be their first exposure to the IEP/IFSP process and it proceeds their full-time student teaching experience.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Promotes child development and learning

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all indicators, including those indicators aligned with promoting child development and learning.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The achievement target was met. 100% of candidates received a rating of at least "developing" on indicators associated with promoting child development and learning.

Target for O2: Builds family-community relationships

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all eight indicators demonstrating their ability to plan effectively for children's development and learning.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The achievement target was met. 100% of candidates received a rating of at least "developing" on those indicators associated with family and community relations.

Target for O3: Uses assessments to support learning/development

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all indicators, including those indicators aligned with using assessment to support learning/development.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The achievement target was not met. More than 85% of candidates (2) received ratings below "developing" on three indicators associated with using assessments to support learning and development.

Target for O4: Demonstrates effective teaching methods

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all indicators, including those indicators aligned with planning for effective teaching methods.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The achievement target was met. 100% of candidates received ratings of at least "developing" on indicators related to planning for effective teaching.

Target for O5: Exhibits professional and ethical conduct

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all indicators, including those indicators aligned with professional and ethical practice.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The achievement target was met. 100% of candidates received ratings of at least "developing" on indicators related to professional and ethical practice.

M 3: Evaluation of Field Performance (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Candidates for the B-5 degree and certification program are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performance and dispositions that are essential for high quality early care and education. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children and families, as well as in the university coursework. An evaluation rubric has been designed based upon the NAEYC and DEC/CEC national standards for initial teacher licensure that serve as the framework for the B-5 program. Evaluations of Field Performance will be completed in three (3) field based courses: BRFV 4380 Methods for Infants and Toddlers (4); BRFV 4390 Methods for Preschool/Pre-Kindergarten & Kdgnd Children (4) and BRFV 4661 Student Teaching (9-12). Candidates are required to complete
900 hours of field experiences over the course of the program; 100 clock hours of field experiences are completed in each of the following categories: with infants/toddlers, with preschool/Pre-Kindergarten students and with Kindergarten-age students. A minimum of 100 hours of field experiences must also be in settings inclusive of children with special needs. Student teaching, or full time clinical practice requires 400-500 clock hours in one early childhood education setting. At the completion of methods courses requiring field experiences, candidates’ field performance will be evaluated by the cooperating classroom teacher (or center director in the case of work-based field placements) and the university supervisor who visits the candidate’s field placement. These evaluations will be collected and reviewed by the university supervisor and the B-5 program coordinator. Candidates must receive ratings of “meets standard” or “exceeds standard” for 85% of the 19 possible (applicable/observed) standards in order to advance to student teaching. (There could be standards that the candidate does not have the opportunity to demonstrate as a novice in an early field placement, for example, “candidate involves families and community in the child’s development.”) Based on the target, candidates can receive no more than three (3) “not mets” for applicable standards. If candidates do not demonstrate that they have met the standard, additional field opportunities, coaching, and action plans will be required until mastery of standards is demonstrated at the level of 85%. At the completion of student teaching, candidates will also receive a final evaluation of field performance by their supervising teacher (or director) and university supervisor. Candidates must receive 100% ratings of “meets standard” or “exceeds standard” in order to successfully complete student teaching and be recommended for certification. If candidates do not demonstrate that they have met this performance standard, additional field opportunities, coaching, and action plans will be required until mastery of standards is demonstrated at the level of 100%.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Promotes child development and learning**

85% of candidates will receive ratings of “meets standard” for 85% of all standards, including those specifically focused on promoting child development and learning (NAEYC 1a, b, c).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The data reported is for candidates “in progress” with no program completers at this assessment cycle. Thus, this assessment is formative and based on evaluations of performance in field placements prior to student teaching. At the end of student teaching, candidates will receive summative assessments of field performance. Four (4) separate evaluations are reported for each candidate: ratings from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor; ratings in the preschool or Pre-K placement and ratings in the Kindergarten placement. 100% of candidates obtained a rating of “meets standard” or “exceeds standard” for 85% of all standards, including those standards focused on family and community relationships. (NAEYC 2a, b, c).

**Target for O2: Builds family-community relationships**

85% of candidates will receive ratings of “meets standard” for 85% of all standards, including those specifically focused on family and community relationships. (NAEYC 2a, b, c).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

The achievement target was partially met. The data reported is for candidates "in progress" with no program completers at this assessment cycle. Thus, this assessment is formative and based on evaluations of performance in field placements prior to student teaching. At the end of student teaching, candidates will receive summative assessments of field performance. Four (4) separate evaluations are reported for each candidate: ratings from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor; ratings in the preschool or Pre-K placement and ratings in the Kindergarten placement. 100% of candidates obtained a rating of “meets standard” or “exceeds standard” for 85% of the standards, including those standards focused on family and community relations. However, a number of cooperating teachers and university supervisors rated these relevant standards as "no opportunity to observe." It appears that in these early practicum experiences, especially if the intern was only in the setting one day per week, some interns had little access to families or community agencies. It is expected that during their full time student teaching, all candidates will have access to families (i.e, parent conferences, curriculum night, etc.). If data on this outcome shows many ratings of "no opportunity to observe" on the student teaching evaluation, we may consider a couple of alternative action plans: 1) create additional assignments where interns must interact with families and community agencies during the early field placement, or 2) use an assignment from the course BRFV 4400 Family and Community Relations as a measure of this outcome, rather than the evaluation of field performance.

**Target for O3: Uses assessments to support learning/development**

85% of candidates will receive ratings of "meets standard" for 85% of all standards, including those specifically focused on assessment (NAEYC 3 a, b, c, d).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The achievement target was met. The data reported is for candidates "in progress" with no program completers at this assessment cycle. Thus, this assessment is formative and based on evaluations of performance in field placements prior to student teaching. At the end of student teaching, candidates will receive summative assessments of field performance. Four (4) separate evaluations are reported for each candidate: ratings from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor; ratings in the preschool or Pre-K placement and ratings in the Kindergarten placement. 100% of candidates obtained a rating of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for 85% of all standards, including those standards focused on assessment.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates effective teaching methods**

85% of candidates will receive ratings of "meets standard" for 85% of all standards, including those specifically focused on effective teaching and planning methods (NAEYC 4 a, b, c, d).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The achievement target was met. The data reported is for candidates "in progress" with no program completers at this assessment cycle. Thus, this assessment is formative and based on evaluations of performance in field placements prior to student teaching. At the end of student teaching, candidates will receive summative assessments of field performance. Four (4) separate evaluations are reported for each candidate: ratings from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor; ratings in the preschool or Pre-K placement and ratings in the Kindergarten placement. 100% of candidates obtained a rating of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for 85% of all standards. Consistently, the highest ratings by both cooperating teachers and university supervisors alike was on standard 4a “connecting with children and families.” However, two of 12 candidates received a rating of "does not yet meet" for standards focused on effective teaching methods. Individual professional action plans were prescribed for both candidates.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating professional and ethical practices in this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: e-Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Exhibits professional and ethical conduct
- **Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating family and community relations this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: e-Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Builds family-community relationships
- **Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in family and community relations this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: e-Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Uses assessments to support learning/development
- **Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes were made 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 were made in the assessment process last year as the program was new (first admissions in Spring 2009) with no program completers this assessment cycle. There will be several changes and improvements in the assessment process in the coming year. Goals and learning outcomes will be revised to better align with broad categories for state and national accreditation assessment processes and reporting. Four new measures will be added to assess learning outcomes. I.) Goals will be revised, as follows: 1.) Content Knowledge: The teacher candidate will possess the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum they teach. 2.) Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills: The teacher candidate will possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be able to plan and teach effectively. 3.) Student Learning: The teacher candidate will use varied instructional strategies, assessment techniques and critical reflection to document children’s development and learning. 4.) Diversity: The teacher candidate will collaborate with diverse professionals to meet the cultural, linguistic, learning, and behavioral needs of all learners. II.) Learning Outcomes will be revised, as follows: 1.) Demonstrates content knowledge: The teacher candidate understands child development and learning and the central concepts of the subject areas she/he teaches and creates learning experiences that are developmentally appropriate. Measures: (new measures) Grade Point Average (GPA): (program exit) - Target: 2.75 or better; Licensure Exam (GACE Birth Through Five, 005, 006) - Target: Passing Score 2.) Plans effectively for development and learning: The teacher candidate plans for the educational progress of children based upon knowledge of the individual student, curriculum and behavioral goals, family goals and community resources. Measures: (current measures) Individualized Educational Plan (IEP/IPSP) Project - Target: Minimum Rating of “Developing” Evaluation of Field Performance - Target: Minimum Rating of “Meets Standards” 3.) Uses assessment methods to document student learning: The teacher candidate understands the goals and benefits of assessment and uses formal and informal strategies to evaluate the continuous physical, social, language, and cognitive development of the learner. Measures: (new measure) Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project - Target: 80/100 4.) Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions: The teacher candidate knows and uses the ethical guidelines of the early childhood profession. She/he uses reflection to improve practice and displays interpersonal and communication skills with diverse learners, families and colleagues. Measures: (new measure) Teacher Education Dispositions Survey - Target: 3.0/4.0

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 mid-program assessment measures used this year will be modified. The IEP/IPSP project and rubric, used to assess the candidate’s skill in individualized educational planning, showed that 61% of candidates scored below target on three indicators of the rubric. An analysis of candidate’s work and rubric ratings revealed that these lower ratings did not result from their lack of knowledge, but because they did not follow assignment instructions. These instructions will be clarified on future assessments. A new measure was developed to more specifically determine each candidate’s ability to use assessment techniques to document children’s learning during clinical practice (student teaching). The Documentation of Learning (DOL) project focuses on varied assessment strategies and documentation formats (photographic and narrative). The achievement target for teacher candidates is 80/100 points. We believe that the DOL Project is a strong and focused measure of candidate’s assessment skills (as part of the candidate’s broader professional portfolio).
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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 the ECE 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
Normal 0 false false false 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

The third goal for the program is to develop the habits of maintaining learning as a lifelong process. Teachers adapt to the changing needs of the school and their own growth as quality educators. Doing so requires the development of the understandings and skills needed to discover the answers to ongoing educational issues through learning challenges and opportunities.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Shows commitment to learning and development (M: 1, 4, 6)**

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 educator's mission extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their learners to address the needs of the whole child and the development of a nurturing learning environment.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #1; PSC Standard Domain: Effects on P-12 Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
<td></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>

**SLO 2: Applies expertise for learning and development (M: 2, 4, 5, 6)**

Educators appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organized and linked to other disciplines. Educators have specialized knowledge about how to convey content to learners. Educators generate multiple paths to learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #2; PSC Standard Domain: Content Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></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>

**SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 1, 2, 5)**

Educators call on multiple methods to meet clearly defined goals. Educators orchestrate learning in different groupings and settings. Educators place a premium on learners' engagement. Educators regularly assess learners' progress.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #3; PSC Standard Domain: Clinical Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
<td></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>

**SLO 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 3, 4, 5)**

Educators are models for life-long learning, exemplifying the ideals they seek to inspire in others. Educators seek advice from others and draw on educational research and scholarship to improve their practice and make principled judgments.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #4; PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Content Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students</td>
<td></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>

**SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities (M: 1, 3, 4)**

Educators collaborate with other professionals to make schools more effective. Educators find ways to work collaboratively with parents and caregivers engaging them in the work of the school in multiple ways and through creative avenues. Educators take advantage of a school's surrounding community as a resource for learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #6; PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Clinical Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles &amp; life circumstances of students</td>
<td></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>
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Disposition Survey (NBPTS) (O: 1, 3, 5)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Program instructors complete 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 data is used as one key assessment for TSS completion and the end of the program data is used for follow-through and as Ed.S. program exit point. Students also complete the survey independently at these two points.
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Each Ed.S. participant is rated by the Ed.S. 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-Intermediate (4+); End of the Program-Advanced (5+). We increased the achievement targets this year from 3 to 4 for the midpoint and 4 to 5 for end of the program completion.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Overall Disposition Rating Met, Item 2.1 Not Met Data Table: NBPTS Advanced Program Survey for Faculty Summer 2009: Program Completers Fall 2009: Midpoint Program Average Rating (n=22) % at or above Target Average Rating (n=15) % at or above Target Disposition Items 1.4 Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical). 5.0 100% 4.07 100% 2.1 Appreciates how knowledge in his/her field is created, organized and linked to other disciplines. 4.73 73% 4.0 100% 3.3 Places a premium on student involvement in the process of learning/development. 5.0 100% 4.0 100% 3.5 Mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development. 4.95 95% 4.0 100% 4.2 Values personal reflection in his/her professional development. 4.9 90% 4.0 100% 5.1 Values importance of collaborating with other professionals in the schools. 4.95 95% 3.93 93%

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 phase of the mentor role. The remaining 4 items invite respondents to comment upon mentor strengths, weaknesses, whether or not they would recommend the mentor 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
An overall Likert score of 4.0 or better is expected for all supervisors.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
On average, student interns rated the EdS teachers who served as their supervisor on average 4.574 out of 5.0. These ratings represent placements and supervision during the Fall 2009 semester (n = 17). Some supervisors supported two interns during the semester and received two independent evaluations. All student evaluations were used to calculate the mean. Data for the last years is provided for comparisons. Data Table ECE Preservice Teachers of ECE EDS Supervisors 2009 (n=17) 2008 (n=15) 2007 (n=21) Average 4.574 4.640 4.940 Median 5.0 5.0 5.0 Minimum 2.833 1.818 4.250 Maximum 5.0 5.0 5.0

M 3: Supervision Summative Report (O: 4, 5)
The supervision summative report is based on the TSS and NBPTS standards. Candidates must address each standard in their performance assessments and through artifacts submitted indicating the candidate’s proficiency at meeting the standard. Candidates must also be able to articulate how she/he demonstrates proficiency and understanding of the standard through narrative. The academic performance of all students is evaluated toward the end of the fall semester when the summative report is due.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All Ed.S. participants who completed the course met the achievement target for Fall 2009 (n=15). The range of scores (out of total 50 points) was 43-50, with a mean of 47.2. Two students have not completed the course requirement and have an IP (in progress grade) at this time.

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.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Capstone project is assessed using a detailed rubric that scores the project using a Likert scale of O (not demonstrated) to 5 (Excellent) for each category: proposal, experience and reflection. Score totals 100 points. Program target is 80% of participants completing the capstone must demonstrate an overall score of B or better on the capstone (total score of 83 or better).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully completed the capstone experience with a grade of B or better. The range of capstone total scores was 83-100; with a mean of 96. We have now completed the cycle shift to align the Weave report with the PSC reporting cycles. All data reported in this report represents participants during the summer 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010 period. Capstone scores are for those Ed.S. participants who completed the capstone during this period (summer 2009) and who are now program completers. Other data reported represents current cohort who completed coursework and key assessments but are currently finishing the program and completing the capstone during 2010. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**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 teacher-researchers to make informed decisions at both the classroom and school level. In the Ed.S. program, each participant conducted an action research project in the classroom or school thereby bridging 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 is carried out throughout the Ed.S. program. During spring term Ed.S. participants share the action research with an educational community. Final research reports are due in summer 2.

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 (83+). Program target is that 80% of participants will achieve this target.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Action Research Report Cohort Average Range % at or above Target Criterion PSC Standard Summer 2009 92 out of total of 100 80 to 100 85% 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 during 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. Two GPAs are calculated. The first content GPA is for the TSS Endorsement and is calculated using final grades for the two key courses (ECE 8400, ECE 8680) and provides evidence of meeting TSS standards. This GPA is determined for the current cohort at the midpoint in the program and after completion of the two TSS specific courses each fall term. The second content GPA is calculated using the content program courses (ECE 8100, ECE 8200, ECE 8400, ECE 8410, and ECE 8920). The internship (ECE 8680), the capstone (ECE 8800), and the elective (ECE 9850) are not used in the overall content GPA as a key assessment for program completion. The overall content GPA is calculated after completion of all coursework, typically at the end of the 2nd year.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Data Table: Content GPA Summer 2009 Ed.S. Program Completers (program entry summer 2008) (n=21) Fall 2009 TSS Program Completers Ed.S. Midpoint Program (program entry summer 2009) (n=15) Average Exit GPA 3.80 4.1 Low GPA 3.1 3.7 High GPA 4.0 4.3 (program moved to grade +/- schedule, A+ available)

**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 action research project until summer 2010 and will be counted in the next round.
completers for next report cycle as this group will not complete the capstone until summer 2010 and will be counted in the next round.

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.

Achievement Targets
Inclusion of the preservice teachers ratings of supervisors has provided useful information on how our students perceive their supervisors and whether they are applying the skills associated with the TSS standards. However, the program faculty need to determine better achievement targets that indicate supervision quality.

New Disposition Measure
STARS Survey as Measure Aligned with NBPTS: We increased the achievement targets this year from 3 to 4 for the midpoint and 4 to 5 for end of the program completion. Doing so provided more variability but not enough to be able to use discrete data to make program changes (standard deviations among items ranged from 0 to 0.45 but averaged around 0.25). This is, in part, due to the fact that each item must be scored in whole units. We concluded that the STARS survey does not serve adequate assessment purposes and have decided to only use the disposition items from the previous survey for the time being as we explore additional measures (have included these in this report). Currently, the disposition survey is housed using livetext. In addition, the disposition item 2.1, program completers did not meet achievement target: Only 73% of the program completers (summer 2009) met the achievement target for item 2.1 on the disposition survey. The current group was assessed on this same item in fall 2009 and all met the target. Program faculty need to discuss and analysis this item and ways to help participants understand how knowledge is created and linked to other disciplines and possible explanations for the differences in the two groups in response to program and curriculum changes 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?

Progress on the four goals for 2009-2010 Ed.S. Program are listed below.
1. Shift the program assessment cycle for Weave to match the same cycle as set for Professional Standards Commission (PAARs report). For this cycle, we reported data for the cohort that entered in the program in summer 2009, fall 2009, spring 2010. We are now in alignment with other reports.
2. Implement new program assessment plan based on changes and findings from this year. The 2009-2010 Program Assessment Plan included new
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 3: Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners (G: 4)**
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
- 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 4: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 2) (M: 4)**
The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.12 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 5: Motivate and manage students for learning (G: 2) (M: 5)**
The teacher candidate uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Relevant Associations: INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.12 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 6: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 2) (M: 6)**

The teacher candidate uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Relevant Associations:** INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 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 7: Effectively plans for instruction (G: 2) (M: 7)**

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

**Relevant Associations:** INTASC, NAEYC, NCTM, IRA, NCSS, NSTA

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 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 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
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
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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 3: Faculty Rating 3 - Diverse Groups of Learners
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

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

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

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

---

**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

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

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 8 - Assessment for Learning
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** We plan to offer this course for the first time during the summer 2010 semester.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director - Nancy Jo Schafer
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **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

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

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 8 - Assessment for Learning
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** The Opening School Experience Orientation occurs in July of each year.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **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

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

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 9 - Professional Reflection
- **Outcome/Objective:** Practices professional reflection
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 10 - Professional Relationships
- **Outcome/Objective:** Fosters relationships with school and community
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 3 - Diverse Groups of Learners
- **Outcome/Objective:** Effectively teaches diverse groups of learners
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 4-Multiple Instructional Strategies
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 5 - Motivate and Manage Students
- **Outcome/Objective:** Motivate and manage students for learning
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 6 - Communication Skills and Technology
- **Outcome/Objective:** Uses communication skills and technology
- **Measure:** Faculty Rating 7 - Plan for Instruction
- **Outcome/Objective:** Effectively plans for instruction

**Implementation Description:** This is an on-going action Plan for the program.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (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.**
  Benchmark The Benchmark is a mid-program personal written reflection that: (1) identifies three ways the program has altered personal conceptions of teaching and learning (2) provides specific examples which demonstrate the change, and (3) reflects on how these changes have impacted personal conceptions of teaching and learning. Target for Benchmark is 75%. This is a mid year assessment so it is expected that the students will not achieve at the same level as expected for the end of program performance as measured by the Capstone.

  **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  Out of 15 students: 15 students received 3/3. Therefore students 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. A rubric is used to score student performance. Total possible score is 24. For a 24 point scale, 20 is score needed to achieve 80%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 15 students: 4 students received 2/3; 11 students received 3/3 Average score for 15 is 2.73. Therefore students as a whole met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Educators reflect on their practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 15 students: 4 students received 2/3; 11 students received 3/3 Average score for 15 is 2.73. Therefore students as a whole met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 15 students: 2 students received 2/3; 13 students received 3/3 Average score for 15 is 2.9. Therefore students as a whole met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Educator will show commitment to student learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 15 students: 15 students received 3/3 Average score for 15 is 3. Therefore students as a whole met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Educators manage and monitor student learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 15 students: 15 students received 3/3 Average score for 15 students is 3. Therefore students as a whole met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 15 students: 4 students received 2/3; 11 students received 3/3 Average score for 15 students is 2.73. Therefore students as a whole met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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*
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

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 2009-2010 CMP Cohort will be the last group assessed with rubrics with rankings of 1-3. Beginning with the 2010 cohort, rubrics will be developed which have a 1-4 rating scale. Further, each scale will be defined more definitely.

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 made two changes to the field component of the program. Both were implemented for the 2010 cohort. The feedback received on the video clubs was positive. One concern expressed by the teachers was how difficult it was to gain access to reliable cameras. We submitted a request to fund video cameras so each teacher could have her/his own camera. A second concern was the lack of specific assessments for the video clubs. A new protocol was implemented. This protocol will provide ongoing assessment of each teacher’s participation in the video clubs.

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?

Beginning Fall 2010 all students in the CMP program will be required to participate in Live Text. This will allow students and professors to maintain an ongoing record of student performance.
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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, Skills and Dispositions
Master's candidates will have the content and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions 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

### 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, skills and dispositions needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
93% 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, skills and dispositions needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2009-2010 - 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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
98% 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

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through studying the effectiveness of one's pedagogy.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% 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

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Participates in professional learning communities**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate or higher level of knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through active engagement as a member of the teaching profession.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% 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:** In-Progress
- **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
  - **Measure:** Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
  - **Measure:** Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in professional learning communities

- **Implementation Description:** The MEd. Orientation will be scheduled in July of each year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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:** In-Progress
- **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
  - **Measure:** Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages in scholarship about teaching and learning
  - **Measure:** Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in professional learning communities

- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** N/A
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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:** In-Progress  
**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 & Development  
**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:** 09/2011

**Additional Resources:** Program Faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

Once a Week Classes
We have adjusted the program schedule to better meet the needs of our student. All of our students are first year teachers, and previously our program required them to come to GSU twice a week for classes. Our students now only come to GSU on Mondays for longer period of time relieving them some of their burden. We will interview students on the effectiveness of this new schedule.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Faculty coordinated the program schedule to ensure that students could receive all of their contact time on Monday evening.

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011

**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? 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 MEd UACM (formally GATAPP) program has made the following changes since last year’s assessment report: 1. The College of Education has committed to the use of LiveText as its assessment system for all of the college’s program. Because of this, the UACM faculty has been trained and is currently implementing this system to keep track of and analyze the program’s assessment data. 2. We have revised our assessment rubrics to more clearly assess the various key assessments of the program. As a part of the transition to the use of LiveText, we have reviewed our assessment rubrics allowing us to improve their effectiveness. We will monitor as evaluate this process.

**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 UACM (formally 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 made the following changes to the program: 1. 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 started 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. 2. We started implementing the LiveText assessment tracking system to help organize and evaluate program assessment data. We have adjusted the program schedule to make it easier for students to complete their assignments. 3. We have adjusted the program schedule to better meet the needs of our student. All of our students are first year teachers, and previously our program required them to come to GSU twice a week for classes. Our students now only come to GSU on Mondays for longer period of time relieving them some of their burden.

---
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**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, 2, 3)**
Active seeks 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: 1, 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, 3)**
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Seven students took comprehensive exams; six successfully completed both oral and written components - this is an 86% pass rate.

Target for O3: Demonstrate research skills
80% will pass the comprehensive exams on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Seven students took comprehensive exams; six successfully completed both oral and written components - this is an 86% pass rate.

M 2: Teaching apprenticeship (O: 2, 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 O2: Active seeker of knowledge
All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Three (out of 3 eligible students) students successfully completed their university teaching apprenticeship.

Target for O4: Knowledgeable teachers
All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Three (out of 3 eligible students) 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 want 100% of our eligible PHD students to have rigorous dissertations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PHD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

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: Active seeker of knowledge

Implementation Description: Beginning summer 2009...
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: Thoughtful writers and speakers

Implementation Description: Beginning summer 2009, continuing...
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
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: 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: Demonstrate research skills
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
Continue to research and 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: PHD Advisory Committee

Monitoring of comp exam process
We will continue to monitor "process" for comp. exams. The timeframe could be problematic for students who also work full-time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
 Measure: Comprehensive examination | Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator of PHD program

UTA as coursework
Now that the university teaching apprenticeship is a required course, the success rate is higher and the outcomes are more systematic. Continue to monitor.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Teaching apprenticeship | Outcome/Objective: Active seeker of knowledge  
Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator of PHD Program

---

### 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.

**G 2: new goals/outcomes**

NOTE: We have decided to move to the new core curriculum learning outcomes this reporting cycle. We have three courses in area E of the core curriculum: ECON 2100 (The Global Economy), ECON 2105 (Principles of Macroeconomics), and ECON 2106 (Principles of Microeconomics). One of those courses (ECON 2100) is also one of the designated courses for the BOR Global Perspectives (GL) overlay. The new social science core learning outcome (which is really more of a goal, so we list it here - we further refine this as a learning outcome for our courses in the outcomes section of this report) is: Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change. The new BOR Global Perspectives (GL) learning outcome (which is really more of a goal, so we list it here - we further refine this as a learning outcome for our courses in the outcomes section of this report) is: Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: social science core learning outcome - econ (G: 2) (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge about how economists think about human behavior and the interactions between humans as they make choices.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
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

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 2: Global Perspectives (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Students demonstrate understanding of global and cultural differences across the globe and how they apply to the field of economics.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Multiple Choice Questions on Final Exams (O: 1)**

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: social science core learning outcome - econ**
We are reporting the data this year in the new way we started last year. This year, we include a table with the exact questions used and the number of students (as well as the percentage of students) that got each question correct. We also report the average of those percentages for each set of questions (which generally correspond to a single section, with some exceptions where instructors used the same questions in multiple sections). We then report the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions for each of the three separate courses (2100, 2105, and 2106) assessed. (See the attached document in the measures section.) We would like to see the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions for each course to be at least 75%.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

For ECON 2100, the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 82%. There were a total of 200 students assessed across 3 different sections with 3 different instructors. See the attached document in the measures section for more details on the questions and the variations in the percentage of correct answers. We are generally pleased with these results. For ECON 2106, the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 76.1%. There were a total of 543 students assessed across 4 different sections with 2 different instructors. See the attached document in the measures section for more details on the questions and the variations in the percentage of correct answers. We are generally pleased with these results. For ECON 2105, the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 61.1%. There were a total of 277 students assessed across 3 different sections with 2 different instructors. See the attached document in the measures section for more details on the questions and the variations in the percentage of correct answers. We are generally not as pleased with these results as those for the other courses. It is interesting to note that the bulk of these students were taught by a part-time instructor (the same instructor with lower scores for the ECON 2106 courses reported).

**M 2: Multiple Choice questions embedded on unit exams (O: 2)**

Five multiple choice questions which can be used to assess the new global perspectives learning outcome were embedded on the mid-term exams of a selected section of ECON 2100: The Global Economy in the Spring 2010 semester. See the attached file to see the actual questions used.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Global Perspectives**

We would like to see the average percentage of correct answers across all questions asked be at least 75%.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The average percentage of correct answers across all questions asked was 79.52%. See the attached document in the measures section for the results of each individual question. We are generally pleased with these results. We only assessed one section this year, but hope to assess more in this area next year.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Economics Department Undergraduate Programs Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analyze questions and consider course improvements**

One of the most useful things about the new way we are reporting this data this year is that it allows us to examine the questions more carefully and look for types of questions and particular concepts that seem to trip students up the most. It also allows us to see more clearly the relationships between average student performance and type of instructor. For instance, in this reporting cycle, we noted that the averages for ECON 2105 and 2106 were lower in the sections taught by a particular part-time instructor. We plan to analyze this data in more detail and consider if we need to recommend certain concepts be emphasized more in the core courses. We may also want to discuss the use of part-time instructors in these courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Measure: Multiple Choice Questions on Final Exams | Outcome/Objective: Social Science core learning outcome - econ
- Responsible Person/Group: Economics Undergraduate Program Committee

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**
Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. As at most universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and to disseminate that knowledge with policymakers and leaders in the public, nonprofit, and business communities, here and abroad. The Department of Economics is committed to the broad goals of Georgia State University and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The University Strategic Plan 2000 states the “[t]he overarching goal of the Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premiere research universities located in an urban setting”. As stated in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Strategic Plan 2002-2007, the School “intends to be the highest rated policy school in the South and one of the highest ranked in the nation by 2007”. The Department of Economics shares both of these goals. We intend to contribute to these goals by continuing our efforts to better serve the needs of our undergraduate majors, our graduate students, and GSU students more broadly, by engaging in such activities as improving our curricula, introducing innovative course features, and creating new degree programs. Finally, we will continue to expand our service and outreach activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.

### 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

**SLO 1: Economics Basic Theories (M: 1, 3)**
To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

**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

**SLO 2: Apply to specific fields (M: 1)**
To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.

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

**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

**SLO 3: Benefits and costs (M: 1)**
To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Tracking Examination (O: 1, 2, 3)

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. Several questions were selected this spring to measure learning outcomes 1 and 2. The questions that were used for each learning outcome.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories

We would like to see the average on the questions selected to assess each of the learning outcomes be at least 65%. While this may seem like a low target to an outsider, we believe it is appropriate because these questions are not necessarily emphasized in the ECON 4999 course. These are really questions that assess skills learned in the introductory (ECON 2105 and 2106) courses, and it may be quite some time since the students took those courses by the time they take the ECON 4999 course. We hesitate to ask questions beyond the introductory level because of the way our program is set up - students have a good bit of flexibility in selecting their upper level economics courses, and therefore, students in the ECON 4999 course will likely have taken different 4000 level courses. The only courses we can be sure they've all had are the introductory and intermediate courses.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Note to review committee: There is a table here that can only be properly viewed via the "reports" view. Summary Findings for Learning Objective 1 (from the Macro/Micro Econ 4999 Tracking Exam) Question Percent Correct Exam Version 1 41 Macro 2 64 Macro 3 26 Macro 4 68 Macro 5 88 Macro 6 58 Micro 7 73 Micro 8 76 Micro 9 76 Micro 10 55 Micro Average 62.5

Target for O2: Apply to specific fields

We would like to see the average on the questions selected to assess each of the learning outcomes be at least 65%. While this may seem like a low target to an outsider, we believe it is appropriate because these questions are not necessarily emphasized in the ECON 4999 course. These are really questions that assess skills learned in the introductory (ECON 2105 and 2106) courses, and it may be quite some time since the students took those courses by the time they take the ECON 4999 course. We hesitate to ask questions beyond the introductory level because of the way our program is set up - students have a good bit of flexibility in selecting their upper level economics courses, and therefore, students in the ECON 4999 course will likely have taken different 4000 level courses. The only courses we can be sure they've all had are the introductory and intermediate courses.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Note to review committee: There is a table here that can only be properly viewed via the "reports" view. Summary Findings for
Learning Objective 2 (from the Macro/Micro econ 4999 tracking exam) Question Percent Correct Exam Version 1 38 Macro 2 47 Macro 3 91 Macro 4 85 Macro 5 70 Macro 6 82 Macro 7 58 Macro 8 76 Micro 9 76 Micro 10 50 Micro Average 67.3

Target for O3: Benefits and costs
We did not use the tracking exam to assess this learning outcome this year. We plan to measure it next year, perhaps with the tracking exam, but maybe with some other measure instead.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
We did not use the tracking exam to assess this learning outcome this year. We plan to measure it next year, perhaps with the tracking exam, but maybe with some other measure instead.

M 2: Group Project in ECON 4999 (O: 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. During this assessment cycle, the project was broken down by different skills and groups were assessed individually on these different skills. See the attached file for a summary of the different skills and how the groups did on them.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O4: Communication
We would like to see groups earn an average score of 7 or more out of 10 on the communication measure of the group project.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

M 3: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 (O: 1)
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. See the attached rubric for the book review.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories
The book review was broken down into different skills and students were assessed separately on each one. See the attached rubric (in the measures section) for more details. We hope to see the majority of students earn a rating of 2 or more, and many of them should earn an even higher rating on the "economics concepts" measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
35 (out of 36) had a rating of 2 or higher on "economic concepts" (90 percent) 21 (out of 36) had a rating of 3 or higher on "economic concepts" (58 percent) See the attached document to see more details on the assessment of the book review.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
determine best way to assess learning outcome #3
We have made adjustments to our assessment of learning outcomes based on feedback from the review committee of our previous assessment reports. Instead of reporting the average score for the micro and macro tracking exams as in the past, this cycle, we selected particular questions to assess the first 2 learning outcomes. We did not select questions from the tracking exams to assess learning outcome #3. We are still thinking about the best way to assess that learning outcome. We also did not use the tracking exam to assess learning outcome #4; we used the group project in ECON 4999 for that instead.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Benefits and costs

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate programs committee in consultation with ECON 4999 instructors
**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 decided to pilot the assessment of the new general education learning outcomes this year, although our method of assessment was essentially the same. We did this because we wanted to be ready for next year’s rollout of the new general education learning outcomes. We also changed the way we gathered assessment data for our majors from the tracking exam.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Economics MA**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST

(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 microeconomics, macroeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**
Target not set in this cycle.
For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 22 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2009-2010. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Math (3.18) and Analytics (3.36) while the highest scores were obtained on Application (4.13). There were 22 students who took the Microeconomics course during the academic year 2009-2010. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Math (3.18) and Analytics (3.36) while the highest scores were obtained on Application (4.13). There were 22 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2009-2010. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Math (3.18) and Analytics (3.36) while the highest scores were obtained on Application (4.13). There were 17 MA-Econ students who took the Econometrics course during the academic year 2009-2010. A factor analysis revealed that the various factors received a score of about 4.2 to 4.8: ranging from Definitions and Computation (4.8) Math and Creativity (4.2) each. Overall, the results show solid performance across the various criteria in the three classes and a substantial increase in scores.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

For the MA-Econ program (both the regular track and the policy track), there were 22 students who took the Macroeconomics course during the academic year 2009-2010. Recall that each exam was graded on eight factors. A factor analysis revealed that the weakest parts were Math (3.18) and Analytics (3.36) while the highest scores were obtained on Application (4.13). Overall, the results show solid performance across the various criteria in the three classes and a substantial increase in scores.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The essays were evaluated on several dimensions. For the 25 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.88 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.22 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.26 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.42 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4.21 for Econometric Skills, 4.24 for Economic Analysis, 3.83 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.46 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, similar to last year.

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The essays were evaluated on several dimensions. For the 25 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.88 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.22 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.26 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.42 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4.21 for Econometric Skills, 4.24 for Economic Analysis, 3.83 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.46 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, similar to last year.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The essays were evaluated on several dimensions. For the 25 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.88 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.22 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.26 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.42 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4.21 for Econometric Skills, 4.24 for Economic Analysis, 3.83 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.46 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, similar to last year.

**Target for O4: Economic Data.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The essays were evaluated on several dimensions. For the 25 essays submitted, the average scores for those dimensions were (with a highest score 5 and a lowest score 1): 3.88 for Overall Contribution to the Related Literature, 4.22 for Comprehension of the Literature, 4.26 for Ability to Convey Technical Material, 4.42 for Ability to Convey Research Question (s), 4.21 for Econometric Skills, 4.24 for Economic Analysis, 3.83 for Theoretical Skills, and 4.46 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, similar to last year.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

We received 8 anonymous exit surveys from graduating students. Of those, 7 students answered that they would agree or strongly agree to recommend the program to their peers (the 8th student was unsure). This reflects a very positive overall experience. The high marks were in various areas including the interactions with faculty, program structure, and the building of research and presentation skills.

**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 advertise 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 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 the answers to Administrative Question 1. In addition, we implemented strict new requirements for the research papers with a required econometrics component. The effect of this measure is immediately evident in the radically improved outcomes for the econometrics 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 findings suggest that we need to maintain the high requirements in terms of the quantitative component of the program. We also need to maintain the high standards in the core microeconomics and macroeconomics classes. The acquired analytical skills and the diverse content of the program produce visible and important results for the current students and the alumni.

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 linked the allocation of funding on a competitive basis to class performance. This gave students motivation to do well in class. We built a new website for the program that lays out a lot of useful information for the current students and is used in recruitment. We implemented an exit survey that gives comprehensive information about the experiences of students. We placed several students with the policy centers to build their practical skills.

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 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, particularly in terms of econometric skills, 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 the students routinely show strong performance. Therefore, radical changes are not needed. Yet, continued emphasis on the objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. We’ll work on two particular areas: 1) Assist students in their preparation for the job market with information seminars and 2) provide more comprehensive information about available classes to the incoming students.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Increasing the communication between the department and MA students. Utilizing the new website for the administration of the program and for recruitment. Linking the allocation of funding to class performance. Raising the bar on research papers. Implementing the exit surveys to collect timely information.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Economics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Ph.D. in Economics program seeks to develop a high level of competence in conducting basic and applied policy research. The doctoral program requires that students demonstrate mastery of a large and complex body of knowledge. In particular, students must master microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics at a level required for professional independent research. Necessary skills for microeconomics are taught in Economics 9010, 9030 and 8500. Necessary skills for macroeconomics are taught in Economics 9020, 9040, and also 8500. Necessary skills for econometrics are taught in Economics 8030, 8730, 8750 and 8760. Students’ mastery of these respective skills is assessed in midterm and final exams in these courses. Skills for microeconomics and macroeconomics are also assessed in comprehensive exams, normally taken after the first year. Additional mastery is required in one
field of the student’s choosing (Environmental and Urban Economics, Experimental Economics, Labor Economics, or Public Economics). Three courses are taken from the chosen field. Skills are assessed using midterm exams, final exams, and research papers in these courses. Field comprehensive exams (covering all three courses in one field) are required and usually are taken in the third year. A secondary field is optional; the requirement includes taking at least two courses from the chosen secondary field. The doctoral program also requires that students demonstrate proficiency in the techniques of teaching and research. This is evidenced by participation with faculty members in research, presentation of papers and reports, and the writing of a dissertation. Students learn this proficiency in Economics 9500, 9510, 9515 and 9940. In these courses, they work individually with professors on research projects and gain skills in presenting and understanding new research. Satisfactory progress is indicated by a passing grade in these courses. Finally proficiency in these skills is determined by the successful completion of an oral examination on the subject of the student’s dissertation.

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 at least one of the fields 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 in 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 at least one of the fields in 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 take a Comprehensive Examination at the end of the first-year after taking the core courses. This examination tests their basic learning of microeconomics and macroeconomics (e.g., Ph.D. in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The examination is graded on a discrete scale (e.g., High Pass, Pass, Low Pass, High Fail, Fail), and students are given feedback. Questions on the examinations are classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination are able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.

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

**Target for O3: Field Specialization**
NA

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The Public Finance field exam was given to 2 and 3 students respectively in summer 2009 and spring 2010. All five students passed the exam. The average evaluation scores per category were comparable to the last year’s group of students. The Experimental Economics field exam was given in summer 2009. Two students took the exam and they both passed.

**M 3: Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4)**
After completion of the program’s coursework, students write a Dissertation. The dissertation is written with close supervision of a faculty dissertation chair and a dissertation committee. The Dissertation is 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 O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods**
NA

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Since January 2009, 10 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category were significantly higher than those of previous years. The average score for the overall contribution to the literature is about 4.5 out of 5, which is quite high. In 2008 the respective average score was 4.1. Last year, three essays from three different dissertations have 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.

**Target for O3: Field Specialization**
We organized a CV writing course for Ph.D. students.

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

**CV writing course**

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

---

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Since January 2009, 10 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category were significantly higher than those of previous years. The average score for the overall contribution to the literature is about 4.5 out of 5, which is quite high. In 2008 the respective average score was 4.1. Last year, three essays from three different dissertations have 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.

**Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research**

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Three alumni responded to the survey this year. All three stated that the program has expanded their job opportunities; their score was 5 (out of 5). They suggested that the program however should utilize different teaching pedagogies and that publishable research should be emphasized. Overall the alumni gave high scores to the program. The program's effects on acquired skills of applying econometric techniques, carrying out research projects and communicating ideas in writing, all received scores of 4.7 (out of 5). The average score was 4.3 for the program's value with respect to oral communication of ideas, preparation for academic career and collaboration with professionals in the field. All three alumni would recommend the program to their peers (4.3 out of 5). These alumni are performing quite successfully. These alumni have published a total of 15 papers and 17 policy reports since 2006, the year they graduated. They currently work for Massachusetts Department of Revenue, Georgia State University, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, and Bank of Botswana.

**Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research**

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

There are 22 Ph.D. students in their 5th, 4th and 3rd year of study; fifteen of them responded to the survey. Overall the students valued the program highly. They would recommend the program to their peers (4.1 out of 5). They value the program with respect to improved ability in applying econometric techniques (4.7), conducting independent research (4.4), communicating ideas in writing and collaborating with professional in their fields (4.1) and improved the ability to communicate their ideas orally (4.0). The perceived value of the program on expanding job opportunities earned a score of 3.9. Slightly lower scores were obtained on preparation for an academic career (3.8). All students participated in reporting on their research activities. The total number of papers, book chapters and policy reports already published is 31; the figure for working papers is 67. Eight students among the 13 students in the 5th and 4th year of study have already published book chapters and articles. The list of journals where the work of these students is published includes highly regarded refereed journals such as American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Environmental and Resource Economics, National Tax Journal, Journal of Risk and Uncertainty and Social Choice and Welfare. Furthermore, 12 of these 13 PhD students have written at least two research papers; nine of them have presented their research papers at conferences and professional meetings, such as American Economic Associations, Economic Science Association, and Southern Economic Association, to mention a few. Six students have teaching experience and three of them taught as instructors at Georgia State University. The survey results are not significantly different from the previous year. Overall, from the students’ point of view the program seems to be on track.
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.

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

Micro sequence
The microeconomics sequence was reorganized from three semesters to two semesters. This change eliminated the overlap in material from previous courses. It also allows students to have their first summer course free; students can focus solely on preparing for their comprehensive exams. We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams. As we had expected, students’ performance on those exams improved significantly. All first year students passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam. In comparison with the previous year, the percentage of students who passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam on the first attempt increased from 81% to 100%; with respect to the Microeconomics comprehensive exam, the percentage of students who passed the exam on the first attempt went up from 53% to 67%.

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

Re-organization of the summer semester I
We moved ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from the summer of the second year to the spring of the first year. This change eliminated mandatory courses in the summer of the second year. This allows students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This also helps with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course.

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

Re-organization of the summer semester II
We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams.

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

Additional dissertation workshop
Students will be required to take an additional dissertation workshop (ECON 9515) in which they will present research and give peer feedback. Particular attention will be paid to presentation skills and the substance of the research; students will be videotaped while presenting.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Econometrics sequence
To help differentiate the Ph.D. level courses from the MA level courses, we have proposed renumbering the courses in the econometrics curriculum. These proposed changes are in line with the policy of using course numbers starting with 9 for PhD level courses. ECON 8730 was re-numbered to Econ 9710. ECON 8750 was re-numbered to Econ 9720. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8760 was re-numbered to Econ 9730. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8790 was re-numbered to Econ 9740. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8770 was re-numbered to Econ 9750. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Students’ characteristics and success in the program.
We are planning to create a database with students' individual characteristics, their academic performance during the years in the program, placements in the job market and their subsequent research activates. The purpose is to identify determinants of what students' characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Summer Support
Development of an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### Tutoring Experience
All 3rd year students will be rotated through the tutoring lab. This will help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

### 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 continued with implementation of two surveys to complement our alumni survey. One of the surveys is administered to the graduating class and current students and inquires about their publications, research in progress, policy reports, participation at conferences, teaching experience, and other measurable outcomes. The information was 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 was administered to graduating students as well as to current students. The objective is to have timely and comprehensive information about the program. That information will be used to make adjustments to the curriculum, administration, and other aspects of the program. We are planning to create a database with students’ individual characteristics, their academic performance during the years in the program, placements in the job market and their subsequent research activities. The purpose is to identify what students’ characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

**What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report?**

1. The microeconomics sequence was reorganized from three semesters to two semesters. This change eliminated the overlap in material from previous courses. It also allows students to have their first summer course free; students can focus solely on preparing for their comprehensive exams. We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams. As we had expected, students’ performance on those exams improved significantly. All first year students passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam. In comparison with the previous year, the percentage of students who passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam on the first attempt increased from 81% to 100%; with respect to the Microeconomics comprehensive exam, the percentage of students who passed the exam on the first attempt went up from 53% to 67%. We now require all Ph.D. students who went through our Masters program to take the PhD micro- and macroeconomics sequences. Previously, they could opt out of the 8100 and 8110 courses and tended to do worse on the comprehensive exams because of it. We expect this will improve the performance of students on the comprehensive exams.

2. We now mandate that all students defend their dissertation proposals within one year of successfully passing the field exam, or they lose funding. This is the second year we have done 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 one or two years from now. We moved ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from the summer of the second year to the spring of the first year. This change eliminated mandatory courses in the summer of the second year. This allows students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This also helps with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course. With respect to job market preparation we: (i) organized a CV writing course for Ph.D. students; (ii) ran consulting sessions during which faculty gave advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications; (iii) require all graduating students to present job market papers in the brown bag seminar during the fall semester. We expect that these changes will help improve job market outcomes. Indeed, this year six out of eight fifth-year PhD students (or 75%) got a job; in the previous year only three students out of the ten fifth-year PhD students got a job. Furthermore, the remaining seven students all moved to the following year job market; six of these seven students got a job this year. There were nine (six if we do not include the sixth-year students) students and three students respectively in 2010 and 2009 who got an academic job. According to these figures our students have done significantly better in the job market this year than in the previous year.

**What changes and improvements in 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. Proposed/planned changes include: All 3rd year students will be rotated through the tutoring lab. This will help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market. Students will be required to take an additional course free; students can focus solely on preparing for their comprehensive exams. We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams. As we had expected, students’ performance on those exams improved significantly. All first year students passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam. In comparison with the previous year, the percentage of students who passed the Macroeconomics comprehensive exam on the first attempt increased from 81% to 100%; with respect to the Microeconomics comprehensive exam, the percentage of students who passed the exam on the first attempt went up from 53% to 67%. We now require all Ph.D. students who went through our Masters program to take the PhD micro- and macroeconomics sequences. Previously, they could opt out of the 8100 and 8110 courses and tended to do worse on the comprehensive exams because of it. We expect this will improve the performance of students on the comprehensive exams. We now mandate that all students defend their dissertation proposals within one year of successfully passing the field exam, or they lose funding. This is the second year we have done 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 one or two years from now. We moved ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from the summer of the second year to the spring of the first year. This change eliminated mandatory courses in the summer of the second year. This allows students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This also helps with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course. With respect to job market preparation we: (i) organized a CV writing course for Ph.D. students; (ii) ran consulting sessions during which faculty gave advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications; (iii) require all graduating students to present job market papers in the brown bag seminar during the fall semester. We expect that these changes will help improve job market outcomes. Indeed, this year six out of eight fifth-year PhD students (or 75%) got a job; in the previous year only three students out of the ten fifth-year PhD students got a job. Furthermore, the remaining seven students all moved to the following year job market; six of these seven students got a job this year. There were nine (six if we do not include the sixth-year students) students and three students respectively in 2010 and 2009 who got an academic job. According to these figures our students have done significantly better in the job market this year than in the previous 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.

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. Proposed/planned changes include: All 3rd year students will be rotated through the tutoring lab. This will help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market. Students will be required to take an additional
dissertation workshop (ECON 9515) in which they will present research and give peer feedback. Particular attention will be paid to presentation skills and the substance of the research; students will be videotaped while presenting. Development of an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support. To help differentiate the Ph.D. level courses from the MA level courses, we have proposed renumbering the courses in the econometrics curriculum. These proposed changes are in line with the policy of using course numbers starting with 9 for Ph.D level courses. ECON 8730 was re-numbered to Econ 9710. ECON 8750 was re-numbered to Econ 9720. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8760 was re-numbered to Econ 9730. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8790 was re-numbered to Econ 9740. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8770 was re-numbered to Econ 9750. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. The department intends to continue: (1) to 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) to organize the CV writing course for Ph.D. students; (3) to conduct consulting sessions during which faculty will give advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications and encourage the students to use the University career services for additional experience for job talks; (4) to require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag seminar series during the fall semester.

**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.

**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 PhD 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?

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 standard. From an administrative point of view, 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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD**

(Announced 12/10/2016 09:57 PM EDT)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Description: The mission of the Ph.D. program in Exceptional Students, Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at Georgia State University, is to prepare graduates who are capable of performing the roles expected of faculty members in special education at institutions of higher education. Students enrolled in this program will demonstrate the ability to (a) design, 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.

During the 09-10 year, there were 31 Ph.D. students in Special Education; 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. This is a significant increase from the previous year, where there were 37 Ph.D. students in Special Education; 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; 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 31 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. Therefore, radical changes are not needed. Yet, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standard. From an administrative point of view, 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.

**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
- 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Doctoral Indicator Survey- Research section (O: 1)**

Evidence of submitted database articles, number of published articles, number of book chapters, and participation in grant development as complied 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 are senior author to a refereed journal.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In 2009 - 2010, we had a total of 31 doctoral students. All students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Additionally, 33 articles were submitted by 19 students (with students being the senior author on 10 of these articles); 14 articles were published by 11 students (with students being the senior author on 3 articles); 9 book chapters were authored or coauthored by 7 students, and 11 grants were prepared with the assistance of 7 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 complied 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In 2009 - 2010, all students who had reached candidacy had assisted or taught at least one university course. For the 09 - 10 year, 15 students assisted in teaching 72 courses, 13 students taught 34 courses as GTAs, 11 students gave 61 guest lectures, and 11 students supervised 115 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 workshop presentation by candidacy.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In 2009-2010, all students who had reached candidacy had made at least one conference or workshop presentation. 21 students made 33 national conference presentations, 6 students made 6 state conference presentations, 8 students made 24 workshop presentations, and 4 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 (rectal, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: The student will meet course/program requirements

Students will rate a satisfactory or higher on annual evaluations which include a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exams, and prospectus (as appropriate) and is determined by PMA faculty.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2009 - 2010 there were a total of 31 doctoral students, of these 29 were evaluated in spring 2010 (2 had graduated) and 28 students demonstrated expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in special education. A remediation plan was developed for 1 student. Six of the students had full funding through federally funded doctoral leadership grants. Five students graduated in 09-10. We continue to further refine the exit interview process.

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

**Exit interviews need to be further refined**

Although there has been standardization of the exit interview process, further refinement of the exit interview is needed to ascertain if we are capturing desired information.

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

**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 2010 and be completed by May 2011.

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011

**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 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 expand/update our Ph.D. student handbook as a result of discussions while reviewing the weave data.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Educational Leadership EdS**  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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

**G 1: Stewardship of a vision**

An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

**G 2: School culture and instructional program**

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.

**G 3: Management of the organization**

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.

**G 4: Collaboration with stakeholders**

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.

**G 5: Integrity, fairness, and ethics**

An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

**G 6: Legal and ethical considerations**

Students will apply relevant legal principles and demonstrate the ability to assess the ethical considerations involved hypothetical cases presented in class. (EPEL 8330).
 **Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Professional Development (G: 2) (M: 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).

**SLO 2: Analysis of significant educational problem (G: 1, 3) (M: 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).

**SLO 3: Legal and ethical considerations (G: 6) (M: 3)**

Students will apply relevant legal principles and demonstrate the ability to assess the ethical considerations involved hypothetical cases presented in class. (EPEL 8330).

**SLO 4: Equity audit (G: 4, 5) (M: 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). (EPEL 8020).

**SLO 5: Curriculum reform model (G: 2) (M: 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 a consistent means for ongoing monitoring of the package or reform. (EPSF 8440).

**SLO 6: Instructional Leadership (G: 2) (M: 6)**

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 lesson plans, examination of student work, review of test scores assessment of class policies, plus other relevant data and information. (EPEL 8420).

**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).

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations:** Use data/evidence from multiple sources as a basis for development of a professional development plan for a select group of faculty and/or staff that addresses instructional, safety, and/or learning environment issues. Plan is consistent with effective adult learning strategies and effective professional development. Makes professional development plan presentation relevant to the implementation of school improvement strategies and initiatives. Demonstrates full knowledge by answering all questions with explanations and elaborations. Budget is thorough, complete, and matches the needs consistent with what is required for the proposed professional development plan. Plan is consistent with the requirements for Exceeds Expectations and shows evidence of revisions based on stakeholder input. Meets Expectations: Use data/evidence from two sources as a basis for development of a professional development plan for a select group of faculty and/or staff that addresses instructional, safety, and/or learning environment issues. Plan is somewhat consistent with effective adult learning strategies and effective professional development. Makes professional development plan presentation somewhat relevant to the implementation of school improvement strategies and initiatives. Is at ease with all questions, but fails to elaborate. Budget somewhat matches goals and objectives, but lacks specification in certain items. Plan is consistent with the requirements for Meets Expectations and shows little evidence of revisions based on stakeholder input. Does Not Meet Expectations: Use data/evidence from one source as a basis for development of a professional development plan for a select group of faculty and/or staff that addresses instructional, safety, and/or learning environment issues. Plan not consistent with effective adult learning strategies and effective professional development. Is not able to make professional development plan presentation relevant to the implementation of school improvement strategies and initiatives. Does not have a grasp of the information and unable to answer questions. Budget is limited and does not address needs and/or figures do not total correctly. Plan is consistent with the requirements for Does not Meet Exceeds Expectations and shows little or no evidence of revisions based on stakeholder input.

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

**Target for O1: Professional Development**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the professional development rubric (EPEL 8420).

**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). **EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM RUBRIC:** Exceeds Expectations: Highly thoughtful identification, description, and analysis of a major educational problem; relevant and feasible development of an action plan for resolving the problem; effective use of strategies that unite the members of the school community and empower them to work collaboratively to address areas of primary need. Meets Expectations: Moderately thoughtful identification, description, and analysis of a major educational problem; somewhat relevant and feasible development of an action plan for resolving the problem; use of strategies that unite the members of the school community and empower them to work collaboratively to address areas of primary need. Does Not Meet Expectations: Use data/evidence from one source as a basis for development of an action plan that only somewhat addresses the problem; use of strategies that unite the members of the school community and empower them to work collaboratively to address areas of primary need.
Students will apply relevant legal principles and demonstrate the ability to assess the ethical considerations involved in hypothetical cases presented in class. (EPEL 8330). 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: Minimally effective or ineffective use of resources regarding legal issue; 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 undefended; little or no identification of laws applicable to the legal topic.

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

**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).

**Target for O4: Equity audit**

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.(EPEL 8020). 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: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Curriculum reform model**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the curriculum reform model rubric (EPSF 8440).

**Target for O6: Instructional leadership**

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. (EPEL 8420). 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

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
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).

**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 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 upcoming academic year?

Our program has not made substantial changes to the assessment process during this academic year because the program had been revised during the previous academic year, and this year’s assessment process included working to better align the program delivery and coaching elements of the overall program. In the coming year, we anticipate making minimal changes to the assessment process including adding an assessment that is housed in the new prerequisite courses and aligning our assessments to the National Board Core Propositions for Accomplished Educational Leaders.

**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.

Because the PSC (Professional Standards Commission) has revised the admission criteria for the Specialist in Educational Leadership (EdS) degree program, candidates are now required to take two prerequisite courses prior to entry into the program. Beginning September 2011, these two courses, a general leadership course and school law, must be completed prior to full admission into the program. As a result of this change, the educational leadership unit decided to modify the admission process from a rolling process to a once-a-year process. Making this change will enable the unit to offer the prerequisites at the same time each year as well as keep better track of where students are in their program of study. Additionally, the change will help us better align the coaching structure because each cohort of students will be at the same point in their program of study.
MISSION STATEMENT and PROGRAM DESCRIPTION The mission of the Masters in Educational Leadership at Georgia State University is to prepare graduates to be effective instructional leaders who positively impact student achievement. Masters of Educational Leadership: The mission of the Masters in Educational Leadership at Georgia State University is to prepare graduates to be effective instructional leaders who positively impact student achievement. The program is developed around a set of academic and field experiences that provide basic knowledge and skills for educational leadership positions. The masters degree program of study includes EPEL 7000 and EPEL 7330 which are prerequisites for the Specialist in Educational Leadership. M.Ed. GOALS (What we want our students to BE): Goal 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals: Graduates will possess the knowledge and understanding of how to guide the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission and high expectations for every student. Goal 2: Teaching and Learning: Graduates will possess the knowledge and understanding of how to monitor and continuously improve teaching and learning. Goal 3: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety: Graduates will possess the knowledge and understanding of organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment. Goal 4: Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders: Graduates will possess the knowledge and understanding of how to ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders who represent diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources that improve teaching and learning. Objective 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals: Graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of how to guide the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission and high expectations for every student. Objective 2: Teaching and Learning: Graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of how to monitor and continuously improve teaching and learning. Objective 3: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety: Graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment. Objective 4: Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders: Graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of how to ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders who represent diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources that improve teaching and learning. Objective 5: Ethics and Integrity: Graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of professional ethical behavior and integrity. Objective 6: The Education System: Graduates will demonstrate the knowledge and understanding of educational systems of political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts that effect education. GSU PEF Conceptual Framework “Preparing informed, empowered, committed, and engaged educators” Vision: The vision of the Georgia State University (GSU) Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide international leadership in educational research and to create and implement exemplary educational programs in metropolitan areas. The PEF envisions a world that embraces diversity; where social justice, democratic ideals, and equal opportunity can be increasingly enacted; and where technology is used to enhance opportunities for human development. The PEF believes that all people should be lifelong learners. Mission: The GSU PEF represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, our mission is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. Guiding Principles: Educators are informed by research, knowledge, and practice. They critically examine theoretical and applied inquiry, their own practicals, and the practices of others to make well-reasoned, data-based decisions about teaching, learning, and development (Bandura, 1977, 2001; Bowlby, 1969, 1980; Bruner 1996; Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2004; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Darling-Hammond, Bullmister & Cobb 1995; Erikson, 1950, 1968; Feiman-Nemser & Floden 1986; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Freud, 1974; Gillyan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1976; Kohlberg, Levine, & Haynes 1983; Kohlberg, 1987; Shulman 1987; Shulman, 1992; Shulman & Haynes, 2001). In addition, educators are empowered to serve as change agents in the pursuit of social justice and equity (Cochran-Smith 2004; Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1992, 2004; Fairbanks, et al, 2010; Freire 1999; Neto, Noffke, & Brennan 1997; Sleeter, 1992). Along with being reflective and deliberate in their actions (King & Kitchener, 2004; Pultorak, 1996; Schon, 1983, 1987; Van Manen, 1977; Zeichner & Liston, 1996), they understand how educational policies and practices affect the lives of those they serve (Milter, 2010). Outcomes 1.1 Our candidates use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners. 1.2 Our candidates possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all. 1.3 Our candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development. 1.4 Our candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. Educators are respectful of all learners and committed to the belief that all people can learn (Delpit, 1995; Dewey, 1933; Gay, 2000, 2010; Hilliard, 1995; King & Castenoll, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1990a, 1995b; Neto, 1992; United States Department of Education, 2002).They are caring, ethical, and knowledgeable advocates for students and their families (Freire 1999; Noddings, 2002; Piasta 1999; Piasta & Nnetz 1991). Educators view education as the pathway to personal and societal success (Goodlad, 2008; Kozol, 2002, 2005). Educators maximize the potential of all learners in diverse educational environments so that everyone will be able to participate as a productive, respectful member of our global society (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Garcia, Acosta, & Wexler, 2010; Himmel, 1998; Serna, 2010; Heberlein, 1991). Outcomes 2.1 Our candidates know and respect individual differences, establish productive and ethical relationships with students, and modify the learning environment to positively impact student learning. 2.2 Our candidates create engaging learning communities where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected. 2.3 Our candidates commit to continuing personal and professional development. Educators are engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities (Liebman & MacC, 2010). They understand and intentionally consider the dynamic interactions between learners and educators with diverse cultural contexts (Wertsch, 1988; Wertsch & Post, 1998; Wertsch & Vuyts, 1993; Weinert & Post, 1997). In addition, educators recognize the potential and use of technology to enhance learning and communication (Gee, 2003, Landow, 2006, Laurillard, 1993; Sherin, 2004; Wysocki, 2004). They see technology as a vital cultural tool with socio-cultural implications. Outcomes 3.1 Our candidates use knowledge of students’ cultures, experiences, and communities to create and sustain culturally responsive classrooms and schools. 3.2 Our candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable learning environments and curriculum. 3.3 Our candidates implement appropriate digital resources, instructional strategies, and appropriate and safe online tools and techniques to provide for learner interaction within local and global communities. "Moving lives forward!" Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 1-26. Bowby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment. New York: Basic Books. Bowby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Loss. New York: Basic Books. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. Developmental Psychology, 22, 723-742. Bruner, J. (1996). The culture of education.
Goals

G 1: Goals 1-4

1. Can apply leadership theory in practice. Can design and implement action research. Can perform as change agent in schools
2. Can lead in urban education settings

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Outcomes/Objectives 1-4 (M. 1)

Student is able to apply general theories of leadership to practice. Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Active Through: Keep Active 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. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization.
operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans Georgia State University Goal 2: Significantly strengthen and grow the base of distinctive graduate and professional programs that assure development of the next generation of researchers and societal leaders. Institutional Priorities and Strategies 1. Leverage on current global degree programs for effective instruction in professional degree programs. Georgia State has achieved national prominence of its professional programs and will leverage their strengths in ways that support their current trajectory toward becoming elite programs for professional education and dissemination of scholarship that respond to the 21st century need for leaders with cross-professional competencies. Increasingly, societal leaders play multiple roles in complex organizations with responsibilities across sectors. This requires that professional education broaden to include sets of experiences across disciplines. To accomplish this, cross-professional competencies will be increased, both by leveraging existing successful programs and by creating new programs that address unmet and evolving needs. The University also will create a consortium of courses designed to provide leadership and professional skills drawn from a broad array of disciplines to supplement profession-specific curricula. Further, the University will develop noncredit executive education programs for those who face increasingly complex issues in their operating environments and/or are considering transition to other organizational contexts (e.g., business to nonprofit). In addition, the University will consider the creation of a university-level facility that will serve as a central location for executive education and allow the University to accommodate individuals from outside the Atlanta metropolitan area. 2: Can design and implement action research (Final) Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: Keep Active Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jammi 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. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans Georgia State University Goal 5: Achieve distinct in globalization the University. Institutional Priorities INITIATIVE 4: Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff. Georgia State can become the institution of choice for students from across the world by leveraging...
current strengths in international studies and by putting new programs in place to enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff. Georgia State will establish educational objectives and provide resources necessary to help students develop the cultural competencies necessary to interact effectively with people, ideas and activities from other cultures. Examples of these objectives include (a) doubling the number of students who enroll in study abroad opportunities and expanding the study abroad program to include more semester-long opportunities, (b) introducing a Global Leadership Certificate program for undergraduates featuring interdisciplinary programs that combine comparative and international courses with professional experiences as well as on- and off-campus extracurricular activities; and (c) commissioning a task force to assess requirements for and identify efficient and contemporary ways of assisting students to gain multi-language and cultural proficiency.

4. Can provide leadership for urban education (Final) Student is able to lead an effective urban school Student Learning Outcome: No Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: Keep Active Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry 11/30/11 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 analyzing the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans Georgia State University Goal 5: Achieve distinction in globalizing the University. Institutional Priorities INITIATIVE 4: Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff. Georgia State can become the institution of choice for students from across the world by leveraging current strengths in international studies and by putting new programs in place to enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff. Georgia State will establish educational objectives and provide resources necessary to help students develop the cultural competencies necessary to interact effectively with people, ideas and activities from other cultures. Examples of these objectives include (a) doubling the number of students who enroll in study abroad opportunities and expanding the study abroad program to include more semester-long opportunities, (b) introducing a Global Leadership Certificate program for undergraduates featuring interdisciplinary programs that combine comparative and international courses with professional experiences as well as on- and off-campus extracurricular activities; and (c) commissioning a task force to assess requirements for and identify efficient and contemporary ways of assisting students to gain multi-language and cultural proficiency.

 Measures, Targets, and Findings

M1: Evaluations in Key Courses (O: 1)
1: Evaluations in key courses (O:1) (Final) Individual student grades in EPEL 7000 (Leadership in Educational Organizations). EPEL 7510 (Issues of School Governance). EPEL 7500 (Human Resources Administration). EPEL 7330 (School Law). EPEL 7410 (Supervision of Instruction). EPSF 7450 (Curriculum Foundations of Educational Leadership) Source of Evidence: Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2009-2010 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 11/23/2011 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Edit Measure Achievement Targets and Assessment Results / Findings: 1: Can apply leadership theory in practice Achievement Target (Final) 70 percent of all students earning an “A” in all of these courses combined and in each individual course. Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2009-2010 Edit Achievement Target Findings: 2009-2010 Assessment Results/Findings Target: Met EPEL 7000: 95% EPEL 7330: 90% EPEL 7410 80% EPSF 7450 89% EPEL 7500: 86% EPEL 7510 93% Ave: 89% 2. Can design and implement action research Findings: 2009-2010 Assessment Results/Findings Source: Written action research assignment scored by rubric associated with EPEL 7000 Target: Over 90% of students met or exceeded expectations on this measure 3. Can perform as change agent in schools 2009-2010 Assessment Results/Findings Source: Written leadership for change assignment scored by rubric associated with EPEL 7330 Target: Over 90% of students met or exceeded expectations on this measure 4. Can lead in urban education 2009-2010 Assessment Results/Findings Source: Written philosophy of education assignment scored by rubric associated with EPEL 7000 Target: Over 90% of students met or exceeded expectations on this measure

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. Then-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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Evaluations in Key Courses | Outcome/Objective: Outcomes/Objectives 1-4

Responsible Person Group: All leadership faculty

Additional Resources: Greater collaboration with research faculty and others with expertise in school-based research

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 increased emphasis on issues of diversity in schools and communities.
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.

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?

There have not been any changes to the assessment process for this degree for this reporting term. A team comprised of units throughout the College of Education revised the degree over 2009-2010. This change took place in order to meet the Professional Standards Commission’s (PSC’s) new guidelines for the Teacher Leader certificate, to condense several smaller degree programs into one, and to reformat the M.S. degree program into a more appropriate M.Ed. degree. The newly revised degree will debut in Summer 2012, and as a result of this substantive change, no changes were made to our current M.Ed. programs while the revision took place. We will revisit the viability of this program in Spring 2012.

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 indicated in the previous response, one of the main catalysts for the forthcoming changes to the Urban Teacher Leader degree program was the PSC’s new guidelines for the Teacher Leader certificate. Because of this redesign, there will be substantial changes and improvements made to our M.Ed. program, and these changes will likely impact the delivery and format of the M.Ed. in educational leadership. The unit plans to review this program in Spring 2012 and make adjustments based on both the data collected and the new certification structure adopted by the PSC.

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 link 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, 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.

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

**SLO 4: Students will prepare and conduct a mock oral defense (M: 4)**

Students will prepare and conduct a mock oral defense of their prospectus topic.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

**Standard Associations**

4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

8 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 8 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

18 students successfully defended their dissertations during the period under assessment.

**M 4: Mock Oral Defense Assessment (O: 4)**

The defense should be 15-20 minutes of formal presentation and then open to no more than 5-10 minutes of questions from the class. (Use of PowerPoint slides for the formal presentation is optional.) The prospectus elements to include in the mock defense are identified in the scoring rubric.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Target for O4: Students will prepare and conduct a mock oral defense**

In Development

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

In Development

**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 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 changed the admissions deadlines for Ph.D. student applications. We eliminated the October 1st date and have one yearly application deadline in January. We favor a smaller pool of full-time doctoral students with higher quality credentials. We will start the APR planning year process in fall 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.

We plan an auditing system to report on the progress of our current and newly admitted doctoral students. We will discuss these changes and others at the start of the APR planning year in the fall of 2010.
### 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. There were 35 students (including two concurrent students) in the MS program as of summer 2009; of these 9 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. |
| Institutional Priority Associations |
| 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation |
| Strategic Plan Associations |
| 6.3 Graduate Experience |
| SLO 3: Students demonstrate values underpinning ed. psych (G: 3) (M: 3) |
| Students 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 4: Understand and apply research methods (G: 4) (M: 4) |
| 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 |

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students passed their comprehensive exams.

**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 complete their theses/projects.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed their theses/projects

**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 who engage in theses/projects will successfully portray values of EPY.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students who engaged in theses/projects successfully portrayed values of EPY.

**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 adviser 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 will successfully complete coursework related to research expertise prior to beginning work on their project or thesis.

**Findings 2009-2010 - 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This was implemented last spring and will continue to occur every spring.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and EPY faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Review of program**

Faculty will review the program to determine if changes need to be made.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The faculty have made the following change: All new students, starting in the fall of 2010 will take EPY 8961, a course which orients them to GSU, EPSE, and EPY in the beginning of the course (for example, library, counseling and technology resource), and exposes them to issues such as APA, IRB/CITI, and plagiarism. The faculty also discussed implementing a test option for students to choose from, in addition to selecting a project or thesis. Discussion will continue in the fall of 2010.
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: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: none

Master's Handbook
The Master's Handbook will be updated to reflect new changes in policy and new URL addresses.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and EPY faculty
Additional Resources: none

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 current assessment process of gathering data on student performance has been effective and will be continued.

**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 review our program requirements and decide whether it is appropriate to make changes to the program. We feel that adding the spring orientation helped our spring students get acclimated to graduate school life, and hope that encouraging them to take EPY 8961 will help them succeed in our program. Although everyone has passed their projects and theses, we know that many of our students struggle with this final requirement. Therefore we will strongly consider including a test option for students.

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Doctoral level prepares students for careers in teaching in schools, colleges, and universities; as researchers in state and city departments of education; and professionals in training research programs in government and industry. There were 32 students as of Fall 2009 in the Ph.D. program; of these 4 graduated during this academic year.

**Goals**

G 2: Annual Review
Students will undergo an annual review of their phd performance

G 4: Dissertation
Students will undergo the scholarly activity of writing and defending a dissertation.

G 5: College teaching
Develop competence in college teaching

G 6: Scholarly activities
Participates in scholarly activities
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students will receive a satisfactory or better on their annual reviews, indicating their developing abilities to 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: Exposure to the field of EPY (M: 2)**
Students will attend EPY 8961 to obtain exposure to 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 4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation (G: 4) (M: 3)**
Students will successfully write and defend their dissertation, indicating that they 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 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 5) (M: 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: 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: 2)**
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 O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing**
All students will receive a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
All students except for 4 received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review.

**M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 3)**
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 O3: Exposure to the field of EPY**
All doctoral students will complete this professional development seminar during the first semester of their first year.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Four students did not complete this professional development seminar and received a grade of "IP"

### M 3: Dissertation (O: 4)
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 O4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation**
All students who attempt, will successfully defend their dissertation.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students who attempted, successfully defended their dissertation.

### M 4: Teaching Internship (O: 5)
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 O5: Develop competence in college teaching**
All students who attempt the teaching internship will successfully complete the requirements.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.

### M 5: Presentations and Publications (O: 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 O6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities**
Students will present, publish and write grant proposals related to their areas of interest.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
During this reporting period, approximately 20 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)

#### 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:** Student survey was reviewed. As a result, changes are being made to EPY 8961, EPY 8010, and a new course will be introduced. As appropriate, these changes will be presented to the COE curriculum committee for approval.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and EPY faculty

#### Additional Resources: none

#### 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
- **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
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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing process and no longer needs to be included in our action plan.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

**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
- **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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This has been implemented over the course of this last year. We will review it during this year, to see if students and faculty believe this to be a worthwhile action.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPY faculty and students
- **Additional Resources:** none

**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 was conducted during this past year and will continue as an action plan
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Phd Handbook**

The Phd handbook will be continuously reviewed and updated to reflect new requirements and URL address changes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPY coordinator and faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Remediation Plan**

When a student receives an "IP" grade in the EPY 8961 seminar, they need to "make up" the work within one academic semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** none

**Remediation Plan**

When a student receives an "IP" grade in this seminar, they are required to "make-up" the missed work within one academic semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Additional Resources:** none

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

- **Measure:** Educational Psychology seminar
- **Outcome/Objective:** Exposure to the field of EPY
- **Implementation Description:** This is an ongoing process.
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 current assessment process of gathering data on student performance has been effective and will be continued.

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 student survey results, we are going to be trying three new changes to our program requirements, and based on our findings we will seek approval from the COE curriculum committee for these changes. We will continue to monitor our acceptances in terms of GRE scores and demographic characteristics. We will also review with students the impact of having student representation in our EPY faculty meetings to decide whether we should continue this practice.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Educational Research MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to provide high-quality, relevant and useful training in qualitative and quantitative research methods, program evaluation, testing, and computer applications to all students in the College of Education and to serve the needs of external stakeholders, including local school districts, state educational and social service agencies and policy makers.

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 relevant 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

A few literature reviews this year came from course assignments, while others came from master's projects. 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

A few literature reviews this year came from course assignments, while others came from master's projects. 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All students met or exceeded the standard of performance for analyzing data and reporting on the results of the analysis, including one student who did so in multiple 9000-level quantitative methods courses.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students who completed a master’s project in 2009 met or exceeded the standard for forming a clear, useful, and practical research query.

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students who completed a master’s project in 2009 met or exceeded the standard for reviewing and critiquing the research literature.

**Target for O3: Design a research study**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students who completed a master’s project in 2009 met or exceeded the standard for designing a research study.

**Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results**
100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Among the students who completed their master’s degree requirements in 2009, none did a master’s thesis or a project that called for the analysis of data or the reporting of results.

#### 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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
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.

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**
100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
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.
### Target for O3: Design a research study
100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
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.

### Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results
100% of students meet or exceed the standard

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
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.

### 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

### 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.

### Goals

#### G 1: Developing critical readers and writers
To realize our mission of developing critical and effective readers and writers, the core courses in English are committed to helping our students 1) develop critical think through analytical reading of literary, cultural, and other works;

#### G 2: knowledge of the discipline
Student will gain knowledge of the discipline through reading and writing;

#### G 3: rhetorical situation
Student will grasp a solid understanding of rhetorical situation.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Idea (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop clear, logical ideas in their writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Organization (G: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will demonstrate effective and logical organization in their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Development (G: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate logical and clear development of their ideas through examples, illustrations, and details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Audience (G: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an awareness of audience as they consider a given or changing context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Grammar (G: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate appropriate standard written English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Format (G: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of MLA format as well as others (APA and Chicago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/O 5: Style (G: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an appropriate style for various situations through sentence structure, vocabulary, and transitions, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Written Communication Assessing Rubric (O: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication in Lower division English courses (the Core) is a primary focus of our learning outcomes and objectives for students in our classes. In 2008-2009, success in written communication was determined through a rubric that included the following categories: Ideas (topic, thesis, purpose, articulate, original) Organization (structure, coherence, unity, transitions), Development (details, evidence, examples, logic), Audience, Style and Mechanics (sentence structure, word choice, tone), Grammar and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During 2009-10, a total of 80 teaching portfolios were collected from instructors of English teaching in the Core (1000 and 2000). Data for Written Communication was gathered from a randomly selected group of 25 TA Teaching portfolios, which included essays from approximately 600 students taking Composition in the Core. Each TA teaching portfolio included at least three essays rated High, Medium, Low with a rubric that instructors used to analytically score each essay. These essays were representative of what instructors saw in student writing in their classes. The following data is a compilation of the results from the rubric scores of written communication from this academic year, based on 25 TA portfolios, each including three student samples, totaling 75 student papers.

**Target for O1: Idea**

In order to assess the level of understanding that students have achieved, the Assessment Rubric provides a clear measure. Considering that students are rated on a 1-6 scale (6 being the highest), our target for assessment is that 70% of students rate at least a 4 in each of the following areas: Ideas Organization Development Audience Style Grammar & Mechanics Format.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Ideas: 54 out of the 75 student papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 72%; Organization: 48 out of 75 student papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 64%; Development: 48 out of 75 student papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 64%; Audience: 52 out of 75 student papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 69%; Style: 42 out of 75 student papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 56%; Grammar & Mechanics: 48 out of 75 papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 64%; Format: 53 out of 75 papers scored a 4 or better, totaling 71%.

**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

**Implementation Plan for Style**
In order to improve the “Style” element of writing, instructors will receive information at the Fall GTA conference in August 2010. A panel will be planned, consisting of at least three members who will provide assignments, activities and strategies for improving student writing style. These items will address sentence structure, transitions, MLA, and active/passive voice.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Written Communication Assessing Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Idea

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 English Concentration in Creative Writing**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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. 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 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. In the summer of 2010, we decided to break down the portfolio results into the four different concentrations and to allow each concentration to choose the particular outcomes to focus on in the upcoming assessment year.

**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge of language**

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.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts (M: 2)
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.

SLO 2: Knowledge of Language and Linguistics (M: 2)
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.

SLO 3: Effective Written Communications (M: 2)
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 2: Senior Exit Portfolio (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.

Target for O1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts
The target for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
A total of 22 students submitted senior portfolios in the Creative Writing concentration in 09-10 (21 in fiction and 1 in poetry). The average score for this outcome was a 4.4 for fiction students and a 4.0 for the poetry student. This means that the fiction students exceeded the target while the poetry student fell a bit short. Also, the fiction students’ score was in keeping with previous years (a 4.4 - 4.5 range) while the poetry score fell below the averages of the past six years.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Language and Linguistics
The target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
A total of 22 students submitted senior portfolios in the Creative Writing concentration in 09-10 (21 in fiction and 1 in poetry). The fiction students averaged a 4.4 score for this outcome (listed on the portfolio assessment sheet as “the knowledge of rhetorical strategies and literary aesthetics”), while the poetry student had a 4.5 score for this outcome. Consequently, both sets of students exceeded the target. In addition, these were the highest mean scores achieved in this concentration in the past six years of assessment work (scores from previous years ranged from 3.7-4.3).

Target for O3: Effective Written Communications
The target for this outcome related to effective written communications is a 4.3 out of 5.0.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
A total of 21 students submitted senior portfolios in the Creative Writing concentration in 09-10 (21 in fiction and 1 in poetry). The average score for Creative Writing students for the learning outcome related to effective written communications (listed on the assessment sheet as “ability to produce authentic and engaging writing”) was a 4.3 for the fiction students and a 4.0 for the poetry student. Consequently, the fiction students met the target and the poetry did not. Additionally, the fiction score was at the high end of the range of scores produced in the last six years of assessment work (3.8-4.4) while the poetry score was at the middle of this range.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Change the focus of next year's assessment process, starting in Jan. 2011**

Instead of focusing on language, interpretation, and effective written communications, the Creative Writing concentration will give particular attention to two other criteria on the portfolio assessment form: "the ability to demonstrate content knowledge related to Creative Writing" (this is the newly formed criterion as indicated in one of the other action plans) and "the ability to demonstrate familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works." They want to establish a target of 4.2 out of 5.0 for these two outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator, Renee Schatteman
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Investigate the disparity between the number of fiction and poetry students**

This year's assessment work in Creative Writing revealed that only one student graduated with a concentration in poetry while eight graduated with a concentration in fiction. The Creative Writing faculty will investigate reasons for this disparity and the implications for teaching. In addition, they will consider the disparity in portfolio results between the two genres, as poetry portfolios have fared less successfully for the past two assessment cycles.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Senior Exit Portfolio
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Ability to think critically and interpret texts
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Creative Writing in consultation with other Creative Writing faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Make changes to the Creative Writing senior portfolio assessment form**

As per the Director of Creative Writing, three of the criteria on the Creative Writing portfolio assessment form (does the student show knowledge of literary composition and aesthetics, does the student demonstrate the knowledge of vocabulary for discussing the genre, and does the student use a variety of techniques to create effective work?) will be combined to form a single criterion which reads "How well does the student's reflective essay demonstrate content knowledge related to Creative Writing, including literary composition and aesthetics, vocabulary for discussing the genre, and a variety of techniques to create effective work?"

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator, Renee Schatteman
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Revise the Creative Writing portfolio instruction document**

Previously, the reflective essay in the Creative Writing portfolio was primarily a piece of writing in which a student analyzed his or her own writing and how it was developed during the course of the program. The Creative Writing faculty instead wants students to use the reflective essay as a place to reflect upon their own writing by analyzing it through the lens of the content knowledge they have gained through their classes. (For example, they might consider which writers have influenced their creative output, what literary techniques they have learned about from other writers or from their instructors that they have used in their own writing, what vocabulary they have learned about the genre they have selected and how this knowledge of terminology has helped their writing). Consequently, the portfolio instruction sheet for this concentration will be revised by Jan. 2011 to highlight this expectation for the portfolio reflective essay.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Creative Writing in collaboration with other Creative Writing faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Rewrite mission, goals, and objectives to better suit the particulars of the Creative Writing concentration**

Now that the department has decided to break down the assessment work into the four different concentrations, faculty members in each concentration will examine the mission, goals, and objectives to see if they want to make changes in order to better match the specific skills and knowledge their students are expected to gain and the particular types of assignments they are expected to produce.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty in Creative Writing
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**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?

Now that the Creative Writing undergraduate assessment work has been separated from that of the other three concentrations, the...
Creative Writing faculty members are beginning to make changes to reflect the particulars of their program. So far, the Creative Writing faculty members have decided to drop last year’s focus on language, interpretation, and effective written communications and to concentration instead on their students’ mastery of content knowledge related to Creative Writing as well as their students’ familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works. During the fall 2010 semester, Creative Writing faculty will do further work to make the assessment tools more relevant to their concentration by revising the mission, the goals, the objectives, and the portfolio instruction document.

**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 fiction students met the targets set for language, interpretation, and effective written communications in last year’s assessment process, while the one poetry student met in target set for language knowledge but fell short of the targets for the other two outcomes. Two areas of concerned emerged from this assessment data. First, why was there such a disparity in the number of students in fiction as compared to the number in poetry? Are fewer students choosing poetry, and, if yes, why? What are the implications of this disparity for classes in the program. Second, there has been a gap between the assessment scores of students in the two genres for two assessment cycles. Are readers or poetry portfolios using a more stringent standard for assessing? Would norming efforts help to decrease the disparity between the scores of the two genres? The changes to the expectations for the reflective essay in the portfolio will likely assist in the norming process. The Creative Writing faculty will consider these issues during the course of the year and will pay attention to how the two genres fare in next year’s assessment work.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2009-2010 English Concentration in Literature**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST)

**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. 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. In the summer of 2010, we decided to break down the portfolio results into the four different concentrations and to allow each concentration to choose the particular outcomes to focus on in the upcoming assessment year.

**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge of language**

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.

**G 2: Effective written communications**

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.

**G 3: Ability to interpret texts**

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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts (M: 1)**

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.

**SLO 2: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1)**

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.

**SLO 3: Effective written communications (M: 1)**
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Literature Senior Exit Portfolio (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: Ability to think critically and interpret texts

The target for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

A total of 34 students submitted senior portfolios in the literature concentration in 09-10, and they scored a mean average of 4.2 for this outcome, meaning that it met the target. This score was on the low side of the six year averages which ranged from 4.2-4.4.

#### Target for O2: Knowledge of language and linguistics

The target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

A total of 34 students submitted senior portfolios in the literature concentration in 09-10, and they scored a mean average of 4.1 for this outcome. In the past six years of assessment work, literature students have scored between 4.0-4.3 on this outcome, so this year’s score is in the middle of the range, even though it falls a bit short of the target.

#### Target for O3: Effective written communications

The target for this learning outcome relate to effective written communications is a 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

A total of 34 students submitted senior portfolios in the literature concentration in 09-10, and they scored a mean average of 4.0 for this outcome, meaning they did not meet the target. In addition, this score was on the low side of the six-year range from 3.9-4.3.

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

#### Change focus of portfolio assessments

Instead of focusing on language, interpretation skills, and effective written communications, faculty in the Literature concentration will focus on the following three outcomes in the portfolio assessment process: outcome 1: knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres; outcome 5: ability to think critically and interpret texts; and outcome 6: mastery of basic elements of writing. A target of 4.2 out of 5.0 will be set for these three learning outcomes.

**Established in Cycle: 2009-2010**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: High**

**Projected Completion Date: 01/2011**

**Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator**

**Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)**

#### Change the criteria on the Literature portfolio assessment form

The Literature portfolio assessment sheet has been revised so that the criteria read as follows: criterion 1: presentation: portfolio's appearance, organization, and comprehensiveness; criterion 2: quality of thought in the reflective essay; criterion 3: knowledge of major figures and genres, periods and movements, and approaches and literary terms; criterion 4: knowledge of criticism and theory; criterion 5: careful and detailed reading of texts; criterion 6: insightful interpretation of texts; criterion 7: ability to use basic elements of writing (such as grammar, punctuation, diction, syntax, and organization); criterion 8: skills at written communications (including rhetorical strategies); criterion 9: researching skills; criterion 10: overall impression.

**Established in Cycle: 2009-2010**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: High**

**Projected Completion Date: 01/2011**

**Responsible Person/Group: Assessment coordinator**

**Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)**

#### Make revisions to the full list of learning outcomes for the Literature concentration

The faculty in the Literature concentration have revised the full list of learning outcomes for the Literature concentration to the following: outcome 1: knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres; outcome 2: ability to use literary terms; outcome 3: knowledge of language and linguistics; outcome 4: knowledge of criticism and theory; outcome 5: ability to think critically and interpret texts.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies, Audrey Goodman
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Separate basic writing skills from rhetorical skills on the portfolio assessment
Since the portfolios from 2009-2010 did not meet the target set for effective written communications, the Literature concentration is going to score basic writing skills separate from rhetorical skills on the portfolios starting in spring 2011 to try to isolate the writing problem.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Literature Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Effective written communications
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

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 faculty in the Literature concentration met and decided to revise their outcomes and their portfolio assessment form. The changes they made will be put into effect in Jan. 2011. Besides changing some of the criteria, they are combining the student and department forms and providing one space for comments to the students and a separate space for comments to the department. This concentration is also changing its focus for next year; they will give particular attention to students' mastery of basic writing skills, the knowledge of figures and genres, and their interpretation 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.

Literature portfolios from this past year met the target for interpretation but fell short of the target for language and effective written communications. Next year, they will continue to track students' success in interpretation but will shift to also examine basic writing skills as well as knowledge of figures and genres.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 English Concentration in Rhetoric/Composition
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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. 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. In the summer of 2010, we decided to break down the portfolio results into the four different concentrations and to allow each concentration to choose the particular outcomes to focus on in the upcoming assessment year.

Goals

G 1: Knowledge of language and linguistics
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.

G 2: Effective Written Communications
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.

**G 3: Interpretive Skills**
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.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts (M: 1)**
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.

**SLO 2: Effective written communications (M: 1)**
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

**SLO 3: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1)**
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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Rhetoric and Composition senior exit portfolio (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.

**Target for O1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts**
The target for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
A total of 25 students submitted senior exit portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration in 09-10, and mean average on the outcome related to critical thinking and the interpretation of texts was a 4.3, meaning that it exceeded the target. This outcome had been included as part of the Rhetoric and Composition portfolio assessment process for only the past two years, and this year’s score was an improvement over last year’s score of a 4.1.

**Target for O2: Effective written communications**
The target for this outcome related to effective written communications is a 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
A total of 25 students submitted senior portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration in 09-10. Students earned an average of 4.1 for this outcome, which is listed on the assessment sheet as "ability to produce writing for a wide range of purposes." This was short of the target and it was the lowest score of the past six years (previous years' scores ranged from 4.2-4.9).

**Target for O3: Knowledge of language and linguistics**
The target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
A total of 25 students submitted senior portfolios in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration in 09-10, and they scored a mean average of 4.2 for this outcome (which is listed on the assessment sheet as "the knowledge of language and the history of rhetoric"). In the past seven years of assessment work, Rhetoric and Composition students have scored between 3.8-4.5 on this outcome; consequently, this year’s score is in the middle of the range.

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

**Continue targets set in last year's assessment report**
The Rhetoric and Composition faculty will continue to focus on the following learning outcomes in their assessment work in 2009-2010: knowledge of language and linguistics (with a target of 4.2); ability to think critically and to interpret texts (with a target of 4.2); and ability to produce effective written communications (with a target of 4.3).

**Established in Cycle: 2009-2010**
Revise the mission, goals, and objectives to match the particulars of the Rhetoric/Composition concentration
Now that the undergraduate assessment is being broken down into the four concentrations, each concentration will revise the mission, goals, and objectives so that they are more relevant to the particulars of their program. This work will be done in the fall 2010 semester.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

Switch the criterion used to determine effective written communications in the Rhetoric and Composition portfolios
The scores on the 2009-2010 Rhetoric and Composition portfolios did not meet the target, in large part because students did not include a wide enough range of papers and projects for the readers of the portfolios to give an accurate judgment of this outcome. The faculty in this concentration would like to use the criterion that reads "ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage" as the indicator for the outcome related to effective written communications instead.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Rhetoric and Composition senior exit portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Effective written communications
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

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?

In the past two years, the Rhetoric and Composition concentration have done a lot of work to make their assessment documents closely aligned with the particular work of their concentration. Now that the undergraduate assessment report is being broken up into the four concentrations, they will take that one step further by revising the mission and goals sections of the assessment report to suit their 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 portfolio assessment results for the Rhetoric and Composition concentration from last year indicate that students met the targets for two of the outcomes but fell short of the target in the ability to produce effective written communications. The Rhetoric and Composition faculty feel that this failure was in part due to the criterion that was chosen to represent this outcome: the ability to produce writing for a wide range of audiences. Some students scored lower on this criterion because they did not include evidence of a wide range of papers and projects in the portfolio, not necessarily because they were unable to do so. Therefore, they would like to use a different criterion to judge the ability to produce effective writing, specifically the ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage. At the same time, instructors of the senior seminar in this concentration will encourage students to make an effort to submit evidence that covers a range of audiences and purposes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 English Concentration in Secondary Education
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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. 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. In the summer of 2010, we decided to break down the portfolio results into the four different concentrations and to allow each concentration to choose the particular outcomes to focus on in the upcoming assessment year.
Goals

G 1: Knowledge of language
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.

G 2: Effective Written Communications
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.

G 3: Ability to Interpret Texts
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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts (M: 1)
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.

SLO 2: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1)
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.

SLO 3: Effective Written Communications (M: 1)
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio (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: Ability to think critically and interpret texts
The target for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
A total of 13 students submitted senior portfolios in the Secondary English concentration in 09-10, and the mean score for the outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation was a 4.6, meaning that it exceeded the target. This score was at the high end of the six-year averages which ranged from 4.2-4.6.

Target for O2: Knowledge of language and linguistics
The target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
A total of 13 students submitted senior portfolios in the Secondary English concentration in 09-10, and they scored a mean average of 4.3 for this outcome. In the past six years of assessment work, students in this concentration have scored between 3.7-4.3 on this outcome, so this year's score is at the top end of the range and it meets the target set in last year's assessment report.

Target for O3: Effective Written Communications
The target for this outcome related to effective written communications is a 4.3 out of 5.0.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
A total of 13 students submitted senior portfolios in the Secondary English concentration in 09-10, and they scored a mean average of 4.4 for this outcome, meaning they exceeded the target. The score was on the high end of the six-year averages which ranged from 3.9-4.5.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Create an assignment on the teaching profession for the senior seminar**
The senior seminar in Secondary English is intended to introduce students to elements of the teaching profession, including lesson and unit planning, the integration of standards in English classroom teaching, the resources available for classroom instruction (journals, on-line pedagogy sites), classroom management as demonstrated by teachers at their observation sites, and content enhancement possibilities though teaching conferences. At the end of the senior seminar, students will do an assignment that asks students to reflect upon what they have learned of the profession. Scores from this assignment will be submitted to the Assessment Coordinator as another assessment measure for this concentration.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors of the Secondary English Committee
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Investigate the possibility of offering an elective on the Professionalization of Teaching**
Two years ago, the Secondary English faculty made an adjustment to the senior portfolio instruction document so that the expectations of this concentration’s portfolio would be more similar to the expectations of the Literature concentration’s portfolio (for example, requiring only five pieces of evidence rather than six). One result of this shift is that recent portfolios have not included as much in the way of content or reflection upon teaching. Acting on the assumption that our undergraduates would benefit from more involvement in the schools before they finish the program, faculty will investigate the possibility of offering an elective course on the Professionalization of Teaching. One possibility is that this course could be run as a type of internship program in which students go out to observe in schools and come back to the classroom to process their experiences.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Members from the Secondary English committee will brainstorm ideas for this course and will meet with the director of the department’s internship program, Malinda Snow, as well as with our counterparts in MSIT to get their recommendations and suggestions.
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Revise the mission, goals, and outcomes to better match the specifics of the Secondary English program**
Now that the undergraduate assessment is being broken down into the four concentrations, each concentration will revise the mission, goals, and objectives so that they are more relevant to the particulars of their program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Secondary English committee

**Revise the Secondary English portfolio assessment form**
Faculty members in the Secondary English concentration have made a number of changes to their portfolio assessment form. The revised form, which will be put into use starting in the spring of 2011, includes the following: criterion 1: adequate knowledge of genres, approaches, and critical terms; criterion 2: adequate knowledge of language and linguistics (as evidenced in work included in the portfolio from any of the department’s language courses or in the student’s reflective essay); criterion 3: adequate reading interpretation skills; criterion 4: ability to understand and incorporate literary criticism; criterion 5: adequate written communication skills (style, editing, voice, diction, audience awareness, argumentative strategies, etc.); criterion 6: adequate researching skills (finding sources, integrating sources, citing sources); criterion 7: engagement with and passion for the teaching profession; criterion 8: knowledge of literature, language, and composition potentially suitable for middle and secondary classroom instruction; criterion 9: ability to reflect upon teaching; and criterion 10: overall evaluation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Set target for three areas of focus for the Secondary English portfolio assessment**
In 2009-2010, all four concentrations focused on learning outcomes related to knowledge of language, interpretation skills, and effective written communications. Starting in the spring of 2011, the Secondary English concentration will keep these areas of emphasis with the exception of one. Instead of focusing on interpretation skills, they will add the focus on the learning outcome related to the ability to reflect upon teaching. A target of 4.2 out of 5.0 will be set for all three outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011

---

**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?

Now that each concentration is producing its own assessment report, the Secondary English faculty determined to make a number of changes to their assessment form so that their evaluation criteria was more in alignment with the work typically included in these
portfolios. During the course of the semester, the Secondary English committee will also work to revise the mission, goals, and outcomes as well as to review their portfolio instruction document.

**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.

Secondary English portfolios that were submitted in 2009-2010 met or exceeded the targets set for the three learning outcomes. While the data therefore did not indicate any problem areas, faculty members agreed that the portfolios are giving less and less evidence of an understanding of the teaching profession. This concentration will undertake three efforts to counteract that problem: first, they are adding a pedagogy-focused learning outcome (knowledge of Secondary English profession) to the outcomes they will focus on in the future. Second, they will introduce an assignment in the senior seminar that asks students to reflect upon what they have learned about the profession from that course. The grades for this assignment will be submitted to the Assessment Coordinator as another assessment tool for this concentration. Finally, faculty members will begin to seriously discuss the possibility of an elective course on the Professionalization of English Teaching. They plan to enter into conversations with the department's internship director and with MSIT faculty to gain input for this proposed class.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2009-2010 English Creative Writing MFA

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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 and creative writing. 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**

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**
Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M1: M.F.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)

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 will 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One student completed a M.F.A. thesis in 2009-2010, and he/she scored a 6.0 for the criteria related to this learning outcome (familiarity with representative examples of writing, an understanding of literary history, and an understanding of form and theory of fiction or poetry). This far exceeds the target of 4.5.

### Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies

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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One student completed a M.F.A. thesis in 2009-2010, and he/she scored a 6.0 for the criterion related to this learning outcome (the ability to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics in English studies to create meaningful literary works, deemed worthy of publication). This far exceeds the target of 4.5.

### Target for O3: Craftsmanship

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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One student completed a M.F.A. thesis in 2009-2010, and he/she scored a 6.0 for the criteria related to this learning outcome (the ability to produce work that is authentic and engaging, the ability to produce work that is grammatically sound and syntactically correct, and the use of a variety of literary techniques). This far exceeds the target of 4.5.

### 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One student completed a M.F.A. thesis in 2009-2010, and he/she scored a 6.0 for this learning outcome. This far exceeds the target of 4.5.

### M2: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all M.F.A. exams stating the intention that 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or fewer of the 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 where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Five M.F.A. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of exams that were scored as a low pass or a failure was 20%. This did not meet the target. On the other end of the spectrum, 60% of exams were scored as a high pass, in comparison to 14% in the previous year.

**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 where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Five M.F.A. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of exams that were scored as a low pass or a failure was 20%. This did not meet the target. On the other end of the spectrum, 60% of exams were scored as a high pass, in comparison to 14% in the previous year.

**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 of a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Five M.F.A. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of exams that were scored as a low pass or a failure was 20%. This did not meet the target. On the other end of the spectrum, 60% of exams were scored as a high pass, in comparison to 14% in the previous year.

**Target for O5: Effective Communication Skills**

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 of a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Five M.F.A. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of exams that were scored as a low pass or a failure was 20%. This did not meet the target. On the other end of the spectrum, 60% of exams were scored as a high pass, in comparison to 14% in the previous year.

**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 members 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: Finished
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)

Adjust the target for the low pass/ failure rate on the MFA exams to 25% or less
The Creative Writing department is changing the target for the low pass/failure rate on the MFA exams to 25% or less.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: M.F.A. Exams | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Adjust the target for the MFA thesis to 4.7 on all learning outcomes
The target for the learning outcomes on the MFA thesis (content knowledge, application of literary studies, craftsmanship) will be moved from a 4.5 to a 4.7.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Adjust the target of MFA exam to a low pass/ failure rate of 25% or less
The target for the MFA exam will be adjusted so that 25% or fewer of the examinees receive a low pass or failure for the exam.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator, Renee Schatteman
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Create a document that explains the rankings on the thesis assessment form
The Graduate of Creative Writing, in conjunction with other Creative Writing faculty, will create a document that explains the meaning of each of the rankings of the thesis assessment form (outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor inadequate) in terms of the specific work of this concentration. This intention of this action step is that the explanation of the rankings can help in the norming process to better ensure accurate and useful results.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Distinguish between poetry and fiction exams
To ensure better data on the MFA exams, results will distinguish between poetry and fiction and will indicate whether the student is taking the exam as his or her primary or secondary area.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Reach 100% compliance on MFA thesis assessment process

During 2009-2010, half of the thesis assessment forms were submitted with the signature sheets for completed MFA theses (one out of two). To guarantee that the thesis assessment sheet is completed by the thesis committee, it will be attached to signature sheets and distributed to a thesis committee chair by the Assistant to the Graduate Director. In the future, a signature sheet will not be accepted for graduation unless the assessment form is included.

Rewrite mission and goals for MFA program

By spring of 2011, faculty in the Creative Writing concentration will revise the mission statement and their goals on the assessment report. Presently, these items reflect the mission and goals for the whole of the MA program. Now that we have broken up the assessment reporting in terms of concentration, Creative Writing can rewrite these items to more specifically match their program.

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?

In the summer of 2010, the English department decided to break down the undergraduate assessment reports in terms of its four concentrations to better represent the needs of students in each concentration. By September of the same year, it was decided to do the same with the graduate program as well. Graduate assessment will now include six different reports in the following areas: PhD in Literary Studies, PhD in Creative Writing, PhD in Rhetoric and Composition, MA in Literary Studies, and MFA in Creative Writing. While the WEAVE report is now divided among these concentrations, there is still a need to further individualize the reports. Therefore, during the course of the fall 2010 semester, concentrations will formulate mission statements and goals specific to their own programs and will create documents that explain the specific rankings (of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) should stand for in terms of specific student achievement. This document was effective in encouraging faculty to rate a dissertation in more critical and ultimately more useful terms. Assuming that normal in the thesis assessment is as important as it was in dissertation assessment, it has been decided that during the fall 2010 semester, the Creative Writing faculty will generate a document that explains their specific rankings on their thesis form. Additionally, this concentration will set a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for all learning outcomes related to the MFA thesis. The Creative Writing MFA exams had a 20% low pass/failure rate. The rate did not match the target. The Creative Writing department wants to see next year’s results to see there is a trend in their exam results. In the meanwhile, they want to raise the target of low pass/failure rates from 15% or fewer to a 25% or fewer (this target is less demanding than the target being set for the PhD exams in Creative Writing of 20% or fewer). The main reason for this is the acknowledgement that Creative Writing students are taking these exams in addition to the creative work they are doing as the critical part of their program. (Conversely, literature students are being tested in their primary areas of concentration, so their low pass/ failure rate is likely going to be lower.) Additionally, the Creative Writing Program wants to gain more data on their MFA exams, with poetry exams being distinguished from fiction exams and with the student’s choice of genre indicated on each exam so that they compare the rate of success on the primary exam as compared with the success rate on the secondary exam.

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 2009-2010, one MFA thesis was assessed. It scored a 6.0 out of 6.0 in all categories. This success speaks well of the concentration, but it is also difficult to draw definite conclusions from a single sample. One point to consider is that when literature dissertations were assessed during the first two years the department participated in this type of assessment work, there were many perfect scores. Consequently, the Graduate Director generated a document that explained what each ranking (of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) should stand for in terms of specific student achievement. This document was effective in encouraging faculty to rate a dissertation in more critical and ultimately more useful terms. Assuming that normal in the thesis assessment is as important as it was in dissertation assessment, it has been decided that during the fall 2010 semester, the Creative Writing faculty will generate a document that explains their specific rankings on their thesis form. Additionally, this concentration will set a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for all learning outcomes related to the MFA thesis. The Creative Writing MFA exams had a 20% low pass/failure rate. The rate did not match the target. The Creative Writing department wants to see next year’s results to see there is a trend in their exam results. In the meanwhile, they want to raise the target of low pass/failure rates from 15% or fewer to a 25% or fewer (this target is less demanding than the target being set for the PhD exams in Creative Writing of 20% or fewer). The main reason for this is the acknowledgement that Creative Writing students are taking these exams in addition to the creative work they are doing as the critical part of their program. (Conversely, literature students are being tested in their primary areas of concentration, so their low pass/ failure rate is likely going to be lower.) Additionally, the Creative Writing Program wants to gain more data on their MFA exams, with poetry exams being distinguished from fiction exams and with the student’s choice of genre indicated on each exam so that they compare the rate of success on the primary exam as compared with the success rate on the secondary exam.
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.
## 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.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) 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.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) 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.

### M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 Assessment (O: 3)
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.

**Target for O3: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) 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.

### M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 Know Eng Grammars (O: 4)
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.

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) 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.

### M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 6 Learning Environments
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.

### M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 7 Prof Development
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.

### M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Know Literary Theories
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.

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

**M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 5 Instructional Practic**

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.

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

**M 9: Use of technology to complete portfolio**

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.

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

### 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 2009-2010 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. As we consider the long term view of our courses in the program, we are aware that the MEd in English Education is a program that may dissolve with the creation of the MEd in Urban Teacher Leadership. Our commitment, however, will remain focused on urban education and embedding technological savvy into our courses in English education at the graduate level.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: English Education Faculty

**New action plan 2010-2011**

Test

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Michelle Zoss
- Additional Resources: N/A

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

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 were satisfied with our assessment program and thus have not made any changes. We look forward to continuing to work with our students and assessing their work in our 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 changes we anticipate for our program include possibly combining with the Urban Teacher Leadership MEd 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
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: Involves school and community in learning (G: 3) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  **Institutional Priority Associations**
  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**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

| **O/O 4: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 2) (M: 4)** |
| The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner. |

  **Institutional Priority Associations**
  1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
  2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

  **Strategic Plan Associations**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

| **O/O 5: Practices professional reflection (M: 5, 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. |

  **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

| **O/O 6: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge (G: 1) (M: 6)** |
| The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students. |

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

  **Strategic Plan Associations**
  6.3 Graduate Experience

| **O/O 7: Uses communication skills and technology (M: 7)** |
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 8: Can effectively plan for instruction (G: 2) (M: 8)**
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 2) (M: 9)**
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**O/O 10: Can motivate and manage students for learning (G: 2) (M: 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.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
93.58 % 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100 % 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

97.3% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
97.3% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

96.15% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

97.3% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

97.3% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.

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

**Assessment Action Plan**

*Update (Fall 2010):* We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students’ knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice

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:** Terminated
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for 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:** 05/2012

**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

**Community Action Plan**

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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community  |  *Outcome/Objective:* Involves school and community in 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

**Diversity 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 diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity  |  *Outcome/Objective:* Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners  

**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

**Motivate/Manage 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 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage  |  *Outcome/Objective:* Can motivate and manage students for 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

**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:** Terminated  
**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**  
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice 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:** Terminated  
**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:** Terminated
- **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

---

**Program Assessment for 2010-2011**

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge, Planning, Effects on P-12 Learners, Pedagogical Knowledge, Dispositions, and Clinical Practice.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment  
**Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2011 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 terms.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Michelle Zoss, Mary Deming, and Ewa McGrail

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

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?

As a faculty, we continued to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements. We piloted an approach in which we
embedded and aligned the portfolio standards into our methods and practicum course assignments (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630). Our reasoning for this was to allow 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. In the upcoming year, 2010-2011, we will be aligning our key assessments with the EDCI 7660, 7670, and 7680 courses. This realignment allows us to change the portfolio requirement to focus more on developing students' professional teaching philosophies. The standards for our discipline are still met with the achievement of the key assessments. Additionally, students can see more explicitly the connection between the theory they learn in methods courses and the practices they encounter in their year-long field placements.

**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 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. 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. As a faculty, we continued to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements. We piloted an approach in which we embedded and aligned the portfolio standards into our methods and practicum course assignments (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630). Our reasoning for this was to allow 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. In the upcoming year, 2010-2011, we will be aligning our key assessments with the EDCI 7660, 7670, and 7680 courses. This realignment allows us to change the portfolio requirement to focus more on developing students' professional teaching philosophies. The standards for our discipline are still met with the achievement of the key assessments. Additionally, students can see more explicitly the connection between the theory they learn in methods courses and the practices they encounter in their year-long field placements.

**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
SLO 1: Content Knowledge (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 2: Knowledge of Language (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 3: Scholarly vocabulary (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.

SLO 4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading 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 (M: 1, 2)

Students will be able to formulate effective questions for master's level research.

SLO 6: Effective Communications Skills (M: 1, 2)

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts.

SLO 7: Researching Skills (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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assessment of work in the Pro-Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

Since the spring of 2008, the English department has required M.A. students in literature to take the Pro-Seminar in the second semester of their program. This course is intended to teach students about the professional elements of literary studies and to prepare them to write the thesis that will serve as the culmination of their masters program. Accordingly, students are expected to complete a draft of their prospectus by the end of the course. Beginning in the spring of 2009, 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: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Content Knowledge

To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.6. This indicates that the target was met for this outcome. This score was slightly lower than the 2008-2009 score of 4.8 for this outcome.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Language

To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.9. This indicates that the target was met for this outcome. This score duplicated the 2008-2009 score for this outcome.

Target for O3: Scholarly vocabulary

To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.7. This indicates that the target was met for this outcome. This score was slightly lower than the 2008-2009 score of 4.9 for this outcome.

Target for O4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature

To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.4. This indicates that the target was not met for this outcome. This score was lower than the 2008-2009 score of 4.8 for this outcome.

Target for O5: Skills of inquiry
To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.4. This indicates that the target was not met for this outcome. This score was lower than the 2008-2009 score of 4.8 for this outcome.

Target for O6: Effective Communications Skills
To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.4. This indicates that the target was not met for this outcome. This score was lower than the 2008-2009 score of 4.8 for this outcome.

Target for O7: Researching Skills
To build on the success of the Pro-Seminar as reflected in the 2008-2009 assessment results, the department decided to set a general target of at least as 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
The average score for this learning outcome for the 15 Pro-Seminar students (from two different classes) was a 4.8. This indicates that the target was met for this outcome. This score duplicated the 2008-2009 score for this outcome.

M 2: M.A. Thesis in Literary Studies (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
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 (with a 6-point scale) 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
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.6 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Language
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.6 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

Target for O3: Scholarly vocabulary
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.4 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

Target for O4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.6 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

**Target for O5: Skills of inquiry**

Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.6 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

**Target for O6: Effective Communications Skills**

Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.6 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

**Target for O7: Researching Skills**

Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Five students completed a literature thesis in 2009-2010, and their average score for this learning outcome was a 5.6 (out of 6). This far exceeds the target of a 4.5.

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

**Create a document that explains the rankings on the MA thesis assessment**

The Graduate Director will create a document to explain what the rankings on the MA in Literary Studies assessment form (outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) mean in terms of the specific work of this concentration. This intention of this action step is that the explanation of the rankings can help in the norming process to better ensure accurate and useful results.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Former Pro-Seminar instructors will offer suggestions for writing the prospectus and the thesis**

In order to assist students in writing the prospectus and in preparing for the challenges of completing a thesis, previous instructors of Pro-Seminar will create a document that provides recommendations and cautions about the work that goes into this long-term project. This document will emphasize the need for a conceptual framework (critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts) in thesis writing. Current Pro-Seminar instructors will distribute and review this document with their students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Assessment of work in the Pro-Seminar
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature
- **Implementation Description:** The Graduate Director will ask former instructors of this course to work collectively on a document concerning the prospectus and the thesis that can be given to current Pro-Seminar instructors for distribution and review.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director, Calvin Thomas, and former Pro-Seminar instructors (Pearl McHaney, Chris Kocela, Michael Galchinsky, LeeAnne Richardson, and Murray Brown)
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Move the target for outcomes on the Literary Studies thesis to 4.7**

Since student theses submitted in 2009-2010 scored well on the assessments in all learning outcomes, the department will raise the target for these areas from a 4.5 to a 4.7.
Offer the pro-seminar during the fall and the spring semester

While there has been general satisfaction with the success of the Pro-Seminar since it was initiated two years ago, there has been concern that the second semester of a student’s M.A. program may be too early for this course. Some students have a clear sense of their thesis project by this time, but others could use the additional semester of coursework before taking this course that requires them to pin down their intended topic of interest. The fact that some students are not ideally prepared for the course may be contributing to the fact that assessment targets in three areas of the Pro-Seminar were not met (knowledge and application of theory, skills of inquiry, and effective communication skills). Consequently, the department has determined to offer this course in the fall and spring semesters so that students can choose whether to take it in their second or their third semester.

Reach 100% compliance on the thesis assessment process

During 2009-2010, almost half of the thesis assessment forms were submitted with the signature sheets for completed theses (five out of nine). To guarantee that the thesis assessment sheet is completed by the thesis committee it will be attached to signature sheets and distributed to a thesis committee chair by the Assistant to the Graduate Director. In the future, a signature sheet will not be accepted for graduation unless the assessment form is included.

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?

2009-2010 was the first year that the department requested the chairs of thesis committees to complete a thesis assessment form for students in the MA in Literary Studies. Only about half of these forms were submitted, so it has been decided that from now on, the form will be attached to the signature sheet. Because the student cannot graduate without the completion of the signature sheet, it is much more likely that we will have 100% compliance on this requirement in the future.

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 thesis assessment results for the five theses completed by students in the MA in Literary Studies were all very encouraging (ranging from a 5.4-5.6 out of 6.0). Starting in the spring of 2011, the department will create a document that outlines the specific meaning of each ranking on the assessment form so as to ensure we are getting accurate and meaningful data through the thesis assessment data. Two sections of the Pro-Seminar were taught in the spring of 2010, and both instructors submitted assessment forms on the students in their classes. The results indicate that this course continues to be successful, with a few areas that need improvement. While students exceeded the target in four areas (content knowledge, knowledge of language, scholarly vocabulary, and researching skills), they missed the target by .1 in three other areas (knowledge and application of theory, skills of inquiry, and effective communication skills). Two efforts will be made to try to improve Pro-Seminar results. Firstly, previous Pro-Seminar teachers will craft a list of recommendations and cautions for writing the prospectus that can be used by current Pro-Seminar teachers. This list will emphasize the importance of creating a conceptual framework for the work of a thesis. And, secondly, the department has decided to offer the Pro-Seminar in the fall and the spring semester so that students who are not ready for this critical class in their second semester can wait to take it until their third semester. This assumes that students will be better able to engage in inquiry and extensive writing if they have a larger body of content knowledge from which to work. On the other hand, those students who have a clear idea of their thesis early on in their program will still be allowed to take the course in their second semester.
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, rhetoric and composition, and professional and technical writing. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

Goals
G 1: Encourage a scholarly engagement with theoretical frameworks
The department will strive to produce M.A. students who demonstrate a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in masters work, in particular in the thesis writing.

G 2: Assure mastery in content knowledge
The department strives to graduate MA students in this concentration who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of Rhetoric and Composition studies as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

G 3: Effective Written Communications
The department will strive to produce M.A. students who can demonstrate effective written communication skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (M: 1)
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 2: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (M: 1)
Students will be familiar with the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era, although students may focus more on one 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).

SLO 3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (M: 1)
Students will have read the work of rhetorical theorists from a wide range of periods, covering a diverse set of perspectives. Theories of writing practices and pedagogy should be included in this work.

SLO 4: Effective Written Communications (M: 1)
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in journals and publications devoted to Rhetoric and Composition.

SLO 5: Researching skills (M: 1)
M.A. students in Rhetoric and Composition will be able to isolate a fruitful question for in-depth investigation and to carry out research, using both traditional and non-traditional research methods.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: M.A. Thesis in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
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 (with a 6-point scale) 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.

Target for O1: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No Rhetoric and Composition MA thesis was submitted in 2009-2010, so there is no assessment data to report.

Target for O2: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No Rhetoric and Composition MA thesis was submitted in 2009-2010, so there is no assessment data to report.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric**
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No Rhetoric and Composition MA thesis was submitted in 2009-2010, so there is no assessment data to report.

**Target for O4: Effective Written Communications**
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No Rhetoric and Composition MA thesis was submitted in 2009-2010, so there is no assessment data to report.

**Target for O5: Researching skills**
Since this was going to be the first year that the department will collect assessment data on the M.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 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No Rhetoric and Composition MA thesis was submitted in 2009-2010, so there is no assessment data to report.

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

**Revise the mission and goals to suit the particulars of the Rhetoric and Composition M.A. program**

Now that the graduate assessment has been broken down into the three graduate concentrations, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty will work to revise the mission and goals of their assessment report to more specifically match the particulars of their program.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

**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?

Now that the M.A. in Rhetoric and Composition has been separated from the other two M.A. programs, faculty in that concentration will revise the mission statement as well as the goals to better match the particulars of their masters program. This work will be completed by the spring 2011 semester.

**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.

Since there is no assessment data for this M.A. concentration this year, there will be no changes made to the program. Instead, faculty will rely upon next year’s results of students theses to draw conclusions about the success of this M.A. concentration and the thesis assignment.
**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 student mastery of content knowledge**
The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of literary studies (including major figures, periods and movements, and vocabulary) as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

**G 2: Encourage a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts**
The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who are able to successfully apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the study of literary texts.

**G 3: Foster effective written communications**
The department strives to graduate students who have effective written communication skills that they can use successfully for any specific purpose and any particular audience.

**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)**
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)**
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)**
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**
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.
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**

**M1: Ph.D. dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 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.

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Study (Literature)**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Six literature dissertations were completed in 2009-2010, and they received three scores related to content knowledge: the first concerning the knowledge of literary figures, genres, periods, and movements as relevant to the chosen topic of the dissertation (with an average score of 4.9), the second concerning the knowledge of appropriate scholarly vocabulary that demonstrates an understanding of critical concepts and technical concepts important to the study of literature (with an average score of 4.7), and the third with the knowledge of the history, structure, and/or social implications of language as a means of discourse/system of representation (with an average score of 4.6). These averages for the three areas of content knowledge average out to a 4.7.

**Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)**

In the 2008-2009 assessment report, a target of 4.5 (on a six-point scale) was set for this outcome (which is now listed on the literature dissertation assessment form as "the knowledge and application of critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the dissertation work"). This is the second of three years during which the department has set this outcome as a rolling target.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Six students completed a literature dissertation during 2008-2009, and the average score they received for this outcome was a 4.3, which is slightly below the intended target. This score is the same score as what has been achieved for this outcome for the past four years. The averages for all the other outcomes included on the assessment form were all between the range of 4.6-5.1, so this outcome related to critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts continues to score with the lowest average of all the assessed outcomes.

**Target for O3: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The one Creative Writing dissertation scored a 6.0 on the three criteria related to the Content Knowledge learning outcome: the familiarity with representative examples of writing by major figures in poetry or fiction; the understanding of literary history or English and American poetry or fiction; and the understanding of form and theory of fiction or poetry.

**Target for O4: Applying Literary Studies (Creative Writing)**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The Creative Writing dissertation scored a 6.0 for this learning outcome.

**Target for O5: Craftsmanship (Creative Writing)**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The one Creative Writing dissertation scored a 6.0 on the two criteria related to the learning outcome that addresses Craftsmanship: the ability to produce work that is authentic and engaging and the use of a variety of literary techniques.

**Target for O7: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C)**

No target was set for this learning outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations completed in 2009-2010 each received a 6.0 for this learning outcome.

**Target for O8: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric**
No target was set for this outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations each scored a 6.0 for this learning outcome.

Target for O10: Effective Communications Skills - all concentrations

No target was set for this outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The six literature dissertations averaged a 4.6 for this outcome (the range of averages for this outcome over the three years has been 4.6-4.9). The one Creative Writing dissertation was scored with a 6.0 for the criterion related to this outcome (ability to produce work that is grammatically sound and syntactically correct) while the two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations averaged a 5.4, on the criterion addressing mastery of academic writing and a 6.0 on the criterion evaluating effective written communications (for an average of those averages of a 4.7).

Target for O11: Researching Skills - all concentrations

No target was set for this outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The six literature dissertations averaged a 4.9 out of 6.0 for this outcome while the two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations received a 6.0.

M 2: Ph.D. Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 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)

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Twenty-one literature Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 14% (5% low pass and 9% failures), meaning that the target was met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for literature students was 29%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 40%.

Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory (Lit)

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Twenty-one literature Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 14% (5% low pass and 9% failures), meaning that the target was met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for literature students was 29%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 40%.

Target for O3: Content Knowledge (Creative Writing)

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. 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 all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Eight Creative Writing Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 37.5% (12.5% low pass and 25% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Creative Writing students was 12.5%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

Target for O7: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (R & C)

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. 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 all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

Target for O8: Knowledge of Theories of Rhetoric
In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. 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 all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

**Target for O10: Effective Communications Skills - all concentrations**

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. 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 all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Twenty-one literature Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 14% (5% low pass and 9% failures), meaning that the target was met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for literature students was 29%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 40%. Eight Creative Writing Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 37.5% (12.5% low pass and 25% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Creative Writing students was 12.5%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%. Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

### 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
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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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 and creative writing. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

Goals
G 1: Assure Mastery in Content Knowledge
The department strives to graduate PhD students in Creative Writing who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of literary studies (including major figures, periods and movements, and vocabulary) as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

G 2: Scholarly Engagement in Theoretical Frameworks
The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who are able to successfully apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the study of literary texts.

G 3: Foster Effective Written Communications
The department strives to graduate students who have effective written communication skills that they can use successfully for any specific purpose and any particular audience.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Content Knowledge (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 2: Applying Literary Studies to Creative Writing (M: 1)
Students will be able to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics gained in their English studies to compose meaningful literary works that are deemed worthy of being published in national literary journals. Students will also be able to develop vocabularies for studying and discussing poetry and fiction.

SLO 3: Craftsmanship (M: 1)
Ph.D. students will be able to produce writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.

SLO 4: Revising Skills
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: Researching Skills
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.

SLO 6: Effective Communications (M: 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 English studies.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3)
Graduating Ph.D. students in Creative Writing 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 O1: Content Knowledge**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The one Creative Writing dissertation scored a 6.0 on the three criteria related to Content Knowledge: the knowledge of representative examples of writing by major figures in poetry or fiction, depending on the student's choice of genre; the knowledge of literary history of English or American poetry or fiction, depending upon the student’s choice of genre; and the knowledge of form and theory of fiction or poetry, depending upon the students' choice of genre.

**Target for O2: Applying Literary Studies to Creative Writing**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Creative Writing dissertation scored a 6.0 for this learning outcome (as listed in the criterion that rates the dissertation’s ability to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics in English studies to create meaningful literary works, deemed worthy of publication).

**Target for O3: Craftsmanship**

No target was set for this outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The one Creative Writing dissertation scored a 6.0 on the three criteria related to the learning outcome that addresses issues of craftsmanship: the ability to produce work that is authentic and engaging; the ability to produce work that is grammatically sound and syntactically correct; and the use of a variety of literary techniques.

**M 2: PhD Exams (O: 1, 6)**

The Ph.D. examinations are conducted in the fall and the spring 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**

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Eight Creative Writing Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 37.5% (12.5% low pass and 25% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Creative Writing students was 12.5%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

**Target for O6: Effective Communications**

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Eight Creative Writing Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 37.5% (12.5% low pass and 25% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Creative Writing students was 12.5%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

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

**Adjust the target for the low pass/failure rate on Creative Writing PhD exams**

The Creative Writing department is changing the target for the low pass/failure rate on the PhD exams in their concentration to 20% or less.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communications  
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator, Renee Schatteman

*Adjust the target for the low pass/failure rate on PhD exam to 20% or less*
The Creative Writing department is changing the target for the low pass/failure rate on the PhD exams in their concentration to 20% or less.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Distinguish between poetry and fiction on PhD Creative Writing exams

The assistant to the Graduate Director will distinguish between poetry exams and fiction exams when reporting on students who have taken these tests. In addition, when reporting the exam scores, she will indicate which concentration the student has selected as his or her genre of choice.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to Graduate Director
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Create a document that explains the rankings on the dissertation assessment form

Faculty in the Creative Writing Concentration will discuss what the various rankings on the dissertation assessment form mean in terms of student achievement. The Director of Creative Writing will then create a document that explains each ranking, and this form will be attached to the Assessment form that is completed at each dissertation defense. The intention of this document is to help with the norming of the assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Creative Writing Director
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Set a target of 4.7 for learning outcomes included in the dissertation assessment

The Creative Writing PhD program is setting a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for the three learning outcomes included in the dissertation assessment process. These outcomes include Content Knowledge, Applying Literary Studies to Creative Writing, and Craftsmanship.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will track results of the Creative Writing dissertation assessment to see if students achieve the target of 4.7 in all three learning outcomes.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
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? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In the summer of 2010, the English department decided to break down the undergraduate assessment reports in terms of its four concentrations to better represent the needs of students in each concentration. By September of the same year, it was decided to do the same with the graduate program as well. Graduate assessment will now include six different reports in the following areas: PhD in Literary Studies, PhD in Creative Writing, PhD in Rhetoric and Composition, MA in Rhetoric and Composition, MA in Literary Studies, and MFA in Creative Writing. While the WEAVE report is now divided among these concentrations, there is still a need to further individualize the reports. Therefore, during the course of the fall 2010 semester, concentrations will formulate mission statements and goals specific to their own programs and will create documents that explain the specific rankings (of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) for their dissertation and their thesis. In the Creative Writing concentration, data on the assessment from the undergraduate senior exit portfolio indicates whether a student has chosen fiction or poetry as the genre of choice. It will be useful to make such distinctions on the graduate level, so, starting in the fall of 2010, PhD dissertation results and MFA thesis results will also indicate the genre being employed. Creative Writing PhD exams will also be reported with this information, as well as with information concerning the primary genre of the student. This is important since PhD students are required to take an exam in their genre of choice as well as an exam in the genre not selected. Therefore, it will provide important data to know if a student is being tested in...
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies (M: 1, 2)**
This learning outcome for the English Ph.D. in Literary Studies is comparable to that for the M.A. in literary studies 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 (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 English Ph.D. in literary studies is comparable to that for the M.A. in literary studies with crucial differences in terms of specificity. Doctoral study aims for graduates to demonstrate a higher degree of critical sophistication than masters level work.

**SLO 3: Effective Communication Skills (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 literary studies.

**Goals**

**G 1: Assure mastery in content knowledge**
The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of literary studies (including major figures, periods and movements, and vocabulary) as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

**G 2: Encourage a scholarly engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts**
The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who are able to successfully apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the study of literary texts.

**G 3: Foster effective written communications**
The department strives to graduate students who have effective written communication skills that they can use successfully for any specific purpose and any particular audience.

**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, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.
SLO 4: Effective Researching Skills (M: 1)

Using and building upon the knowledge and skills acquired during master's level study, doctoral graduates in Literary Studies 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: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Graduating Ph.D. students in literary studies 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: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies

A target of 4.7 was set for this learning outcome related to content knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Six literature dissertations were completed in 2009-2010, and they received three scores related to content knowledge: the first concerning the knowledge of literary figures, genres, periods, and movements as relevant to the chosen topic of the dissertation (with an average score of 4.9), the second concerning the knowledge of appropriate scholarly vocabulary that demonstrates an understanding of critical concepts and technical concepts important to the study of literature (with an average score of 4.7), and the third with the knowledge of the history, structure, and/or social implications of language as a means of discourse/system of representation (with an average score of 4.6). These averages for the three areas of content knowledge average out to a 4.7, and therefore the target was met.

Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory

In the 2008-2009 assessment report, a target of 4.5 (on a six-point scale) was set for this outcome (which is now listed on the literature dissertation assessment form as “the knowledge and application of critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in the dissertation work”). This is the second of three years during which the department has set this outcome as a rolling target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Six students completed a literature dissertation during 2008-2009, and the average score they received for this outcome was a 4.3, which is slightly below the intended target. This score is the same score as what has been achieved for this outcome for the past four years. The averages for all the other outcomes included on the assessment form were all between the range of 4.6-5.1, so this outcome related to critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts continues to score with the lowest average of all the assessed outcomes.

Target for O3: Effective Communication Skills

A target of 4.7 out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to effective communications skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The six literature dissertations averaged a 4.6 for this outcome (the range of averages for this outcome over the three years has been 4.6-4.9). Consequently, this target was not met.

Target for O4: Effective Researching Skills

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome related to effective research skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The six literature dissertations averaged a 4.9 out of 6.0 for this outcome; therefore, the target for this learning outcome was met.

M 2: PhD exams (O: 1, 2, 3)

The Ph.D. examinations are conducted in the fall and the spring 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 Studies

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams, stating the intention that 15% of fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass or a failure on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year’s where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Twenty-one literature Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 14% (5% low pass and 9% failures), meaning that the target was met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for literature students was 29%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 40%.
Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% of fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year’s where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Twenty-one literature Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 14% (5% low pass and 9% failures), meaning that the target was met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for literature students was 29%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 40%.

Target for O3: Effective Communication Skills

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass/fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year’s where only 14% of all Ph.D. exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Twenty-one literature Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 14% (5% low pass and 9% failures), meaning that the target was met.

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

Continue a target of 15% or less low pass/fail rate on exams

For the second year running, the department will set a target of a low pass/fail rate of 15% or less on PhD exams in Literary Studies.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Continue a target of 4.5 for the learning outcome related to applying theory

For the third year in a row, the department will set a target of 4.5 out of 6.0 for the learning outcome related to the skill of applying critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts to the study of literature.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: PhD dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will track whether or not the target for this learning outcomes on literature dissertations has been met.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator, Renee Schatteman
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for outcomes on dissertation

We department will continue to use the target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for all learning outcomes on the dissertation in Literary Studies other than the outcome related to the application of theory (which is a target of 4.5).

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: PhD dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Create a colloquium for students writing a Literary Studies dissertation

In the spring of 2011, the Graduate Studies Committee will meet to discuss the possibility of creating a colloquium in prospectus writing for students working on a dissertation in literary studies. The will consider the scope of this initiative, whether they want the colloquium to be a single event that occurs each semester, a series of workshops in the course of the semester, or a mini-semester type of course. Ideally, one of the major emphasizes of the colloquium would be the importance of identifying and developing a conceptual framework for the dissertation, involving an engagement with critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, or cultural contexts appropriate to the work. This is intended to better ensure student success in the two learning outcomes that did not meet their targets this year: the outcome related to the application of theory and the outcome related to effective written communications. The colloquium will also serve as a chance to encourage graduate students to form dissertation support groups. The Graduate Studies Committee will offer a recommendation on the colloquium by the end of the spring 2011 semester with the intention of starting the program in the spring of 2012.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: PhD dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, rhetoric and composition, and professional and technical writing. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

**Goals**

**G1: Assure mastery in content knowledge**

The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who have a well-rounded knowledge in the content of Rhetoric and Composition studies as well as advanced knowledge in the content associated with their particular specialty.

**G2: Apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts**

The department strives to graduate PhD students in this concentration who are able to successfully apply critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts in their examination of topics related to rhetoric and composition.

**G3: Foster effective written communications**

The department strives to graduate students who have effective written communication skills that they can use successfully for any specific purpose and any particular audience.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (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).

---

**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?

In the summer of 2010, the English department decided to break down the undergraduate assessment reports in terms of its four concentrations to better represent the needs of students in each concentration. By September of the same year, it was decided to do the same with the graduate program as well. So, starting in the fall of 2010 PhD assessment results will be broken down into the three concentrations on the graduate level, in Literary Studies, Creative Writing, and Rhetorics and Composition. While the WEAVE report is now divided among these concentrations, there is still a need to further individualize the reports. Therefore, during the course of the fall 2010 semester, the Creative Writing and Rhetoric and Composition concentrations will formulate mission statements and goals specific to their own programs and will create documents that explain the specific rankings (of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) for their dissertation. In the literature concentration, one area that continues to demand attention is students’ ability to apply theoretical perspectives in their study of literature. The results for the other learning outcomes (in content knowledge, communication skills, and researching) in this concentration were all generally positive, although the score for effective written communications was below the target by .1. This concentration will continue to set the target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for all areas of the dissertation assessment except for the target for the application of literary theory which will remain at 4.5. Since PhD students in this concentration also performed quite well on their exams in 2009-2010, we will maintain the target of a low pass/fail rate of 15% or less for exam in 2010-2011 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.

Students in the PhD program in literary studies performed well on dissertations and exams in all areas other than the application of literary theory. To consider initiatives to give more attention to this learning outcome, the department will consider offering a colloquium in dissertation prospectus writing each semester. The Graduate Studies Committee will decide what form this colloquium will take (a one-time event, a series of workshops, a mini-semester course). A strong emphasis in the Dissertation Prospectus Colloquium will be the importance of establishing a conceptual framework for a dissertation. In addition, the faculty member will encourage students to form prospectus support groups. Our anticipation is that students will gradually come to realize the necessity of theoretical foundations for dissertation writing through initiatives such as these. It is our goal that students will eventually be able to achieve the 4.5 our of 6.0 target we have set for this aspect of their writing once this initiative has the chance to heighten students’ awareness of expectations for the dissertation.
SLO 2: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (M: 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 3: Knowledge of the 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 the dissertation.

SLO 4: Effective Written Communications (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 journals and publications devoted to Rhetoric and Composition.

SLO 5: Researching Skills (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: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)
Graduating Ph.D. students in Rhetoric and Composition 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 O1: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric
No target was set for this outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations completed in 2009-2010 each received a 6.0 for the criterion related to this learning outcome.

Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric
No target was set for this outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations each scored a 6.0 for the criterion related to this learning outcome.

Target for O4: Effective Written Communications
There was no target set for this learning outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations received an average score of 6.0 for the mastery of academic writing (in particular that of the dissertation genre) and 5.4 for the ability to effectively communicate an argument and results of research. The average of these two scores is a 5.7 for this learning outcome related to effective written communications.

Target for O5: Researching Skills
No target was set for this learning outcome.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations scored a 6.0 for the ability to conduct graduate-level research on the chosen topics and to use appropriate documentation.

M 2: PhD Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The Ph.D. examinations are conducted in the fall and the spring 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: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric
In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% or fewer of examinees would earn a low pass or fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that 15% or fewer of examinees would earn a low pass or fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

Target for O4: Effective Written Communications

In the 2008-2009 assessment plan, the department determined to set a target for all Ph.D. exams stating the intention that fewer than 15% of examinees would earn a low pass or fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Thirteen Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2009-2010, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 23% (15% low pass and 8% failures), meaning that the target was not met. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 31%, which was a decrease from the 2008-2009 high pass rate of 43%.

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

Create a document that explains the rankings of the dissertation assessment form

Faculty in the Rhetoric and Composition Concentration will discuss what the various rankings on the dissertation assessment form mean in terms of student achievement. The faculty in that concentration will then create a document that explains each ranking, and this form will be attached to the Assessment form that is completed at each dissertation defense. The intention of this document is to help with the norming of the assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Faculty in Rhetoric and Composition will revise the mission and goals

By spring of 2011, faculty in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration will revise the mission statement and their goals on the assessment report. Presently, these items reflect the mission and goals for the whole of the PhD program. Now that we have broken up the assessment reporting in terms of concentration, this concentration can rewrite these items to more specifically match their program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: faculty in Rhetoric and Composition

Revisit PhD exam scores in next year's assessment

Since this concentration has only begun to examine the assessment results for the PhD program separate from the Literature PhD, it needs another year to track exam results before making specific programmatic changes or before they change the target set for this measure.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices
  Responsible Person/Group: faculty in Rhetoric and Composition

Set a target for outcomes in dissertation assessment

- Establish a new target for the number of low passes and failures on PhD exams.
- Update the assessment plan to reflect the new target.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Rhetoric and Composition faculty
The Rhetoric and Composition PhD program is setting a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for the four learning outcomes included in the dissertation assessment process. These outcomes include Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric, Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric, Effective Written Communications, and Researching Skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator

### 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?

In the summer of 2010, the English department decided to break down the undergraduate assessment reports in terms of its four concentrations to better represent the needs of students in each concentration. By September of the same year, it was decided to do the same with the graduate program as well. Graduate assessment will now include six different reports in the following areas: PhD in Literary Studies, PhD in Creative Writing, PhD in Rhetoric and Composition, MA in Rhetoric and Composition, MA in Literary Studies, and MFA in Creative Writing. While the WEAVE report is now divided among these concentrations, there is still a need to further individualize the reports. Therefore, during the course of the fall 2010 semester, concentrations will formulate mission statements and goals specific to their own programs and will create documents that explain the specific rankings (of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) for their dissertation and their thesis.

**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 2009-2010, two Rhetoric and Composition dissertations were completed and defended. They scored a 6.0 out of 6.0 in all categories except one (the score for the criterion that reads “effectively communicates argument and results of research” was a 5.4). This success speaks well of the concentration, but it is also difficult to draw definite conclusions from such a small sample. One point to consider is that when literature dissertations were assessed during the first two years the department participated in this type of assessment work, there were many perfect scores. Consequently, the Graduate Director generated a document that explained what each ranking (of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate) should stand for in terms of specific student achievement. This document was effective in encouraging faculty to rate a dissertation in more critical and ultimately more useful terms. Therefore, during the fall 2010 semester, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty will generate a document that explains their specific rankings on their dissertation form. Additionally, this concentration will set a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 for all learning outcomes related to the dissertation. The Rhetoric and Composition PhD exams were less than successful with a 23% low pass/failure rate. The rate did not match the target and it was somewhat lower than the PhD exam results for students in Literary Studies (14%). Since this is the first year this concentration is looking at its own results separate from the results of students in Literary Studies, the faculty want to see next year’s results to see if there is a trend in their exam results. At that point, they will be better able to suggest programmatic changes to address areas of concern.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2009-2010 Executive Doctorate in Business**  
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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

**G1: 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
2009-2010 Exercise Science BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 1:</strong> Health Fitness Specialist certification (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 2:</strong> Fitness Assessment skills (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate effective fitness assessment skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 3:</strong> Knowledge of exercise and fitness science (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 4:</strong> Demonstrate competence with technology (G: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will have a level of competence that will enable them to effectively use contemporary technology to serve clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
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
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

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

While the department definition and mission related to critical thinking has not changed over the past two years, the application of this concept has recently changed. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year the exercise science faculty adopted the American College of Sports Medicine certification exam as a required exit examination for all students. While the results of student performance on this examination are still being analyzed, it became clear that the current objectives, measures and targets did not match with the various content domains that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this
While many of the achievement targets were met, preliminary review of exit examination data revealed a relatively low pass rate. It should be noted that while the sample size was small, it prompted an extensive review of program assessment goals. These activities are shown below. While the department definition and mission related to critical thinking has not changed over the past two years, the application of this concept has recently changed. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year the exercise science faculty adopted the American College of Sports Medicine certification exam as a required exit examination for all students. While the results of student performance on this examination are still being analyzed, it became clear that the current objectives, measures and targets did not match with the various content domains that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

While no "workshops" or "training" for faculty were specifically provided, data was presented during the Fall, 2010 faculty retreat which clearly indicated the need to revisit the current program objectives, measures, and targets for the B.S. in Exercise Science program. All exercise science faculty members spent almost 5 hours developing new objectives, measures, and targets that aligned with the recently adopted exit examination content domains.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

A this point, the exercise science faculty are very pleased with the CTW assignments that are being used in the degree program. Students comment favorably on the assignments and typically indicate that the assignments are highly practical, related to their chosen field, and require them to gather, analyze, and apply information which is a strong aspect of our CTW definition. No changes to the current CTW assignments are anticipated for the 2010-2011 academic year.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

While the department definition and mission related to critical thinking has not changed over the past two years, the application of this concept has recently changed. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year the exercise science faculty adopted the American College of Sports Medicine certification exam as a required exit examination for all students. While the results of student performance on this examination are still being analyzed, it became clear that the current objectives, measures and targets did not match with the various content domains that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

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?

While the department definition and mission related to critical thinking has not changed over the past two years, the application of this concept has recently changed. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year the exercise science faculty adopted the American College of Sports Medicine certification exam as a required exit examination for all students. While the results of student performance on this examination are still being analyzed, it became clear that the current objectives, measures and targets did not match with the various content domains that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

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.

Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year the exercise science faculty adopted the American College of Sports Medicine certification exam as a required exit examination for all students. While the results of student performance on this examination are still being analyzed, it became clear that the current objectives, measures and targets did not match with the various content domains that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.
that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

**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?

Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year the exercise science faculty adopted the American College of Sports Medicine certification exam as a required exit examination for all students. While the results of student performance on this examination are still being analyzed, it became clear that the current objectives, measures and targets did not match with the various content domains that are tested on this examination. The faculty therefore developed, discussed, edited and finally approved new objectives, measures, and targets to be used beginning with the Fall of 2010. In addition, the faculty are currently engaged in an extensive curriculum mapping process which will make sure that the curriculum is aligned with the various test domains. It is expected that this process will be completed before the end of the Fall of 2010. The results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

**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 results of this mapping as well as student performance on the various content domains will be used to drive future curriculum changes. It is also anticipated that after the curriculum mapping process is completed, faculty will have the opportunity to look at student performance on the various content domains and potentially use these results as teaching effectiveness indicators. It should also be noted that while the assessment results for the 2008-2009 academic years have been reported, the results indicate performance on objectives and measures that do not accurately reflect the content domains. A major goal will be to have new objectives, measures and targets posted on Weaveonline before the end of the Fall, 2010 term.

**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 by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year, a significantly larger number of students will have taken the required exit examination. While the pass rate on this examination is certainly important, the exam results also show specific performance on each individual content domain. This data, in conjunction with a variety of other measures designed to assess student performance in these content domains, will allow the faculty to make general curriculum improvements, as well as identify specific courses where there may be unnecessary content overlap or courses where necessary content is either missing or needs to be revised to improve student performance. We anticipate an improvement in student performance in each of the domain areas as well as an improvement in the overall pass rates on the exit examination by the of the summer term of 2011.

---
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science (G: 1) (M: 1, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institutional Priority Associations

- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 2.1 Faculty
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Apply knowledge to practical situations (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 2.1 Faculty
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students should demonstrate knowledge of basic equipment, facility requirements, absolute and relative contraindications, procedures, and protocols for the exercise test.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 2.1 Faculty
- 6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Understands research and human subjects issues (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

- 2.1 Faculty
- 6.3 Graduate Experience
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Target for O1: <strong>Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science</strong></td>
<td>75% scoring at or above 80% on exam</td>
<td>Students demonstrated success in this measure, with 90% of students scoring at or above 80% on exams/quizzes in the following classes: KH 6280, 7500, 7550, 7620, 7630, and 8270. Overall, target achievement was exceeded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Practical Exams (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Target for O2: <strong>Apply knowledge to practical situations</strong></td>
<td>90% of students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding.</td>
<td>100% of students demonstrated proficiency on this measure (KH 7550).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: GXT practical exam (O: 3)</strong></td>
<td>Target for O3: <strong>Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing</strong></td>
<td>90% of students will demonstrate proficiency.</td>
<td>The faculty did not report any findings related to this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Case Studies and Labs (O: 4)</strong></td>
<td>Target for O4: <strong>Understands research and human subjects issues</strong></td>
<td>90% of the students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>In the classes that used case studies and labs (KH 6280, 7500, 7550, 7620 and 7630), students demonstrated success in this measure, with 98% of the students demonstrating proficient knowledge and understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: ACSM EXAM (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</strong></td>
<td>Target for O1: <strong>Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science</strong></td>
<td>80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam</td>
<td>60% of the students passed the ACSM exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target for O2: <strong>Apply knowledge to practical situations</strong></td>
<td>80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam</td>
<td>60% of the students passed the ACSM exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target for O3: <strong>Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing</strong></td>
<td>80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level.
60% of the students passed the ACSM exams.

**Target for O4: Understands research and human subjects issues**

80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

60% of the students passed the ACSM exams.

### 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 insure 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

**Implementation Description:** Exercise Science faculty will review outcomes/objectives during the 2009-2010 period
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science Faculty

**Compare ACSM exam content with course content**

Compare ACSM exam content with course content and add deficient material to appropriate courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** ACSM EXAM | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing

**Implementation Description:** Exercise Science Faculty meeting
**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty

**Compare ACSM exam content with course content**

Compare ACSM exam content with course content and add deficient material to appropriate courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** ACSM EXAM | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands research and human subjects issues

**Implementation Description:** Exercise Science faculty meeting
**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty

**Compare ACSM exam content with course content**

Compare ACSM exam content with course content and add deficient material to appropriate courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** ACSM EXAM | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply knowledge to practical situations

**Implementation Description:** Exercise Science faculty meeting
**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Exercise Science faculty
Implementation Description: Exercise Science Faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science faculty

**Compare ACSM exam content with course content**

Compare ACSM exam content with course content. Add deficient content into appropriate courses.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: ACSM EXAM | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science

Implementation Description: Exercise Science faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science Faculty

**Review course work for GXT measure**

Faculty will meet to discuss the lack of reporting for this measure.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: GXT practical exam | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing

Implementation Description: Faculty will discuss the missing data, and if necessary, the addition of this measure in one or more courses.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science Faculty

---

**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 added to the academic program and assessment measurement the requirement of a standardized national exam developed by the American College of Sports Medicine for all students in the Fitness and Health Promotion Concentration. These changes were made, in part, of the accreditation requirements for the field. Therefore, this test was added as one of the assessment measures. The Exercise Science faculty have met, and will continue to meet, to review the exam categories, and review test scores in the exam categories to determine which, if any, areas need greater emphasis in the academic 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 Exercise Science Faculty have met, and will continue to meet each semester, to review the American College of Sports Medicine exam scores from students to determine whether changes in academic course work are needed to better prepare students for the exam and the workplace.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Film & Video BA**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The film program at Georgia State multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are focused on student development beyond the academic unit. The program promotes a broad appreciation of both artistic, creative endeavors and intellectual, critical traditions in the study of film and media. It is the program's belief that a graduate's success will largely be determined by a developed sense of critical thinking, aesthetic contemplation, and the intellectual cultivation. Our program seeks to enhance the Department of Communication's mission of participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication.

**Goals**

**G 1: understand and interpret**

Students understand and interpret ideas presented in media involving moving images.

**G 2: identify structures**

Students will understand narrative structures in stories using moving images.
**G 3: fundamental concepts**  
Students will understand fundamental visual production and post-production concepts.

**G 4: spectator/textual pleasure**  
Students will be able to recognize a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure in media involving moving images.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: understand and interpret (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Understand and interpret ideas presented in media and can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.

**SLO 2: narrative structures (G: 2) (M: 2)**  
Students will be able to identify and discuss various narrative structures in media using moving images employed for story delivery.

**SLO 3: prod/post-prod concepts (G: 3) (M: 3)**  
Students will understand the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scene, editing and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning.

**SLO 4: spectator/textual pleasure (G: 4) (M: 4)**  
Students will be able to recognize and articulate a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: writing assignment (O: 1)**

Students in the senior capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will write analytical papers and will be assessed using the following rubric: 1. Can understand basic filmic ideas expressed by others. 2. Can fully understand, comment on, and discuss the ideas and theories of others. 3. Has the ability not only to understand and interpret the ideas of others but to use that as the groundwork to begin establishing unique ideas. 4. Can fully establish, develop, and communicate logical, coherent, and engaging ideas on specific topics.

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

**Target for O1: understand and interpret**

70% of students will score 3 or above on the writing rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

The average of 59 analytical papers was 3.0. 62% of the papers met the target of scoring 3 or above.

**M 2: descriptive writing assignment (O: 2)**

Students in the senior capstone courses will write a paper that identifies and discusses key narrative features of visual media, and it will be assessed with the following rubric: 1. Has minimal to basic understanding of narrative structures. 2. Can identify various narrative structures. 3. Is able to identify, understand, and discuss various narrative structures as well as the complications within. 4. Has a full understanding of narrative structure, as well as how to interpret, identify, and dissect it and discuss its meanings and implications.

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

**Target for O2: narrative structures**

70% of the students will score a 3 or above on the rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

The average for 59 papers describing narrative structures was 3.18. 68% of the papers scored 3 or above.

**M 3: mise-en-scene (O: 3)**

Students in the capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will identify in a written assignment mise-en-scene and the consequences that it has in media using moving images.

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

**Target for O3: prod/post-prod concepts**

70% of students will score 3 or above on the written assignment about mise-en-scene using the following rubric: 1. Has a basic understanding of mise-en-scene and its implications. 2. Can have limited discussions about mise-en-scene. 3. Understands the broad concepts of mise-en-scene and can comprehensively discuss its ideas and theories. 4. Fully grasps the idea of mise-en-scene and can discuss the placement of images on screen and well as its implications that relates to and supports the story and characters.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

72% of students scored a 3 or above on the written assignment about mise-en-scene with the overall average 3.31 for the 59 papers.

**M 4: spectator/textual relationship (O: 4)**
Students in the senior capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will be able to write a paper describing the relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure involving media using moving images.

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

**Target for O4: spectator/textual pleasure**

70% of the student papers about the relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure will score at least 3 or above on the following rubric: Has an introductory sense of how cinematic pleasure occurs. Has a basic understanding of the mechanisms of spectator positioning and identification. Articulates the basic theoretical underpinnings of spectatorship. Discusses complications in identification (art cinema, multiple identifications, etc.)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

62% of the papers about the relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure scored on the rubric at least 3 or above. The overall average was 2.97.

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

**Curriculum Revision**

It is anticipated that a significant revision of the Film/Video curriculum will be approved for implementation in the Fall 2011. The new curriculum will provide an opportunity for the faculty to articulate in more precise language the desired learning outcomes of the new curriculum. Greater participation by the faculty will facilitate the adoption of the goals, learning outcomes and other details of the assessment process, especially in regard to collecting data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** meetings to discuss the revised curriculum and its assessment
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Film/Video faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Fundamental Concepts**

Determine system by which students’ understanding of the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scène, editing, and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning can be measured.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty need to find ways that a conversation about media aesthetics can be linked to other program discussions about other learning outcomes.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Film/Video faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Improve Student Performance**

Only one of the goals/learning outcomes, production/post-production, met its assessment target. The faculty should discuss how the instruction of mise-en-scene and fundamental media aesthetics can be used to teach students about spectatorship, textual pleasure, narrative structures, and interpreting ideas and meaning from moving images. A few questions to be considered for the new curriculum: - Are class discussions preparing students for the writing assignments and are the goals of the assignments clearly detailed in class? - Do class discussions emphasize aspects of media that are not associated with curricular goals, e.g. arguments within moving image media, developing meaning through moving images, etc. - Can instructors be encouraged to foster a better class conversation about the generation of spectatorial pleasure? A challenging aspect of media culture is the ways in which it discourages introspection or reflexivity in its audience.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Faculty meetings to discuss the new curriculum and its assessment.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Film/Video faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Narrative Structure Assessment**

Develop system to determine if students can identify and discuss various narrative structures media employ for story delivery.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Conduct program-wide discussion of differences between story and narrative, a challenging differentiation given current media ability to paint over such distinctions.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Film/Video faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Spectatorial Pleasure**

How to create system to assess students’ understanding of the generation of spectatorial pleasure. Recognize and articulate a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: A challenging aspect of media culture is the ways in which it discourages introspection or reflexivity in its audience. Film/Video faculty will examine ways to assess students' understanding.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Film/Video faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Student Understanding Measures
Establish a system to measure students’ understanding and interpretation of ideas presented in media and if they can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty will meet to examine these results and then assess our target and specific means of achieving goal. In class, do we talk in one direction then expect student papers to meet goals taken from another direction? Do we talk about media but not about arguments?
Responsible Person/Group: Film/Video Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Finance BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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 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. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 1a-Fall2009: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2009 and "Exhibit 1b-Spring2010: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2010. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2010:BBA Assessment Plan and Alignment" (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.

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 2009-2010 - 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.

### 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. For current and historic results, please see "Exhibit 3-2010:Educational Testing Service (ETS) Results", which can be found in the Document Repository.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

### M 3: Alignment of student learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)
This measure relates course level student outcomes to program level learning outcomes. In the Document Repository, please see "Exhibit 2-2010:BBA Assessment Plan and Alignment" (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes) for details showing how student learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 4000, FI 4040, and FI 4300) align and map well onto program learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### 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, to see how classroom knowledge can be effectively applied in the real world, and to have the opportunity to work with senior managers on practical 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

### 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: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills
  - Measure: Representative questions from courses | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills

  **Implementation Description:** continuous
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Professor Rasha Ashraf, course coordinator for FI 4000

#### 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 continues to be integrated within our FI 4020 course, which is a required course for all finance majors in the BBA program.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

  **Implementation Description:** continuous
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Rich Fendler and Pete Eisemann
  **Additional Resources:** student assistants

#### Practical training
The field study in finance course "FI 4391" 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 the decline in employment in the financial and non-financial sectors of the...
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

The definition of CTW in finance has changed over the past two years and will continue to evolve going forward. Our original definition gave importance to “writing” in finance. More recently, we have changed our focus to deeper consideration of the “critical thinking” aspect of CTW. Because we believe that the definition of critical thinking should vary from discipline to discipline, in particular, from non-business to business fields of study, we began our process by investigating different definitions of critical thinking in finance. All finance instructors who teach this class read the following articles: 1. “Messy Problems and Lay Audiences: Teaching Critical Thinking within the Finance Curriculum,” by David Carrithers, Teresa Ling and John C. Bean. Business Communication Quarterly, Volume 71, Number 2, June 2008 152-170. 2. “Using a Client Memo to Assess Critical Thinking of Finance Majors,” by David Carrithers and John C. Bean. Business Communication Quarterly, Volume 71, Number 1, March 2008 10-26. 3. “Beyond Critical Thinking and Decision Making: Teaching Business Students How to Think,” by Gerald F. Smith. Journal of Management, Volume 27, Number 1, February 2003, 24-51. These papers led to our current CTW in finance definition and associated goals. We plan to continue to refine our definition of critical thinking to courses in our degree major other than our designated CTW course.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

As noted in Reflection 1, our most significant CTW accomplishment this year was our change in focus from writing to critical thinking. After much discussion, we decided that business thinkers think critically when they analyze situations without a point of view, critically, in terms of the essential facts only. Many aspects of our course, from writing assignments to the implementation of new cases, are being changed to match this new focus. A second significant CTW accomplishment in finance this year, which is also related to our Action Plan from last year, was our discovery, via student writing, class discussion of new cases, etc., that our students: 1. Struggle when faced with complex issues and “messy” data; 2. Experience difficulty when asked to critically assess their arguments or policy decisions; 3. Tend to approach every problem believing that it can be solved with a formula; 4. Answer case questions using data in the case only - that is, they do not seem to make the connection between academic cases and real world events or effects; and 5. Often make biased decisions and seldom develop robust conclusions. Our findings are similar to those expressed in the articles listed in Reflection 1. Now that we know the critical areas in which our students have difficulty the most, we believe that we can continue to develop course guidelines, teaching methods, and assignments that will help our students improve in these areas.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

We did not conduct any formal workshops for faculty this year. Instead, the faculty members who usually teach this course (FI 4020) discussed the meaning of critical thinking through writing in finance and the implementation of new cases and assignments in the course. We agreed on the definition of CTW for our course and on some common cases and assignments; however, each faculty member continues to conduct aspects of the course as they think best matches their teaching style while still meeting the course CTW definition and goals. We will meet again through this summer to discuss what worked and what did not work. In general, faculty who teach this course are positive about CTW and they want to continue to make CTW improvements. The challenge expressed by all faculty members involves two issues. First, this course is already very full and challenging. It is a case based course, but nearly half of the course is devoted to teaching students the skills and procedures needed to analyze financial data. Second, because this is a required course for finance majors, enrollments in this course average 40 to 45 students. Grading papers and providing significant feedback is very challenging. Consultants are difficult to find because a good consultant for this course must first know financial statement analysis techniques and processes. Additionally, because we are still finding our way in CTW and because many of our CTW assignments are new, we do not exactly know what we want a consultant to do for us. We did not conduct any formal workshops for faculty this year. Instead, the faculty members who usually teach this class discussed the meaning of critical thinking through writing in finance and the implementation of new cases and assignments in the course. We agreed on the definition of CTW for our course and on some common cases and assignments; however, each faculty member continues to conduct aspects of the course as they think best matches their teaching style while still meeting the course CTW definition and goals. We will meet again through this summer to discuss what worked and what did not work. In general, faculty who teach this course are positive about CTW and they want to continue to make CTW improvements to the course. The challenge expressed by all faculty members involves two issues. First, this course is already very full and challenging course. It is a case based course, but nearly half of the course is devoted to teaching students the skills and procedures needed to analyze financial data. Second, because this is a required course for finance majors, enrollments in this course average 40 to 45 students. Grading papers and providing significant feedback is very challenging. Consultants are difficult to find because a good consultant for this course must first know financial statement analysis techniques and processes. Additionally, because we are still finding our way in CTW and because many of our CTW assignments are new, we do not exactly know what we want a consultant to do for us. Going forward, all of us hope that consultants can be found and/or developed to assist us in the evaluation of student papers and assignments as well as being able to serve as a resource to students who want and need additional help and guidance.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

Our assignments continue to evolve each year as we continue to learn about CTW and better understand effective ways to implement CTW in finance. As mentioned above, the most significant change in our assignments has been a move from emphasizing...
writing to instead stresses critical thinking. Most of our assignments and grading rubrics are now being designed to promote and evaluate critical thinking. We plan to continue the process of developing assignments and finding new cases for the course that force our students, as well as ourselves, to think critically. Some of the cases that we have used for many years will be replaced and others will be enhanced or reworked to incorporate elements of CTW. Going forward, we plan to try harder to standardize more writing assignments from instructor to instructor and to grade more consistently. We also plan to find effective ways to address the student critical thinking deficiencies noted in CTW Reflection 2 above.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

There has been little change to our department’s general approach to CTW. All of the faculty members teaching this class support the initiative— they meet to talk about CTW, usually during the summer and after each semester. For those who teach and take the class, the impact has been significant. CTW has caused us to reconsider how we teach this course as well as our objectives in the course. The discussions we have had about critical thinking, the articles we have read, and the writing assignments we have designed, are forcing each of us to reevaluate the purpose of this course. Although we still believe that adding CTW to the course is difficult and, given our large average class sizes, the burden of extra grading is heavy (on top of what was already a very full and challenging class), we understand the importance of the CTW initiative.

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?

With each academic year, there is the likelihood that new and/or different faculty will instruct those undergraduate courses in which much of the assessment of student learning is embedded. While the courses remain relatively the same from semester to semester, the instructors may change from one year to the next. As a result, these new faculty are trained to enable their participation in the assessment process.

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 downturn in the economic environment, employers are increasingly seeking those students who are well-trained in finance and have a strong appreciation for working with and understanding real-world financial data. As a result, we sought and obtained a substantial university grant to purchase financial market data for incorporation into undergraduate classroom assignments and projects. Along the above lines, we have also improved and expanded opportunities for students to participate in the finance society student association as well as on the student portfolio management team. Finally, three faculty members (Professors Richard Fendler, Craig Ruff, and Milind Shrikhande) recently conducted a detailed study of student learning styles and instructor teaching styles based on undergraduate business students taking the required core class FI 3300. The purpose of the student was to better understand which teaching styles or methods match best with the students' varied learning styles. The results of this study indicate that if student learning is improved as a result of more effective teaching methods it will lead to a lower rate of attrition out of the finance discipline. These findings have now been shared with the course coordinator (Professor Jonathan Godbey) as well as the instructors teaching this course who are predominantly GTAs.

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 and expanded the number of faculty overseeing each critical action plan component: Professor Rasha Ashraf for the careers component in FI 4000; Professor Richard Fendler and Peter Eisemann for the critical thinking through writing initiative in FI 4020; and Professor Milind Shrikhande and Richard Fendler for the enhancement of practical training through FI 4391. The changes have resulted in 1) furthering student knowledge of career paths and post-degree opportunities in the field of finance; 2) improved their critical thinking skills; and 3) expanded the number of field study opportunities for our finance majors.

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 overall targets continue to be met indicating that the Department continues 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. As a result of our review, one major implication that will result is that we will pursue with the RCB’s Undergraduate Program Committee have some areas of potential improvement for students entering finance electives.

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 including faculty review committees along with input from advisory committee members. We hope to show continued improvement but the economic downturn and university budget cuts will present a serious challenge.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Finance MS
Ac-ct. 12/12/2016 03:57 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. The Executive Master of Science in Finance provides experienced professionals the opportunity to gain these skills in a cohort format while preparing them for careers in senior management.

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 developing 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 8310), 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. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 1-2010:Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2010. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2010:MS Assessment Plan and Alignment" (in which course level questions Q1 through Q5 are cross-referenced to learning outcomes), also included in the Document Repository.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 six years, survey responses have indicated fairly high satisfaction levels with curricula and teaching and learning processes within the MS-Finance program. In the Document Repository, see "Exhibit 3-2010:MS Exit Survey".

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 3: Alignment of student learning outcomes (O: 1, 2, 3)**

In the Document Repository, see "Exhibit 2-2010:MS Assessment Plan and Alignment" for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310) 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

**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

### 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 2009-10 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. Last year at this time we sought to add two new courses: “Corporate restructuring and workouts” and “Hedge funds and their trading strategies.” These two courses were indeed successfully launched during the year. Looking forward to the 2010-2011 academic year, we will continue to identify potential new courses that will provide students with important skill sets relevant to their professional development.

- **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):**
- **Measure:** MS-Finance Exit Survey Responses
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

**Implementation Description:** continuous

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Richard Fendler

#### Program marketing and innovation

At this time last year we believed that there was a potential executive audience for the MS-Finance program who desires a strong cohort format with an emphasis on academic training in corporation finance. In response, we initiated plans to launch such a program beginning in January 2010. In addition, we will continue to bring the attention of students pursuing an MBA degree, whether in finance, accounting, risk management, 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** In January 2010 we successfully launched a one-year Executive MS in Finance program at the Robinson College’s Buckhead Executive Center.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Alfred Mettler

### 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?

During the 2008-2009 cycle, we tracked course level questions for the first time in both the Fall and Spring semesters. Based on the similarity of findings between the two semesters last year and in consideration of the burden placed on faculty, we reverted back to the former practice of tracking course level questions in only the Spring 2010 semester. In regards to the Executive MS in Finance program, we will solicit guidance from an executive advisory board that we are creating.

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 past academic year, the Department successfully launched a one-year Executive MS in Finance program at the Robinson College’s Buckhead Executive Center. We plan to again offer this program to a new cohort of students beginning in January 2011. We continue to review the progress of this program and obtain feedback from students for improving the curriculum and structure. In response to earlier feedback from students, we continue to seek increased participation from leading industry executives to enhance student learning in the classroom. During the past academic year we also successfully added two new courses to the curriculum based on student and industry demand. These two courses were FI 8260 "Hedge funds and their trading strategies" and FI 8350 "Corporate restructuring and workouts”.

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?

During the previous academic year, Professor Alfred Mettler served as the core course coordinator for the Corporate Finance class “MBA 8135.” This is a core required of all MBA students as well as MS-Finance students. 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. During the next academic year, based on feedback from advisors and RCB marketing professionals, we will be changing the title of the program to Fast-track MS-Finance. Brochures and other marketing materials will be changed accordingly.

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 continues 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. Our findings continue to provide us with valuable information for improving the curriculum. To facilitate our improvement we have formed an industry advisory board to provide input on program quality and to enhance student interaction with senior executives in industry.

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 including the use of faculty review committees along with seeking input from advisory committee members. We hope to show continued improvement but the economic downturn and university budget cuts will present a serious challenge.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to provide students majoring in modern languages the opportunity to improve their critical thinking skills and to better appreciate universal humanistic values, help them to acquire an international perspective and equip them to function as global citizens, and prepare them for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business, through the study of modern and classical languages, cultures and literatures.

Goals
G 4: Knowledge of French Literature
Student will understand the particularities of French literature.

G 5: Outcomes for the current period
Previous assessments could not be completed successfully due to several factors including personnel changes in the Department, the complexity and inflexibility of the program and the unsatisfactory design of the original rubrics. After consultation with GSU’s Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to Literature course, a requirement for all majors in French, German and Spanish. The new rubric for this goal was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment. It includes 4 weighted criteria of a literary text: Focus on Topic (35%), Literary Lens Use (35%), Organization (15%) and Accuracy of Grammar and Spelling (15%).
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 4: Knowledge of French Literature (G: 4) (M: 1)**
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

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

**Standard Associations**
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: paper (O: 4)**
In French 3033 (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts), students wrote an end-of-course paper whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

**Target for O4: Knowledge of French Literature**
We hope that students will be able to achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature. However, because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions taken for each criteria and in each major, and a decision will be made whether to assess a larger number of goals.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
In French 3033 (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary texts), students majoring in French achieved a score of 7.3.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
Previous assessments could not be completed successfully due to several factors including personnel changes in the Department, the complexity and inflexibility of the program and the unsatisfactory design of the original rubrics. After consultation with GSUs Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts (French 3033), a requirement for all majors in French. The new rubric for this goal, which now includes 4 weighed criteria, was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment.

**Challenges for Next Year**
Because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions will be taken accordingly. At that point, the Department will make a decision regarding the goals to be evaluated in the future.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**
In French 3033 (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts), students completed an end-of-course written assignment whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%). Students majoring in French achieved a score of 7.3. The objective is that they reach a score of at least 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**
Because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions will be taken accordingly. At that point, the Department will make a decision regarding the goals to be evaluated in the future.

**University-wide Committee Participation**
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of France and French speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in French, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of French and Francophone literatures and cultures, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing
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
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Mission / Purpose
The geography program of the Department of Geosciences presents an integrative perspective on the relations among social, political, economic, and physical phenomena occurring across space. The program is committed to teaching the concepts and research methods of the discipline in order to prepare geography majors for professional careers or advanced study or both. Students acquire geographic knowledge and thinking skills in order to understand the complex nature of the human and environmental patterns found in the world around them. Therefore, the program is committed to excellence in both the theoretical and applied arenas. Through scholarship, teaching, and service, the geography program of the Department of Geosciences is dedicated to improving our community, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Foundational-Knowledge Acquisition
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Quantitative Skills -- Arithmetic Operations</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Quantitative Skills -- Problem Solving</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students effectively and appropriately apply quantitative methods to geographical problems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>6 Quantitative Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (1)</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Critical Thinking -- Question Formulation (2)</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Critical Thinking -- Evidence Collection</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students effectively collect appropriate evidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students appropriately evaluate claims, arguments, evidence and hypotheses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Technology</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students effectively use computers and other technology appropriate to geography.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>7 Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Collaboration</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>3 Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Contemporary Issues -- Diverse Disciplines</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Contemporary Issues -- &quot;Global&quot;</th>
<th>Normal 0 false false false Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</td>
<td>5 Contemporary Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose

The geography program of the Department of Geosciences presents an integrative perspective on the relations among social, political, economic, and physical phenomena occurring across space. The program is committed to teaching the concepts and research methods of the discipline in order to prepare geography majors for professional careers or advanced study or both. Students acquire geographic knowledge and thinking skills in order to understand the complex nature of the human and environmental patterns found in the world around them. Therefore, the program is committed to excellence in both the theoretical and applied arenas. Through scholarship, teaching, and service, the geography program of the Department of Geosciences is dedicated to improving our community, nation, and world.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Communication – Oral (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students communicate effectively using appropriate oral or signed conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Collaboration (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Communication – Visual (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively develop effective visual-communication skills (e.g., graphics construction), especially cartographic mapping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students perform arithmetic operations effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Contemporary Issues – &quot;Global&quot; (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students apply quantitative methods to geographical problems effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students formulate appropriate questions for geographical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students use the results of analyses to appropriately construct new arguments and formulate new geographical questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive exam, thesis/practicum, and seminars (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data used to assess learning-outcomes achievement of graduated M.A. students were obtained from critiques of those students’ comprehensive examinations (i.e. written exam and oral exam), theses/practicums, and performance in graduate-only seminars. Possible scores for each student/outcome combination are 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection**

We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 on this outcome/goal.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

7 students were ranked by a total of 7 professors, and in this category scored 4.54 out of 5

**Target for O2: Foundational Knowledge Acquisition**

We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

7 students were assessed by 7 faculty in this category, students were rated as 4.54/5

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking – Information Evaluation**

We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.38/5

**Target for O4: Communication – Written**

We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.77/5

**Target for O5: Technology**

We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.62/5

Target for O6: Communication – Oral
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.46/5

Target for O7: Collaboration
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.63/5

Target for O8: Communication – Visual
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.35/5

Target for O9: Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.46/5

Target for O10: Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 3.9/5

Target for O11: Contemporary Issues – "Global"
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.54/5

Target for O12: Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.1/5

Target for O13: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (1)
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.6/5

Target for O14: Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)
We target a cross-faculty ranking of at least 4.0 out of 5 in achieving the outcome/objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
7 students were assessed by 7 faculty. In this category, students were rated as 4.35/5

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
I think this year we’ve had to focus on integrating two different scholarly traditions, which might be identified as social and physical sciences. In general, I would expect both to engage critically, but I think there needs to be more intra-departmental discussion.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this
academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

We planned this year to have an integrative undergraduate and graduate seminar. This is being implemented in fall 2010. We believe we are forging a new definition and approach to "geosciences" which is neither just geography nor just geology but finds the commonalities in both. The most popular topic was how issues like thinking critically across long historical periods, thinking at different scales, etc can be done by both sets of 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?

I don't think very much to be honest. I try to bring these in to the APR we are undergoing at the moment.

---
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---

**Goals**

**G 1: Broadening the scope of thinking**

One goal of geosciences in the Core is help students to think more broadly.

**G 2: Understand impacts of Geology in our world**

Student will better appreciate how Geology impacts the world they live in.

---

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate that they can use knowledge not explicitly stated in a question to answer the question at hand. The knowledge is designed to come from an earlier taught concept in either of the two introductory courses (GEOL 1121 and GEOL 1122). In other words the students were asked to “piece concepts together” somewhat or think critically.

---

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

- 4 Critical Thinking

**Standard Associations**

- 1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 6.2 Undergraduate Experience

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Test Questions (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

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**

Students will answer at least 70% of questions correctly.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

The students scored an average grade of 79% on the 14 critical thinking questions and an average of 73% on the test as a whole. Therefore, the student performance on these critical thinking questions was certainly satisfactory.

---
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## Mission / Purpose

The Department of Geosciences at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in instruction and research in the Earth Sciences. We recognize that to achieve and maintain excellence we must set forth goals in the form of Learning Outcomes and put into place a way of effectively assessing and improving results. We expect all our graduates to develop a thorough knowledge base in geology which will place them in a good position for moving on to graduate school or to employment in geology. We expect each graduate to have a strong understanding of the constitution of the earth; earth processes, both internal and external; and earth history.

## Goals

**G 1: Geological Knowledge**

Like all sciences, Geology includes a body of knowledge built up over hundreds of years. Whereas some knowledge is site-specific and may not be of immediate importance, much of the knowledge is general, applying to all parts of the earth. Upon graduation, students will have a general understanding of the earth, both in terms of its current constitution, the processes that drive terrestrial events and processes, and its history. Students will understand how the earth is differentiated internally and will know the general make-up of the core, mantle, and crust. They will understand the processes that produced the differentiation and that continue to modify the earth's interior. Students will understand how the earth has evolved and continues to evolve due to plate tectonics. Students will have a general knowledge of the distribution and characteristics of lithospheric plates and plate margins. They will understand the role of plate tectonics in formation and evolution of both oceanic crust and continental crust, and the role of plate tectonics in mountain building.

Students will understand the origin and evolution of the three rock types, igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic, and how they can be used to decipher earth history. Students will have a general understanding of the origin and distribution of geologic resources, including metallic and nonmetallic ore deposits, and energy resources. They will understand the role of water on earth, including the hydrologic cycle. They will understand the surficial processes of weathering and erosion and how landscapes develop and evolve. Students will have a general knowledge of how life on earth has evolved and how fossils can be used to help decipher earth history. Students will be proficient in the use of basic geologic tools such as the hand lens, Brunton compass, and the petrographic microscope.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Constitution of the Earth (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each graduate will know what the earth is made of and how the various earth materials are distributed within the earth and on its surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Earth Processes (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each graduate will understand the processes driving changes inside the earth and on the earth's surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Earth History (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each graduate will have an understanding of the historical development of the earth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

4 Critical Thinking

## Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: "LOESS" Exit Survey (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The Learning Outcomes Exit Survey for Seniors (LOESS) was given to six graduating seniors. The test consisted of 90 questions, 10 questions from each of nine geology courses. The courses are Geol 1121 (Introductory Geosciences I), Geol 1122 (Introductory Geosciences II), Geol 3002 (Introduction to Earth Materials), Geol 4006 (Sedimentary Environments and Stratigraphy), Geol 4013 (Structural Geology), Geol 4015 (Crystallography and Optical Mineralogy), Geol 4016 (Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology), Geol 4017 (Environmental Geology), and Geol 4007 (Hydrogeology). Geol 1121, 1122, 3002, 4006, 4013, 4015, and 4016 are required for the BS degree; Geol 4017 and 4007 are not required but are taken by almost every graduating student.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

### Target for O1: Constitution of the Earth

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The average score was 58%.

### Target for O2: Earth Processes

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

The average score was 54%.

### Target for O3: Earth History

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The overall performance on the LOESS exit survey by the student group will be at least 80%.
The average score was 81%.

**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?

Since last year we have added the LOESS procedure, the exit survey, to our assessment. We made the change to give us a tool by which we could guage and track the geology knowledge level reached by each student who was poised to graduate. For the coming year we will improve the survey because we think many of the questions on the survey failed to test properly the achievement or knowledge we expected. In particular, we think that many of the questions were too detailed, thereby testing minor or obscure points rather than broad concepts. We also think that the coverage of our 3 objectives on LOESS was too uneven for a good sampling. For next year we anticipate modifying LOESS so that earth history gets greater coverage.

**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.

At this point we plan no major changes to the program. Until our main assessment tool, the LOESS survey, is brought up to par, we don't want to "fix" something that might not be broken. We do anticipate, however, having each instructor consciously include adequate coverage of topics and concepts that we will be surveying on the LOESS survey in the future.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Geology MS**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The primary mission and goal is to produce a well-educated student at the MS degree level in Geology. That mission includes: delivering courses at the MS level relevant to what a MS student in Geology needs to know; and providing stimulating research opportunities at the MS level.

**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 2: MS Degree 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

- **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

- **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.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of German 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: Knowledge of German Literature
Student will understand the particularities of German literature.

G 5: Outcomes for the current period
Previous assessments could not be completed successfully due to several factors including personnel changes in the Department, the complexity of the program and the unsatisfactory design of the original rubrics. After consultation with GSU's Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to Literature course, a requirement for all majors in French, German and Spanish. The new rubric for this goal was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment. It includes 4 weighted criteria of a literary text: Focus on Topic (35%), Literary Lens Use (35%), Organization (15%) and Accuracy of Grammar and Spelling (15%).

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 6: Knowledge of German Literature (M: 1)
The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priority Associations
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Paper (O: 6)
In German 3312 (Introduction to Reading German Literary Texts), students wrote a paper whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyse and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

Target for O6: Knowledge of German Literature
We hope that students will be able to achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature. However, because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions taken for each criteria and in each major, and a decision will be made whether to assess a larger number of goals.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In German 3312 (Introduction to the Reading of German Literature), students majoring in German achieved a score of 8.69.
Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year

Previous assessments could not be completed successfully due to several factors including personnel changes in the Department, the complexity and inflexibility of the program and the unsatisfactory design of the original rubrics. After consultation with GSU's Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to the Reading of German Literature course (German 3312), a requirement for all majors in German. The new rubric for this goal, which now includes 4 weighed criteria, was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment.

Challenges for Next Year

Because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions will be taken accordingly. At that point, the Department will make a decision regarding the goals to be evaluated in the future.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes

Students wrote an end-of-course assignment whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%). The intended minimum objective for students majoring in German was a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature. They achieved a score of 8.69. Although this score is higher than the minimum, we are confident that we can achieve an even higher score in their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text.

Modifications in Measurement Methods

Because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions will be taken accordingly. At that point, the Department will make a decision regarding the goals to be evaluated in the future.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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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
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Unknown (M: 1)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Unknown (M: 3)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Unknown (M: 2)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/O 4: Unknown (M: 4)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Unknown (O: 1)

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

**Target for O1: Unknown**

80% of HPE students should achieve an INTASC rating of 4 coinciding with a grade of 85% or above equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 17 students completing a degree in Health and Physical Education (HPE) the average grade was 91% equating to a rating of above average or outstanding. A total of 88% of students met or exceeded the 80% target. Three students earned a grade between 36-38 out of 45; five students earned a grade between 40-42/45; and nine students earned a grade between 43-45 out of 45 points.

#### M 2: Unknown (O: 2)

**Source of Evidence:** Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O2: Unknown**

80% of HPE students should achieve an INTASC rating of 4 coinciding with a grade of 85% or above equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the 17 students completing an undergraduate degree in Health and Physical Education (HPE) met or exceeded the 80% target. One student achieved a grade of 87%, 10 students achieved grades between 90-94.5% and 6 students achieved grades of 95-100%. The highest grade was 97%.

#### M 3: Unknown (O: 3)

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

**Target for O3: Unknown**

80% of HPE students should achieve an INTASC rating of 4 coinciding with a grade of 85% or above equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 17 students completing an undergraduate degree in Health and Physical Education (HPE) 100% of students achieved the three goals outlined under this measure exceeding the 80% target.

#### M 4: Unknown (O: 4)

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

**Target for O4: Unknown**

80% of HPE students should achieve an INTASC rating of 4 coinciding with a grade of 85% or above equating to a qualitative
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Of the 17 Health and Physical education (HPE) students graduating this year the average score for clinical practice was 96%. A total of 82% of students met or exceeded the 80% target. A total of 14 of the 17 students earned a rating of 5 out of 5 points with 2 students earning a score of 4 out of 5 and one student earning a score of 3 out of 5 points. It is important to note that this score is based on a single item. The HPE faculty have already identified additional measures for clinical practice for fall 2010 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?

The HPE faculty revised the organization of assessment data around the 6 PSC/NCATE Domains rather than around STARS. This enabled the HPE program to better align with the Unit level assessment in the College of Education. In the coming academic year, the HPE faculty will continue to identify key assessments for each of the 6 PSC/NCATE domains as well as assessment rubrics for each key assessment. The HPE faculty will also begin pilot testing and collecting data using Livetext.

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 change in assessment organization will enable faculty to develop rubrics to better analyze key content knowledge in each of the 6 PSC/NCATE domains.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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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**

Target is 75% of program completers with at least 6 of the 9 indicators in the Unit Plan Project scored as Acceptable or Target.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Two of the four students in this cohort took KH 7240 prior to the use of the current assessments for this course. The two completers who did take KH 7240 under this assessment plan both had 6 of the 9 indicators scored at the level of Acceptable or Target, thus meeting this objective.

**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**

Target is 75% of program completers reaching a score of at least 25 (out of 30) on the instructional portion of the KH 7250 Models Project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Two of the four students in this cohort took KH 7250 prior to the use of the current assessments for this course. The two completers who did take KH 7240 under this assessment plan both scored above 25 (out of 30) on this assessment, thus meeting this objective.

**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**

Target is 75% of program completers scoring at least 25 (out of 30) on both the digital and peer supervision projects.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the completers (n = 4) in this cohort met this objective. All completers scored at least 25 (out of 30) on both the digital peer (live) assessments of supervision knowledge and skills.

**M 4: KH 7250 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**

Target is 75% of program completers scoring at least 30 (out of 40) points on the KH 7250 models project assignment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Two of the four students in this cohort took KH 7250 prior to the use of the current assessments for this course. Both completers (n = 2) who took KH 7250 with this assessment scored at least 30 (out of 40) on this assessment, thus meeting the objective.

**M 5: Research synthesis (O: 5)**

The purpose of this assignment is to develop teacher candidate ability to develop a research question and then conduct a complete review of the extant literature on that topic. The teacher candidate writes the research synthesis and then presents it to other students in KH 7820.

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**

Target is 75% of program completers scoring at least 37 (out of 45) on the major paper in KH 7820.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All three students who completed this assessment scored at least 40 (out of 45) on this assessment, thus meeting the objective.

**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.

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

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

- **Measure:** KH 7240 Unit plan  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan

**Implementation Description:** This plan will go into effect in the fall of 2009, and remain in effect for all subsequent offerings of this course  

Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund (Course instructor)  
Additional Resources: none

**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.

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

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

- **Measure:** KH 7250 Instructional models project  
- **Outcome/Objective:** should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models

**Implementation Description:** This plan will go into effect with the next time this course is offered, in spring of 2009  

Projected Completion Date: 12/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (Course instructor)  
Additional Resources: none

**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.

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

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

- **Measure:** Project to demonstrate supervision competence  
- **Outcome/Objective:** should be able to systematically supervise other teachers

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing.  

Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)  
Additional Resources: none

**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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
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.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
Responsible Person/Group: HPE Graduate faculty members, led by Mike Metzler, HPE graduate program coordinator.

Maintain and monitor
The assessment used to measure this outcome appears to be appropriate, and all completers met the stated objective. There is no need for change at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: KH 7250 Instructional models project | Outcome/Objective: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models
Implementation Description: maintain and monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (course instructor)

Maintain and monitor
The assessment used to measure this outcome appears to be appropriate, and all three completers scored above the stated criterion, demonstrating their ability to conduct a research literature synthesis. There is no need to change at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Research synthesis | Outcome/Objective: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document
Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Metzler (course instructor)
Additional Resources: none

Maintain and monitor
These assessments appear to be appropriate for this outcome, and the program completers in this cohort all met the objective. There is no need for any changes at this time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Project to demonstrate supervision competence | Outcome/Objective: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers
Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Gurvitch (course instructor)

Re-calibrate the rubric used in this assessment
The rubric currently used in this assessment appears to be too stringent, as many more of the indicators should have been scored as "Target" but going by the definitions in the rubric had to be scored as "Acceptable."

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: KH 7240 Unit plan | Outcome/Objective: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan
Implementation Description: Revise the scoring rubric for this assessment in KH 7240
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund
Additional Resources: none
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A. This is a graduate program.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A. This is a graduate program.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A. This is a graduate program.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A. This is a graduate program.

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
N/A. This is a graduate 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 used the same assessments in 2009-2010 as we did in 2008-2009. In 2010-2011 we will work to re-calibrate the scoring rubric in KH 7240 to better reflect performance on the the embedded indicators.

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 program is small and each year's graduation cohort does not provide an adequate number. We will examine the cumulative data from 2008-2011 when that is available to determine the need for changes 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?
We have made no changes in the program from 2008-2009.

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 are pleased with the assessments we are currently using, and the performance of our students on them--therefore, except for reviewing the rubric used in KH 7240, we foresee no changes in this current year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The only strategy we'll use is to re-calibrate the scoring rubric in KH 7240. We anticipate that this will be completed in 2010-2011, and will improve our ability to match performance with scoring on that assessment.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
The high rate of student performance on all assessments used in this report.

Challenges for Next Year
None.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
None at this time. The outcomes might change next year when the PSC has revised its standards for advanced HPE certification.

Modifications in Measurement Methods
As noted, a re-calibration of the scoring rubric used in KH 7240. All other assessment appear to be valid and complete for our stated outcomes.

University-wide Committee Participation
N/A
## Mission / Purpose
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 program is accredited by the AACSB and CAHME (The Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education) and is ranked 34th nationally (USNEWSWR, 2009). The mission is to prepare graduates to assume managerial and leadership positions in health sector organizations through 1) A leading-edge curriculum that integrates business and health care knowledge, 2) 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 3) Providing and promoting professional service to the academic and health care communities.

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
- 1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
- 1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
- 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)
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)

This relates to the 2nd domain of the HLA competency model.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Critical Thinking
3. Quantitative Skills

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. 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)

This is the 3rd domain of the HLA competency model.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. 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)

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. 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)

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. 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)
GPA of each HA graduate student

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### M 2: % CAHME educational content areas provided (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

% CAHME educational content areas provided specified courses and administrative residency.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

#### M 3: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Electronic Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance
ratings for all H.A. instructors; specifically items #35 (course effectiveness), 34, 9, and 25.

Source of Evidence: Client satisfaction survey (student, faculty)

**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 on-going feedback

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**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

**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

**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

**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:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Knowledge of the healthcare environment | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** GPA of each HA student | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Develop leadership knowledge and skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Knowledge of the healthcare environment | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Student evaluation of H.A. program | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Develop leadership knowledge and skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Knowledge of the healthcare environment | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Business skills and knowledge
Implementation Description: Fall 2010 target for CAHME competencies in IHA
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche
Additional Resources: Development and Implementation of CAHME competencies requires much additional faculty effort.

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 Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Health Science-Nutrition MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
To prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics.

Goals

G 4: Design and Conduct of Ethical Nutrition Research
The M.S. prepares graduates to formulate research questions, organize and test research hypotheses, 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 5: Critical thinking and professional leadership
The M.S. fosters critical thinking, inquiry, and professional leadership. Students have the opportunity to take an active role in the Nutrition Student Network (NSN), American Diabetes Association (ADA) diabetes expo, as a student liaison with the American Dietetic Association, or serve on committees within the state or local dietetic associations.

G 7: Competencies for Advanced Degree
The M.S. provides the framework for advanced degree study with advanced study in nutrition through a core of courses, including NUTR 6101, NUTR 6102, NUTR 6104, NUTR 6105, NUTR 6106, and NUTR 7101. Performance is evidenced by assessment on papers/assignments using a rubric, quizzes and examinations. Students evidence competencies and knowledge required for more advanced study (PhD, MD, or Clinical Doctorate).

G 6: Career Development: Understanding Role of Nutrition Professionals
The M.S. enhances career development, and encourages students to attend professional meetings in Atlanta and nationally. 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 8: Framework for advanced degree
The M.S. provides the framework for advanced degree study.

G 1: Core Knowledge of Nutrition
Students demonstrate understanding of nutrient metabolism, can design nutrition plans to meet the needs of clients/patients, and are capable of evaluating the impact of health care policies on nutrition science and the nutrition/dietetic profession.

G 2: Communication Skills
Students demonstrate effective written and oral communications skills that are appropriate for advanced practitioners in the field of nutrition/dietetics.

G 3: Advanced Knowledge of Nutrition
Students demonstrate advanced knowledge of the metabolism of macro-nutrients and integrative functioning of macro- and micro-nutrients, nutrition requirements across the life cycle, culturally specific nutrition issues, medical nutrition therapy, and food safety (including food intolerances, food sensitivities, food allergies, and food microbiological safety).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Students Demonstrate Core Nutrition/Dietetics Knowledge (G: 1, 3, 5, 7) (M: 1, 2, 4)
Students demonstrate core knowledge of nutrition: understanding of nutrient metabolism, can design nutrition plans that meet client/patient needs, and can assess the impact of health care policies on nutrition science and the nutrition profession.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Effective Oral and Written Communication Skills Appropriate to Field of Nutrition/Dietetics (G: 2, 5, 6, 7, 8) (M: 6, 8)**

Discipline-specific writing is required in all core courses. Examples 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: Design, Interpret, and Conduct Ethical Research (G: 3, 4, 5, 7, 8) (M: 6, 7)**

Students complete a course sequence on research methods: HHS 6000, NUTR 6101. Professional courses are modeled 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 6: Evaluate Health Policy (G: 5, 6, 7)**

Since the M.S. has a professional focus, most students will work in a health care setting. Students in HHS 8000, NUTR 7101 and NUTR 7950 evaluate relevant health care policies.

**SLO 7: Comprehend Nutrient Intakes and Impact on Health (G: 3, 7) (M: 2, 3, 5)**

The core content for the M.S. includes nutrient biochemistry and 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 3: Graduates Demonstrate Advanced Knowledge of Nutrition/Dietetics (G: 1, 3, 5, 7) (M: 3, 5, 7)**

Graduates of the program demonstrate advanced knowledge of the metabolism of macro- and micro-nutrients, and the integrative functioning of these nutrients, across the life cycle and as influenced by culture, medical system procedures, and food safety issues.

**O/O 5: Design and Evaluate Nutrition Care Plans (G: 5, 6, 7) (M: 4)**

Students plan, design and evaluate nutrition care plans in NUTR 7200 and NUTR 7250.

**O/O 8: Students Demonstrate Critical Thinking and Professional Leadership (G: 2, 6) (M: 9, 10, 11)**

Students demonstrate critical thinking, inquiry and professional leadership through written assignments and involvement in professional organizations.

**O/O 9: Graduates Demonstrate an Understanding of the Role of Nutrition/Dietetic Professionals (G: 6) (M: 10, 11)**

Students are required to understand their role as it fits within the current medical care system, and to understand how to function professionally within this medical care system.

**O/O 10: Graduates Develop Competencies for More Advanced Study (G: 8) (M: 12)**

Graduates of the program will show evidence of developing competencies and knowledge required for more advanced study (e.g., PhD, MD, or Clinical Doctorate) in nutrition or related fields in the health professions.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Knowledge Gained in HHS 8000, Nutr 7101, and Nutr 7950 (O: 1)**

In HHS 8000, Nutr 7101 and Nutr 7950 students evaluate relevant health care policies as evidenced by performance evaluations on papers/assignments using a rubric, quizzes and examinations.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 2: Knowledge Gained in Nutr 6104 and Nutr 6106 (O: 1, 7)**

Students gain advanced understanding of macro and micro-nutrients as they relate to normal physiological function and disease states.

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

**M 3: Demonstrate Advanced Knowledge of Macronutrients (O: 3, 7)**

Students are required to demonstrate an advanced knowledge of macro-nutrients through assessment of examinations and papers.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**M 4: Knowledge Gained in Nutr 7200 and Nutr 7250 (O: 1, 5)**

Students gain advanced understanding of the science behind the strategies for medical nutrition therapies related to chronic disorders, organ systems, and the immune system.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Demonstrate Advanced Knowledge of Micronutrients (O: 3, 7)</th>
<th>Students are required to demonstrate an advanced knowledge of micro-nutrients through assessment of examinations and papers. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 6: Thesis Proposal Evaluation (O: 2, 4)</td>
<td>Approximately 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 O4: 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7: Demonstrate Capabilities in Formulation of Relevant Research Questions (O: 3, 4)</td>
<td>Students formulate relevant research questions, organize and test research hypotheses, and evaluate results of research to determine if hypotheses can be accepted or rejected. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8: Portfolio Evaluation (O: 2)</td>
<td>Two-thirds of students prepare and present a pre-professional electronic portfolio that contains examples of field-specific writing. 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. The achievement target is a minimum of 2 (proficient) for each area, with an overall mean score of 2.5 (proficient-exemplary) across all areas. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work Target for O2: Demonstrate Effective Oral and Written Communication Skills Appropriate to Field of Nutrition/Dietetics The achievement target is 2 (proficient) for each area, with an overall mean score of 2.5 (proficient-exemplary) across all areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: Written Assignments in HHS 6000 and Nutr 6101 (O: 8)</td>
<td>In these two courses students prepare written assignments that are assessed for evidence of critical thinking and inquiry, which are assessed using a rubric. All students are required to maintain a cumulative grade-point average of 3.0, as computed on all graduate course work taken while enrolled in the program at Georgia State University. Any course grade below a &quot;C&quot; is not acceptable toward the MS degree. No more than two courses with a &quot;C&quot; grade, not to exceed six credit hours in the health sciences core and/or major, can be applied toward the degree. Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: Attendance at Professional Conferences (O: 8, 9)</td>
<td>Students are encouraged to attend professional meetings and to write reflections of those experiences, particularly as these meetings address the major challenges faced by leaders in the field of nutrition/dietetics. Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: Pre-Professional Portfolio (O: 8, 9)</td>
<td>Students are required to demonstrate professional leadership through written reflection statements that are evaluated through a rubric. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: Successful Admission into Advanced Study Degree Program (O: 10)</td>
<td>Students will successfully apply and be accepted to an advanced degree program and will be successful in completing that degree. Of students who apply to an advanced program, we expect that 75% will be accepted. Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate Target for O10: Graduates Develop Competencies for More Advanced Study 75% .......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 History Assessment of Core**

(As of 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of History at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge through the study
of various aspects of humanity's recorded past. Some members of the department explore the rise and fall of empires, while others describe the everyday lives of men and women. The department is interested in every period of the past and all parts of the world. The department also seeks to advance knowledge by examining the principles and theories that influence the writing of history, seeking to understand the forces that have structured human life and the ideas that have shaped the way people perceive and experience their worlds. The department is concerned with change and continuity within societies, and interactions among cultures. The department pays particular attention to the effect of perspectives and values because the discipline of history involves the interpretation of findings, not just the collection of facts. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public.

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, marshal 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
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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Professional Skills (M: 1)
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.

SLO 2: Historiography (M: 1)
The student, knowing that history is the interpretation of data, can demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same data.

SLO 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (M: 1)
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.

SLO 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective (M: 1)
The student is able to compare historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.

SLO 5: Professional Values (M: 1)
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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: capstone course seminar paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
The history department undergraduate studies committee read a sample of sixteen student research papers written for HIST 4990 in Spring, Summer, and Fall 2009. We assessed the extent to which these students seemed to have mastered our stated outcomes. Of the sixteen papers read by the committee, one received a one (no evidence of outcome), eight received a two (some evidence of the outcome), five received a three (met expectations), and two received a four (exceeded expectations). The committee was looking for evidence that the student was aware of the concept of historiography and could explain the conflicting interpretations of his or her topic. Most students made only very brief mention of what previous historians have said about their topics. Only 43.75% went into any detail on historiography. We have found that mastering the concept of
Historiography has been and remains one of the areas our students find more difficult to master. Last year, we implemented plans to emphasize historiography to a greater extent in HIST 3000. We hope to see the positive effects of that work as those students begin to move into the capstone course.

**Target for O3: Interdisciplinary Awareness**

The department's target is for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Of the sixteen papers evaluated by the committee, eight received a three (met expectations), seven received two (some evidence of outcome) and one received a one (no evidence of outcome). Thus only 50% of the papers demonstrated an acceptable level of interdisciplinary awareness, and none exceeded our expectations. Not all topics lend themselves to interdisciplinary approaches. However, our students could do more to build on the methods and materials available in other fields.

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective**

The department's target is for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the sixteen papers evaluated by the committee, two exceeded expectations, eight met expectations, two showed some evidence of the outcome, and four showed no evidence. This means that 62.5% of the students' papers made use of either a comparative, global, or transnational perspective. Again, not all papers can be or should be comparative. However, our description of this outcome also includes temporal dimensions, and most history papers treat the issue of change over time.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**

The department's target for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Of the sixteen papers evaluated by the committee, seven met our expectations in this area and one exceeded expectations. Seven papers showed some evidence of this outcome and one showed no evidence. Thus only 50% of our students met or exceeded our expectations in the area of professional values. In most cases, students who did not meet expectations in this area failed to acknowledge the work of other historians and used their source materials without sufficient critical distance. We are optimistic that the new CTW approaches our students are learning will help to improve their performance in this area.

**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 comparison 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):**
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

Revision of outcomes
The history department’s undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students’ level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective

Implementation Description: The history department’s undergraduate studies committee will work on revising the outcomes in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes
The history department’s undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students’ level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values

Implementation Description: The department’s undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes
The history department’s undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students’ level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Interdisciplinary Awareness

Implementation Description: The undergraduate studies committee will work on these revisions during Fall 2010 and then present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be ready in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.
Revision of outcomes
The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills

Implementation Description: The undergraduate studies committee will be working on these revisions during the fall semester and then bring them before the department as a whole early in the spring 2011 semester. They should be ready in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew

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 involves 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. All students should show outcomes at the high-competent level (rank of 4 on assessment instrument) or sophisticated level (rank of 5 on assessment instrument).

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Histography
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 2010-2011 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
The graduate assessment instrument is now in use in all graduate courses. It will be modified with a broader range of numerical ranking and two additional questions in 2010-2011 to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate their progress in teaching students to meet outcomes and objectives.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The end of Spring semester 2010
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty members who will teach respective courses

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?

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
The collated assessment rankings show that the department's MA students scored an average of 3.67 on the outcomes rated by our assessment instrument (the results of the Spring 2010 are available for review in the department's graduate office). This data suggests that the department could do more to prepare MA students in basic outcomes, particularly in our required 7000-level core course offerings. Instructors in these courses will be asked to design assignments that support our outcome goals. In addition, the assessment rankings that some students may need extra help meeting specific outcome goals. The department will implement a mentoring program for first year students to ensure they are making progress towards meeting all outcome goals.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain?

The department is now using the assessment instrument in all graduate courses, which has resulted in rankings for outcome goals for individual students as well as offered a broad view of how MA students as a group are meeting those goals. Annual assessment reports will allow the department to track student success on both the individual and group levels over time and will help identify strengths and weaknesses in the graduate 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 department values the opportunity to gain information on the preparation and learning of its graduate students and we are pleased that for most part the students rank highly on our objective/outcome goals. Yet we would like all students to show outcomes at the high-competent (rank of 4 on the current assessment instrument) or sophisticated (rank of 5 on the current assessment instrument) levels. Once we have assessment results for several years, said results will aid the department’s evaluation of the recent graduate curriculum changes and will provide information to further improve our graduate program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

While we are in general pleased with the results of the first semester test of the department's assessment instrument, the tight range of outcome rankings suggests that instructors need a broader range of numerical rankings to better evaluate student progress toward meeting the department's stated outcomes and objectives. We will thus revise the assessment instrument in academic year 2010-2011 to extend the range of numerical rankings on the rubric from a range of 1 to 5 to a range of 1 to 8. We will also add two new questions focused on writing and oral communication skills.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
Implemented assessment instrument in all graduate courses in Spring 2010 and evaluated instrument results.

**Challenges for Next Year**
Revise assessment instrument to better evaluate student progress in meeting outcomes/objectives.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**
Expansion of numerical rankings from 1 to 5 to 1 to 8 on assessment instrument. Add two new questions to evaluate written and oral communication skills.

**Contributions to Student Retention**
In Fall 2010 the department implemented a MA program designed to improve retention and facilitate progress toward graduation by streamlining the program, setting clear core course and field requirements, and instituting a graduate student mentoring system. The assessment process will offer guidance for the effectiveness of these reforms and will assist in possible future changes intended to meet action plan outcomes/objectives.
G 2: Learning
Assist students in becoming active, interdisciplinary learners

G 3: Academic Honesty and Integrity
Nurture 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

O/O 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. All students should show outcomes at the high competent level (rank of 4 on assessment instrument) or sophisticated level (rank of 5 on assessment instrument).

O/O 2: Historiography (M: 1)
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 (M: 1)
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 (M: 1)
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 (M: 1)
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: Graduate Assessment Instrument (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
A rubric that was designed to assess a student’s skill set in two core courses of the program.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

General Examinations
During academic year 2010-2011 elements of the rubric/instrument will be applied to all general examination at the completion of PhD coursework.

rubric/instrument: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The end of Spring semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program committee

Rubric Testing
Assessment of our 7000 and 7060 courses

rubric/instrument: 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 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?
Annual Report Section Responses

**Contributions to Student Retention**

In Fall 2010 the department implemented a new PhD program designed to improve retention and facilitate progress towards graduation by streamlining the program, setting clear core course and field requirements, and instituting a graduate student mentoring system. The assessment process will offer guidance for the effectiveness of these reforms and will assist in possible future changes intended to meet action plan outcomes/objectives.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

Expansion of numerical rankings from 1 to 5 to 1 to 8 on assessment instrument. Add two new questions to evaluate written and oral communication skills and extending the range of numerical rankings to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate outcomes and objectives. We will also move to utilize a new assessment instrument for PhD comprehensive exams.

**Challenges for Next Year**

As of last year's assessment report, the department's PhD students an average of 4.30 on the outcomes rated by our assessment instrument (the results of the Spring 2010 are available for review in the department's graduate office). Such rankings suggest that PhD students are more advanced than MA students, which we expect, given their level of training. In addition, the assessment rankings that some students may need extra help meeting specific outcome goals. The department will implement a mentoring program for first year students to ensure they are making progress towards meeting all outcome goals.

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

- Implemented assessment instrument in all graduate courses in Spring 2010 and evaluated instrument results.
- Revise assessment instrument to better evaluate student progress in meeting outcomes/objectives. Design and implement new assessment instrument for PhD comprehensive exams.
- Expanded numerical rankings to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate outcomes and objectives.
- Added two new questions focused on writing and oral communication 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?

The department values the opportunity to gain information on the preparation and learning of its graduate students and we are pleased that for most part the students rank highly on our objective/outcome goals. Yet we would like all students to show outcomes at the high-competent (rank of 4 on the current assessment instrument) or sophisticated (rank of 5 on the current assessment instrument) levels. Once we have assessment results for several years, said results will aid the department's evaluation of the recent graduate curriculum changes and will provide information to further improve our graduate 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?

While we are in general pleased with the results of the first semester test of the department’s assessment instrument, the tight range of outcome rankings suggests that instructors need a broader range of numerical rankings to better evaluate student progress toward meeting the department's stated outcomes and objectives. We will thus revise the assessment instrument in academic year 2010-2011 to extend the range of numerical rankings on the rubric from a range of 1 to 5 to a range of 1 to 8. We will also add two new questions focused on writing and oral communication skills. In addition we will implement a pilot assessment instrument for our PhD comprehensive exams. While it is difficult to anticipate results, we hope that both these strategies will increase the accuracy and usefulness of the assessment process.

**Administrative Question 3:**

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

The department is now using the assessment instrument in all graduate courses, which has resulted in rankings for outcome goals for individual students as well as offered a broad view of how PhD students as a group are meeting those goals. Annual assessment reports will allow the department to track student success on both the individual and group levels over time and will help identify strengths and weaknesses in the graduate program.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

- Implemented assessment instrument in all graduate courses in Spring 2010 and evaluated instrument results.
- Revised assessment instrument to better evaluate student progress in meeting outcomes/objectives. Design and implement assessment instrument for PhD comprehensive exams.
- Expanded numerical rankings from 1 to 5 to 1 to 8 on assessment instrument. Add two new questions to evaluate written and oral communication skills.

**Challenges for Next Year**

- Revised assessment instrument to better evaluate student progress in meeting outcomes/objectives. Design and implement assessment instrument for PhD comprehensive exams.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

- Expansion of numerical rankings from 1 to 5 to 1 to 8 on assessment instrument. Add two new questions to evaluate written and oral communication skills.

**Contributions to Student Retention**

- In Fall 2010 the department implemented a new PhD program designed to improve retention and facilitate progress towards graduation by streamlining the program, setting clear core course and field requirements, and instituting a graduate student mentoring system. The assessment process will offer guidance for the effectiveness of these reforms and will assist in possible future changes intended to meet action plan outcomes/objectives.

---

**Georgia State University**

Assessment Data by Section

2009-2010 Hospitality Administration BBA

As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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 280 majors in the School. The hospitality curriculum consists of seven required major courses and a variety of elective courses from which majors can select three (9 hours.) Hospitality majors are required to work at least 570 hours in industry-related positions. To certify that these hours have been worked, students are required to take “Hospitality Work Study” (HADM 4900) for which there is no fee and no credit hours. Students complete a work portfolio as part of this process.

Goals

G 1: Students will be knowledgeable of major industry segments.
Students will have knowledge 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 also know basic information pertaining to the gaming industry and the cruise line segment.

G 2: Students will be prepared with business knowledge and service skills.
Students will be prepared for the hospitality industry with business knowledge and service skills to optimize the success of companies and corporations.

G 3: Students will develop the analytical skills to evaluate the business environment of today and the future.
Students will be prepared with analytical skills in all functional areas to evaluate the business environment of today and of the future.

G 5: Students will become ethical thinkers.
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 be knowledgeable of sustainable information for having a positive impact on the environment through proactive, environmentally-friendly business practices.

G 7: Students will be prepared for management and leadership positions in the hospitality industry.
Hospitality students will have the knowledge and skills in all major functional areas to be effective managers and leaders in hospitality businesses.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Explain the hospitality/tourism industry segments (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 7)
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.

SLO 2: Explain and evaluate the application of foodservice and culinary terms, principles and techniques (G: 2, 7) (M: 1, 8)
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.

SLO 3: Explain and evaluate the application of human resource principles in a hospitality business operation (G: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7) (M: 2)
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.

SLO 4: Explain and analyze the application of service marketing theories in a hospitality business operation (G: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7) (M: 1)
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.

SLO 5: Explain and analyze the application of laws and regulations in hospitality businesses (G: 2, 3, 5, 7) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate knowledge and application of various facets of hospitality law aimed at minimizing liabilities in hospitality operations.

SLO 6: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations (G: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7) (M: 1, 2)
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. Strategic principles will include the degree to which the company or corporation is including sustainable practices into their operational mission and goals.

SLO 7: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results (G: 2, 3, 7) (M: 4)
Students will be able to apply concepts and principles of financial analysis including cost control techniques and evaluate their effectiveness.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Projects (O: 2, 4, 5, 6)

Group projects are used incorporating actual business needs/problems into the appropriate course. All of the following (HADM 3401/3402, HADM 3720, HADM 3760 and HADM 4800) are required hospitality major courses. Group projects are used in HADM 3401/3402 (Hospitality Food Production and Service Management and Lab) in which students produce food each lab session and hold an end-of-the-semester food event in which they work as teams. Individual and group grades are given for contributions and performance in each lab session and for the final event. In HADM 3720 (Hospitality Law), students work in groups in visiting hospitality businesses and doing a walk-through of the operation looking for possible safety/security issues and writing a report of their findings. Group projects are used in HADM 3760 (Hospitality Service Marketing) involving each group developing a marketing plan for an actual hospitality business. The evaluation criteria relate directly to the course and the marketing plan components completed. Students are graded individually for their contributions as well as getting a group grade for the final presentation. Group projects are used in HADM 4800 (Hospitality Strategic Management) involving students completing a strategic plan for a hospitality company. Rubrics are used in this course delineating the criteria. Students receive an individual grade for their contributions to the group as well as a group grade for the final presentation.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: Explain and evaluate the application of foodservice and culinary terms, principles and techniques

All of the class will make a minimum grade of 75 on the lab sessions.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

The class is composed of nutrition and hospitality majors. This target was met for both groups for this past academic year with 100% making 75 or higher on the lab sessions. In evaluating the scores on lab reports, students displayed a good understanding of culinary terminology and applications. Evaluating the items cooked was sometimes more challenging in determining if the item was at the proper temperature, had the right consistency, right texture and was of the appropriate flavor/taste. The lab reports also included work habits which consisted of wearing the chef's jacket, chef's hat, having all needed utensils, having clean hands and having a clean work station. These aspects were typically above average for the classes.

Target for O4: Explain and analyze the application of service marketing theories in a hospitality business operation

90% of the class will make a minimum grade of 75 on the project.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

This goal was met with the 90% of the class making at least 75 on the project. For the semester selected to review, the average for the course was 84 with student scores ranging from 77 to 97.

Target for O5: Explain and analyze the application of laws and regulations in hospitality businesses

90% of the class will make a minimum of 80 on this project.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

For fall semester 2009, the project grades for HADM 3720 (Hospitality Law) indicated that 100% of the students made a minimum grade of 86 on the project in which they visited hospitality businesses to critique and analyze the application of laws and regulations. For this semester, the focus of this project was on ADA requirements. For spring semester 2010, for this same project, 96.5% of the students made a grade of at least 95 on the project.

Target for O6: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations

85% of the class will make a minimum of 75 on the project.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

For the selected semester to analyze (spring 2010), 93% of the class made at least 75 on the strategic management project. The average score was 88.06 with the scores ranging from 69 to 100. The tests consisted of case vignettes in which students had to apply strategic management terminology and principles. While the terms and principles may have been understood, in theory, the application to real business scenarios was where students lost points.

M 2: Written Exams (O: 1, 3, 6)

Through written exams, students will show their comprehension of industry segments and their relationship to one another. This is in HADM 3010 (Perspectives of the Hospitality Industry.) Written exams, incorporating abbreviated case scenarios, are routinely used in HADM 3750 (Hospitality Human Resources) and HADM 4800 (Hospitality Strategic Management) which are aimed at the application of information.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Explain the hospitality/tourism industry segments

A minimum of 80% of the students in each class will make at least a 75 average on the exams.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

For the Fall - Mean score was 78 ranged from 68 to 96 For the Spring - Mean score was 84 ranged from 66 to 94 For both semesters, at least 80% of the students made at least a 75 on the exam testing their knowledge of hospitality industry segments.
Target for O3: Explain and evaluate the application of human resource principles in a hospitality business operation

At least 80% of the class will have a 75 minimum average on the tests for the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the semester in which the test scores were analyzed for 65 students in HADM 3750 (Hospitality Human Resources), the range of test scores was 48 - 100 with the average on each test being 84 (first test) and 82 (second test). On the first test, 82% of the students scored at least 75. On the second test, 89.4% of the students scored at least 75.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target for O6: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations

At least 75% will have a 75 minimum average on the combined exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester 2010 was used to evaluate the performance of students in HADM 4800 (Hospitality Strategic Management) on written exams. There were 41 students in this course. The scores ranged from 89 to 100 on exam 1 with the average being 94. The average grade on exam 2 was 89 with scores ranging from 70 to 100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 3: Work Experience Portfolio (O: 1)

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 O1: Explain the hospitality/tourism industry segments

100% of the students completing the required "Work Study Course" (HADM 4900) will achieve a satisfactory rating on the work study portfolio which does reflect the student's understanding of a particular industry segment in which the student has decided to work. The work portfolio (which will be attached as a document) is very comprehensive and encompasses many operational components of the company in which the student works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students completing their work study requirements and submitting the work experience portfolio for fall semester 2009 and spring semester 2010 achieved a satisfactory rating. This particular course (no credit/no fee) has the option of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory as a final grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

At least 75% of the class will make a grade of 70 on the simulation exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In fall 2009, 100% of the class scored over 70%. The grades ranged from 82 - 96. For spring semester 2010, 68% of the class made at least a 70 on the simulation exercise but 32% fell below 70 on this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 7: Employer Evaluation of Work Experience (O: 1)

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. The evaluation form (which is provided to employers) includes 12 factors: 1. Knowledge of areas involved in job position 2. Technical skills 3. Interpersonal and service skills with customers 4. Interpersonal and service skills with co-workers 5. Interaction with supervisors/managers 6. Written communication abilities 7. Oral communication abilities 8. Ability to accept feedback; Willingness to learn 9. Work habits (attendance, punctuality, accuracy) 10. Demonstration of potential leadership abilities 11. Credibility/ethical behavior 12. Work performance was reflective of what would be expected of a major in hospitality.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

Target for O1: Explain the hospitality/tourism industry segments

This is an indirect measure of the employee’s work performance which does reflect understanding of the particular segment of the hospitality industry in which the employee is working. The target is for 95% of the students to receive at least a satisfactory rating from their immediate manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 95% (98%) of the evaluations for fall semester 2009 and for spring semester 2010 rated the work performance of students over the level of satisfactory (above expectations or outstanding) on the criteria listed on the form supplied by the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 8: Food Safety/Sanitation Certification (O: 2)

HADM 3401/3402 (Food Production Lab) requires that all students complete a standardized food safety/sanitation exam during the
### Target for O2: Explain and evaluate the application of foodservice and culinary terms, principles and techniques

Successful completion of the food safety/sanitation certification is required for HADM 3401/3402. Therefore, 100% of the students must achieve at least a score of 75.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

For fall 2009, 100% of the students completed HADM 3401/3402 passed the food safety/sanitation certification exam which requires a minimum score of 75. For spring 2010, 100% of the students completed HADM 3401/3402 also passed this certification exam achieving the minimum necessary score of 75.

### 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 for 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. The deadline for the submission of this report is January 2011.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2011
- **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:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Debby Cannon

#### Curriculum Review Process

During fall 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. This session was originally planned for spring 2010 but was postponed due to two new faculty members being hired.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **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. The process for administering the ETS exam is being revised by the College. This action plan will be reinstated once the process is determined.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Debby Cannon

#### 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:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Debby Cannon

#### Hospitality Business Simulation

The professor teaching this course will evaluate the work of the students in HADM 4100 (Hospitality Cost Control and Financial Analysis) to monitor their progress. The project does include check-points throughout the semester. The professor of HADM 4100 felt that the spring semester results were not reflective of past semesters. There were no significant changes in the course during that semester which makes the reason for lower student performance harder to understand.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Business Computerized Simulation
- **Outcome/Objective:** Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results
Implementation Description: Evaluate the assignments throughout fall semester to ascertain if students are comprehending the material and can apply the information to the business simulation project.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Dave Pavesic

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 more involvement from the faculty as a whole including part-time instructors. We are including more in-depth discussions of assessment approaches and results into regular faculty meetings and the annual faculty retreat. There is definitely heightened awareness of what one another is doing within the department and the tie to assessment results.

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, we need to evaluate two main areas from this year's assessment data: 1. Are different sections of the same course consistent in assessment measures? 2. Based on our findings, do we need to increase the degree of academic challenge in our assessment measures? These questions will be discussed at the School's annual retreat in August and in upcoming faculty meetings.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Human Resource Management MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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
1.1 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 project reports. 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 1: Accurate description and usage guides for job analysis, descriptions, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student cannot accurately describe and explain usage of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal. Student can accurately describe and explain usage in detail of job analysis, description, evaluation, and performance appraisal.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Average faculty rating 1.8/3.0. 65% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 2: Intergration 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. 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 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Analysis and Results of Outcome: Faculty rating of 1.7/3.0. 61% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 3: Job Analysis and Description (O: 2)**
In the final project in MGS 8360 students will Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE 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) does not meet Standard 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 good detail. Student uses 3 of 3 bases for selection system in extensive detail

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Average faculty rating of 1.6/3.0. 61.8% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 4: Behavioral Interview Questions (O: 2)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE 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 other 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
Average faculty rating of 1.7/3.0. 63% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M 5: Law Issue Identification (O: 3)**
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Faculty rating of 1.7/3.0. 61% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

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

Target for O3: Employment Law

80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 6 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Rubric for Measuring Learning Outcomes – MS in HRM Criterion 3: Understand and effectively apply employment law Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 6. Appropriate and clearly-written HR policies A few ambiguous or inappropriate HR policies Most appropriate and clearly-written HR policies All appropriate and clearly-written HR policies

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Faculty rating of 1.6/3.0. 63% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

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

Target for O4: Employee Relations

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 7 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 4: Understand and effectively apply performance management and employee relations techniques Does not meet standard (1) Meets the standard (2) Exceeds the standard (3) Measure 7. Discuss performance management and employee relations techniques and advantages and disadvantages of each Can discuss some performance management and employee relations techniques and some advantages and disadvantages of each Can discuss most performance management and employee relations techniques and most advantages and disadvantages of each Can discuss almost all performance management and employee relations techniques and most advantages and disadvantages of each

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Faculty rating of 1.4/3.0. 48% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

M 8: Employee Relations and Productivity (O: 4)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US 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

Target for O4: Employee Relations

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 8 Rubric to randomly selected project reports. Learning Outcome 4: Understand and effectively apply performance management and employee relations techniques Does not meet the standard (1) Meets the standard (2) Exceeds the standard (3) Measure 8. Discuss how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity Cannot discuss how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity Can discuss in some detail how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity Cannot discuss in extensive detail how performance management and employee relations techniques enhance employer productivity

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Integration of All Compensation Components | 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)
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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Behavioral Interview Questions | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment

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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Responsible Person/Group: HR Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Added Case Example

Provide sample of case analysis with issues, laws, and conclusions. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Law Issue Identification | Outcome/Objective: Employment Law

Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Added Exercises in Legal Policy

Add an additional in-class exercise to requiring students to write policy responses. Discuss and critique in class. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements | Outcome/Objective: Employment Law

Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Compensation Class Content Change

Add one hour class time to review competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation | Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design
Compensation Review Checklist

One week prior to due date, review in-class written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Integration of All Compensation Components
  - Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Individual Student Feedback

Provide individual feedback to students prior to having them revise job analysis, job description, and job specification. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Job Analysis and Description
  - Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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(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
   1.1 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
   1.4 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
   1.5 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
3.11 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 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
3.11 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 the 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
3.11 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
3.11 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
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
1.11 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)

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 completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.
### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

### Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation

95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

### 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

### Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development

95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design

95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management

95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation

95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

### 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

### Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

### Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

### Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

**Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

**Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

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

#### Continue to Monitor Curriculum
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2009-2010 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

#### Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - Measure: End of Course Assessments | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
  - Measure: Internship Report | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Implement Certificate in Online Education Program
We will implement our add-on certificate program in online education which is under final review.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

#### Increase Recruitment Efforts
We will actively recruit new students and maintain our high admission standards.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

#### Investigate Certificate Program for P-12
In order to recruit more students and better serve those students in the region, we begin developing a certificate program in expectation that the state will approve a teaching certificate in instructional technology.
Online Degree Program

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All Faculty
Additional Resources: One clinical Faculty line to start.
Budget Amount Requested: $65,000.00 (recurring)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?

Based on feedback from faculty and students we have decided to abandon LiveText as a Portfolio system. We will instead allow the students to use a variety of tools to create their portfolios. This should allow us to get more in-depth and creative portfolios from the students and help us assess their skills more holistically.

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 create a business and industry track for our online MS. We will explore creating a certificate program for P-12 certification. We will change a portion of the MS core to allow students to focus on content that more directly relates to corporate settings.
**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 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. 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. 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
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.
### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
<th>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2</strong>: Develops leadership for the profession</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong>: Demonstrates research expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong>: Engages in scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5</strong>: Understands foundations of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6</strong>: Develops a professional identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7</strong>: Develops an extended knowledge base</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
<th>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong>: Understands and uses technology</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2</strong>: Develops leadership for the profession</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong>: Demonstrates research expertise</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong>: Engages in scholarship</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5</strong>: Understands foundations of education</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

**Target for O2: Develop leadership for the profession**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - Target: 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

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

Improve Post Completion Jobs
Improve the quality of the positions students accept upon graduation from the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor student completers and mentor them through the job search process.
Responsible Person/Group: All IT Faculty
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increase Number of Program Completers
We will monitor and try to increase the number of doctoral graduates per year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Increase student monitoring in order to improve graduation rates.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All IT faculty.
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increase Research Opportunities
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship
Monitor Standards
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year. Due to the increasingly rapid pace of technology evolution and the core function of technology in this program, it may be necessary to shorten the syllabus review cycle to bi-annually. Additionally, faculty may need additional resources in the future to fund professional development in order to stay current with technological change.

Recruit Full-time Students
As we transition to becoming a more research oriented institution we need to recruit more full-time Ph.D. students to assist in that effort. We have added a couple of additional full-time Ph.D. students and we will continue to pursue additional students.

Seek External Funding
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the
initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

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 retreated from the use of Livetext as an assessment tool for our Ph.D. students to allow for greater flexibility in report formats. We found that student dissatisfaction with LiveText led to a lower overall annual report completion rate than we would have gotten without it. This year we will allow students to complete their annual report in a variety of formats and we anticipate that this change will lead to a higher completion rate.

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 past practice we have limited enrollment to 6 Ph.D. students per faculty member. We have found however that due to the length of time students remain in the program (up to 9 years in some cases) this has had the effect of spreading the students out so that no cohort of students existed of more than 6 students. Current university enrollment policy has forced us to cancel classes that students need to graduate because too few students enrolled. We will therefore plan on modifying our overall enrollment policy to allow 6 students at the dissertation stage per faculty member. We will not limit the number students per faculty in the course stage save by qualification. Hopefully this will allow us to increase overall enrollments so classes will make.

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?

---
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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
G 1: Goal 1: Understanding of International Business Environment
Full Description: Students will have the ability to identify and analyze strategic and operational opportunities or problems in a specific international setting. The measurements may incorporate case histories, analytical papers, market studies, etc.

G 2: Goal 2: Country Market Analysis
Full Description: Students will be able to conduct systematic country market analysis from the perspective of potential exporters, investors, global procurers, and other firms. Students will identify the factors that contribute to global market opportunity, identify diverse sources of data, and systematically analyze it in order to generate practical recommendations for managers.

G 3: Goal 3: Extend Functional Skills in International Operations
Full Description: Students will be able to demonstrate their functional knowledge to analyze a case in the international context. They will be able to delineate the impact on business practice of international and cross-cultural issues. Students will demonstrate expertise in such areas as: Cross-Cultural and Collaborative Skills; Global Supply Chain Management; Global CSR; International Marketing and Positioning; Global Financial System Analysis; Global Legal Environment; International Entrepreneurship.

**G 4: Goal 4: Second Language Proficiency**
Full Description: The students need to be proficient in a second language in order to conduct business. If the students do not have proficiency in a second language before they are admitted to the MIB program, they must take language courses while they are in the program before they are granted the degree.

**G 5: Goal 5: Team Skills**
Full Description: Students will engage in a team based project in the Capstone Course that will be self-assessed, team-assessed, and faculty assessed.

**G 6: Goal 6: Extended Work Experience**
Full Description: Students will complete an internship providing foreign business experience, cultural awareness and functional expertise. Students will file monthly internship reports that consist of three parts: a) examples of foreign business experience, b) examples of comparisons for cultural differences, and c) particular examples of tasks and responsibilities undertaken.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**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 5: 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 is able to recognize at least two functional areas and integrate them. Exceeds standards=3. The student can fully capture the implications of four or more functional area decisions.

**SLO 7: 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 an their skill level is distinctly higher than that needed for a pass.

**SLO 9: 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 members: The student has effectively worked with his/her teammates, incorporated functional knowledge and problem solving. Exceeds standards=3. In team evaluation forms by the faculty of the team members: The student has integrated multiple views and perspectives to problem solving, can create synergies from diverse perspectives and demonstrate critical thinking. ” Kaufman, Felder, and Fuller (2000); May and Gueldenzopf (2003)

**SLO 10: Target Levels Goal 5 (M: 10, 11)**
90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Meets Standards” criteria. . 30% of students should pass each outcome/objective with “Exceeds Standards” criteria.

**SLO 11: Complete Analyses Goal 6**
M.11: Faculty assessment of monthly internship report
M.12: Faculty assessment of cumulative supervisor/company report

Measure 11
Extended Work Experience
Monthly internship report
Non Pass: The student fails to file his/her monthly internship report, or files incomplete reports with missing sections.
Pass: The student files his/her monthly internship report and provides details on a) foreign business experience, b) detailed observations of the foreign culture, c) description of the tasks and responsibilities undertaken.
Exceed: The student files his/her monthly internship report and provides details on and comparison of a) foreign business experience, b) cultural differences, c) how he/she integrated concepts learned in class to real-life cases.

Measure 12
Extended work Experience
Cumulative internship report
Non Pass: The company/supervisor fails to file a cumulative internship report Non Pass: The company/supervisor fails to file a cumulative internship report, or files an incomplete report with missing sections.
Pass: The company/supervisor files a cumulative internship report and provides brief description of the student's responsibilities and adequate execution of these tasks.
Exceed: The company files a cumulative internship report and provides a commendation for outstanding work ethic and accomplishment of tasks and responsibilities assigned.

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)

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)
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)
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)
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)
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)
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)
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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Journalism BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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. The journalism program is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of journalism 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 journalistic collaboration with a local, state, regional, national and global media communities. The goal of the program is to prepare students for entry-level positions in print, broadcast and public relations venues. Note: The Department has about 900 are Journalism majors.

Goals
G 1: evaluate information
Students will be able to find and evaluate credible sources of information.

G 2: objective analysis
Students will be able to analyze and interpret information for bias and objectivity.

G 3: apply standards when originating content
Students will be able to apply ethical standards and conventions of journalism and related mass communication industries when creating original content, e.g. news stories, press releases, newsletters, etc.,
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Understand diversity relating to communications (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)**
Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications.

**SLO 5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness (G: 2, 3) (M: 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 (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)**
Think critically, creatively, independently.

**SLO 7: Research and evaluate info. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**
Conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communication professions in which they work.

**SLO 8: Write correctly and clearly (G: 3) (M: 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 (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)**
Critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style and grammatically correctness.

**SLO 10: Apply numerical/statistical concepts (G: 3)**
Apply basic numerical and statistical concepts.

**SLO 11: Apply appropriate tools/technologies (G: 3) (M: 2)**
Apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: self-report**
Questionnaire of a sample of recent graduates asked if they met the goal personally and how they were able to meet the goal. This was not assessed in this cycle.

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

**M 2: rubric (O: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11)**
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**
This is outcome was not specifically assessed although requiring diverse viewpoints is part of the assessment for the writing assignments in Jour 3010, Jour 4040 and Jour 4800.

**Findings 2009-2010** - Target: Not Met

N/A

**Target for O5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness**
Students in Jour 3010, Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 will average at least 16 out of 20 on writing content rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010** - Target: Partially Met

Students in Jour 3010 averaged 14.2 out of 20 or 71% on the writing content rubric. Students in Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 averaged 16.6 or 83% on the writing content rubric.

**Target for O6: Think critically, creatively, independently**
A sample of students in Jour 3010, Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 will average at least 16 on 20-point rubric for critical thinking.

**Findings 2009-2010** - Target: Partially Met

The average score for Jour 3010 students on the critical thinking rubric was 16.6 out of 20 or 83.2%. The average score for the Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 students was 15.7 out of 20 or 78.7%.

**Target for O7: Research and evaluate info.**
A sample of students in Jour 3010, Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 will score a 16 or above out of 20 on a research rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010** - Target: Partially Met
Jour 3010 students averaged 15.4 out of 20 (77%) on the research rubric. Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 students averaged 16.3 or 81.5% on the research rubric.

**Target for O8: Write correctly and clearly**

A sample of students in Jour 3010, Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 will score a 16 or above out of 20 possible points on a writing competency rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Jour 3010 students average score on a writing competency rubric was 16.7 or 83.3%. Jour 4040 and Jour 4800 students average score was 16.3 or 81.5%.

**Target for O9: Critically evaluate own/others’ work**

This outcome was not specifically assessed but critical thinking skills was assessed and reported in another outcome.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

N/A

**Target for O11: Apply appropriate tools/technologies**

This outcome was not specifically assessed with the writing assignment in Jour 3010.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

N/A

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

#### 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 course options-- to the Journalism curriculum, the assessment of the research 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: Research and evaluate info.

  **Implementation Description:** Beginning of 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 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):
  Measure: self-report  
  Outcome/Objective: Think critically, creatively, independently

Implementation Description: Beginning fall semester  
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009  
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: rubric  
  Outcome/Objective: Understand diversity relating to communications

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  
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: rubric  
  Outcome/Objective: Understand diversity relating to communications

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 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

multiple measures

At least one more measure should be considered to assess students' ability to critically evaluate others' work. Perhaps an embedded assignment in at least one of the Journalism core courses or an exercise on an exam should be considered.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: self-report  
  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
align outcomes with goals
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Revise/increase number of goals to align all eleven learning outcomes with a goal.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: rubric | Outcome/Objective: Apply appropriate tools/technologies
  | Critically evaluate own/others' work | Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness | Research and evaluate info. | Think critically, creatively, independently | Understand diversity relating to communications | Write correctly and clearly
Implementation Description: Faculty will assess each outcome to ensure that it flows from specific goal. This assessment will also identify goals not yet captured.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Data Collection Protocol
Improve collection of data and develop multiple measures for each goal/learning outcome.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty will determine most efficient and effective process by which data can be collected for assessment. In addition, faculty will determine assessment tools that best measure learning outcomes.
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Rotate Assessment
Determine rotation of learning outcomes to be assessed in each cycle. Not all goals/learning outcomes have to be assessed every year, but each one has to be assessed regularly.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty will determine system by which all learning outcomes will be assessed at least once over a three-year rotation.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Student Work Selection
Random selection of student work rather than selection based on cross-section of student work by performance.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: rubric | Outcome/Objective: Critically evaluate own/others' work
  | Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness | Research and evaluate info. | Think critically, creatively, independently | Write correctly and clearly
Implementation Description: Instructors will randomly select student work from several assignments for assessment
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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 Eggleston 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. As of Spring 2007, 701 students are enrolled in our JD program. In the academic year 2006-07, beginning with Summer 2006 and ending in Spring 2007, 212 students earned J.D. degrees from the College of Law. Ten of those students earned joint degrees; a breakdown follows: JD/MPA - 2; JD/ MBA - 7; JD/MPA - 2; Other - 1.

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 faculty was required to read the entire Carnegie Report and participate in "book club" sessions held on weekend days at faculty members' homes. In year two, the Faculty Curriculum Committee was charged with studying our entire curriculum, with an eye to suggesting changes responsive to the Carnegie Report. A student representative was appointed to serve on the Committee, as well. By the end of the year, the Committee had made a series of findings and proposals, and presented them to the faculty. In year three, the faculty held 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 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 skills. All agree 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Basic proficiency in legal writing**
Any accredited law school graduate, whether she practices law in a traditional sense or not, needs to be an effective communicator. 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 the future in the law.

**G 2: Basic proficiency in legal research**
All students must learn how to find the existing law, whether it be in the form of statutes, regulations or caselaw. Students must also learn the proper format for using and citing the law in memos, briefs, and other relevant forums.

**G 3: Basic proficiency in fundamental legal principles**
All students must learn the fundamentals of the American legal system. Once they learn these fundamentals, they may choose to "specialize" and takes courses in specific areas of the law.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing (M: 2, 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 legal 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 II in two primary respects. First, the students are no longer able to rely upon any "canned research." For this semester, they rely almost entirely upon research they develop on their own. The research skills are those learned in both RWA I and II, as well as in Legal Bibliography, a course taught by law librarians. 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 memos which are intended to present objective descriptions of the law, the brief includes 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.

**SLO 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.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 4: xxx (M: 2)**

xxx
**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...

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 2: Production of satisfactory written product (O: 1)**

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.

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 modest goal is simply to say that the 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.

**M 2: Writing Intervention exercises (O: 1, 2, 4)**

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 "writing intervention" 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 "practice" 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.

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 exams (just as they will later write better letters, memos, briefs, and all manner of legal documents) than they would write without the intervention.

**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 exams (just as they will later write better letters, memos, briefs, and all manner of legal documents) than they would write without the intervention.

**Target for O4: xxx**

The goal is to have all students demonstrate their proficiency in research and legal writing at the same time. This assessment is made via the "legal writing requirement," pursuant to which each student must produce one substantial paper during law school which means specific criteria for length, sophistication and quality. For every such paper, the student must submit multiple drafts to the supervising professor before turning in the final product. No student may graduate from the College of Law without satisfying this requirement.

---
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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: Goals for Candidates in Library Media Technology
The goals for candidates enrolled in the Library Media Technology Program include development of the following: The role of the school library media specialist as a teacher. The media specialist collaborates with students and other members of the learning community to analyze learning and information needs, to locate and use resources that will meet those needs, and to understand and communicate the information the resources provide. The role of the school library media specialist as an instructional partner. The media specialist joins with teachers and others to identify links across student information needs, curricular content, learning outcomes, and a wide variety of print, nonprint, and electronic information resources. The role of the school library media specialist as an information specialist. The media specialist provides leadership and expertise in acquiring and evaluating information resources in all formats. The role of the school library media specialist as a program administrator. The media specialist works collaboratively with members of the learning community to define the policies of the library media program and to guide and direct all activities related to it.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of professional responsibilities of a school library media specialist. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 2: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance (M: 2)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods and curriculum materials (including print/nonprint materials and technological tools) to support the professional responsibilities of a school library media specialist. The candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced practitioners; plans and carries out instruction based on state 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; exploring teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for students; learns to work and plan productively as part of teams within the school environment. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 3: Demonstrates Use of Technology in Instruction (M: 3)
Candidates demonstrate use of technology in learning and instruction in the course materials they complete for the degree or certification and in materials they create for the LiveText portfolio and for their media centers. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

O/O 4: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities (M: 4)
Candidates demonstrate practices that indicate their commitment to teacher-librarian models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Teaching and Learning (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 from the ALA-AASL Standards for Initial Programs for School Library Media Specialist Preparation (2007). Standard 2 addresses the following: 1.) Knowledge of Learners and Learning, 2.) Effective and Knowledgeable Teacher, and 3.) Information Literacy Curriculum. This rating will be derived from each student's written rationale explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: LiveText portfolio synthesis piece.

Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge
95% 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 of LiveText assessment rubric.)

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of understanding of the pedagogical knowledge necessary to function as competent teacher-librarians.

M 2: Internship Evaluation (O: 2)
All supervising media specialists are required to submit evaluation forms for all students completing ELMT 7660 (Internship in Library Media Technology). Source of Evidence: Supervising library media specialists' ratings on the final evaluation forms.

Target for O2: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance
95% of students completing ELMT 7660 (Internship in Library Media Technology) will receive scores of 4 out of 5 on the final evaluation form submitted by supervising school library media specialists.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrated effective teaching performance.
**M 3: Use of Technology to Complete LMT Portfolio (O: 3)**

Passing the LiveText portfolio requirement for the MLM degree or for add-on certification requires the use of multiple technologies integrated into student reflection, artifacts, and writing. Source of Evidence: Successful completion of all portfolio requirements.

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Use of Technology in Instruction**

95% 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 of LiveText assessment rubric.)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

95% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of understanding of the use of technology in instruction.

**M 4: Faculty Ratings (O: 4)**

Faculty ratings of teacher-librarian candidates who have completed the program. Source of Evidence: STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities**

95% of program completers will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of his/her professional performance and decisions.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrate professional behavior and activities.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Maintain and monitor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge**

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher (media specialist) candidates’ knowledge and performance in planning and instruction we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students’ knowledge of planning and instruction via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in lesson plan writing/alignment and actual teaching experiences). A teacher work sample will be required as part of the portfolio which contains several components of lesson planning and differentiation in instruction. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of planning and instruction.

| Established in Cycle: | 2009-2010 |
| Implementation Status: | In-Progress |
| Priority: | Medium |

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

- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Teaching and Learning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Implementation of the proposed action plan will begin immediately in all fall semester, 2010 LMT classes.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Nancy J. Brown and Dr. Edward Lomax

**Additional Resources:** 0

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A
CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

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 updated our Live Text portfolio system to use the American Association of School Librarian (AASL) Standards in addition to the STARS system in order to ensure we obtain a comprehensive view of the status of the Library Media Technology Program. These changes were made to better reflect the content knowledge and demonstrated academic performance of our program completers. In the coming academic year, we hope to more completely integrate the Live Text portfolio system as a course management tool to provide pertinent data and information for program evaluation.

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 fully committed to implementing the Live Text Program Portfolio as a vital component of our measurement and evaluation strategies that are designed to meet the academic and professional needs of our students.

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?

Although we have yet to identify any specific areas of the Library Media Technology (LMT) Program that require strengthening, this report verifies anecdotal evidence of the need to improve our work in the areas of Content Pedagogical Knowledge, Effective Teaching Performance, the Use of Technology, and Professional Behaviors and Activities. We have already begun improvements in our curriculum and teaching approaches which will address these issues.

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
2009-2010 Managerial Science BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Management Department seeks to provide its undergraduate majors with fundamental principals in general management principles, human resource management, operations management, entrepreneurship, and the concepts that underlie the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations.

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.

Goals

G 1: Functional Expertise
All BBA graduates in the Managerial Sciences Department will show a breadth and depth of functional expertise that is reflective of the successful mastery of a multi-course program in their area of study.

G 2: Decision Making Skills
All BBA graduates in Managerial Sciences will show a high level of competence in making decisions in their respective areas.

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. On one level these capabilities include those that are associated with the motivation, direction and coordination of people, individually and in
groups, for the accomplishment of goals. On another level they include the process of setting goals, negotiating their development and change over time and dealing with both the success and failure of achieving those goals. Managerial Sciences is actually a collection of disciples, each with its own disciplinary track. Each track, organizational behavior, human resource management, entrepreneurship, strategic management, operations management and business analysis addresses a different aspect of the general managerial challenges stated above. Because of the diversity of students in the department and the range of disciples they are studying, "Performance" for the Department's undergraduates as a whole is measured using standardized questions across the field of management as administered in the ETS Major Field Exam, which is given to all graduating seniors in the Robinson College in the Fall Semester of 2009. Due to budgetary constraints the exam was not administered to graduates in the Spring Semester for the first time since it was begun in the mid1990s. Still, this measure was applied to 384 students College-wide and 57 management majors.

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

SLO 2: Student Performance in their Functional Concentration (G: 1)

This objective focuses on the student's functional tracks within Managerial Sciences: Human Resource Management, Operations Management, and Entrepreneurship. At the time of their completion of the degree students in their chosen functional track will show a their ability to recognize problems, select and use decision tools, and present recommendations that reflect the successful completion of a multi-course program of study in that functional track.

Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

SLO 3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making (G: 2)

All students in any MGS undergraduate track need to develop critical thinking skills for problem solving in their track. At the time of their completion of the degree, students in their chosen functional track will show their ability to apply critical thinking techniques in addressing issues and problems that they are likely to confront as managers.

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

Standard Associations

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

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

Managerial Sciences students should exceed the national mean in answering Management questions on the ETS field exam.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

Students in Managerial Sciences were evaluated on only those questions on the ETS Exam that related to the topic of Management. A similar analysis was done by looking at the performance of all students who took the ETS Major Field Test in Business nation-wide. The national average for all business students was 54.5% correct with a standard deviation of 7.8. The MGS students (N=63) scored an average of 58% correct. While this raw percentage correct score for our managerial sciences majors was above the national average it was within one-half of one standard deviation of the mean for all business students of all majors. While meeting the requirement, this was not considered to be a particularly strong result.

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
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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Students in Managerial Sciences were evaluated on only those questions on the ETS Exam that related to the topic of Management. A similar analysis was done by looking at the performance of all students in the Robinson College who took the ETS Major Field Test in Business nation-wide. The statistical outcome for the entire College on the Management questions placed them in the 55th percentile nationally. Looking at Managerial Science majors on the same sub-set of Management questions produced a percentile ranking of 60%. These results were consistent with the relative performance of Managerial Sciences students in the prior cycle. Although student performance better than the college as expected on average, when a more fine grained comparison is made with other majors the results show more disappointing figures. With ETS data the scores of majors on only the questions in their major can be computed and performance percentiles figured. The percentile "background" is the same pool of 132,647 examinees who took the same test between August 2006 and June 2009. If students are performing the same in all majors then their percentile ranking against this common background should be the same when the questions on the major topic are isolated. In the December 2009 administration of the exam students in three other majors, looking just at the questions in their major, scored significantly higher than Managerial Sciences did when only looking at Management questions. All students, when only tested on questions in their major, should outperform the general population on the same single discipline questions. The degree of the over-performance should be the same in all majors, reflecting the general quality of the school relative to the national mean of the schools participating. As a result Managerial Sciences students' marginal performance above the national mean was quite disappointing when compared to other majors who had students capable of perforating at or near the top percentile groups. Thus this goal was judged as "Not Met"

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Performance Relative to Other Schools</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Implementation Status: In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 09/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>William C. Bogner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Challenging Courses

Evaluate the rigor and challenge of the Department's threshold course for majors, MGS 4000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Performance Relative to Other Schools</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Implementation Status: Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 04/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>MGS Teaching Innovation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$100.00 (recurring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Performance Relative to Other Schools</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 04/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>MGS Teaching Innovation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$100.00 (recurring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Performance Relative to Other Schools</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Implementation Status: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 04/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>MGS Teaching Innovation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$100.00 (recurring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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?

There were no changes made in the 2010-2011 degree programs based on the assessment results. In September of 2010 the associate Chair and the Chair of the Department met to address the Department's assessment system. Because the Department is actually a collection of loosely (very) related academic disciplines the assessment of the Managerial Sciences major has been very difficult. Thus, little of any help in curriculum is resulting. The decision was taken to change the assessment system in the Department and to push undergraduate assessment down to the constituent disciplines. These changes will hopefully result in improvement in results and, hence, the ability to make meaningful curriculum improvements in the next cycle.

**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.

A review in September of the assessment systems for Managerial Sciences showed that it was not functioning. The Department is composed of four loosely related discipline areas. Assessment responsibility for graduate programs have been assigned to faculty members in each of those four areas and a range from poor to very good assessment reports resulted. Undergraduate, however, was assessed department wide. Because there is only one Department-wide course, and it is a threshold course, the ability to conduct assessment was haphazard for the BBA when done Department-wide. In September the decision was put forth that the Department should have undergraduate performance in each area assessed by faculty members in that area. This was going to be complicated, however, because three of the four areas either lost their assessment coordinator to retirement from GSU or had significant turnover in their faculty. The Chair was informed of this situation and as of October first discussions were continuing with Department Chair as to how assessment should be conducted in the Department. While the old system will clearly not be used again due to its ineffectiveness, not new system has been put in place.
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 no 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 the 2009-2010 assessment, we used scores on students' analysis of a case entitled "Zenith Pet Foods." The case requires students to assess the marketplace conditions for a new product entry, develop pricing strategy, conduct a break even required share analysis, critique a proposal for product introduction, recommend a go/no go decision, justify their recommendation and offer alternative courses of action (if deemed necessary). 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% for relevant scoring items on case analysis rubric Thorough and accurate analysis of marketplace conditions and potential fit for product/brand in question. Total possible points for this item = 20. Target score average = 17

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Average Score = 85% Total possible score on this item was 20 points. Average score across all students was 17.6 % Below Target 14% Above Target % Above Target 43

**Target for O2: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools**
An average score of 85% or higher on items relevant to marketing metrics in case analysis. Specific tasks can include: Accurate break-even analysis and assessment of required break-even share of market. Appropriate product pricing given competitive set. Assessment of market size potential. Production of appropriate P&L or Pro Forma statement. Competent computation of contribution, margin and profit. Total possible score for this assessment item = 20 Target average score = 17

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Average score was 16.4/20 = 82% 19% Above Target 15% At Target 67% Below Target

**Target for O3: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions**
An average score of 85/100 on items relevant to feasible recommendations for marketing strategy and tactics. Lays out a realistic recommendation based on Qualitative and quantitative data Assessment of pertinent marketplace forces Assessment of marketing organization/brand strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Average score = 85% (21.35/25) 37% Above Target 30% At Target 33% Below Target

**Target for O4: Clear concise writing**
A score of 85/100 on items that assess clear, concise writing: Logical, coherent structure Concise and accurate language Minimum of spelling and usage errors Well composed tables and graphs (if applicable)

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Average score was 90% (31.65/35) 77% Above Target 11% At Target 12% Below Average

**M 2: Case Discussion (O: 5)**
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 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 85/100 total points for in class case discussion.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Average Score = 83.735 53% Above Target 25% At Target 22% Below Target

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Clear concise writing
- **Implementation Description:** Spring 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication
- **Implementation Description:** Fall Semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions
- **Implementation Description:** Fall Semester, 2009
**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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools  
Implementation Description: Fall Semester 2009  
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Additional Resources: None  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Recommend Case Analysis/Discussion in All Required Courses**

Current departmental policy does not require that instructors use case analysis and discussion in all required courses. Therefore, many, if not most, marketing majors have no experience in this learning format prior to taking our capstone class. One of the recommendations that will be forthcoming from our Undergraduate Curriculum Task Force is to incorporate at least one case analysis/discussion in each required course. We believe that this should make students more comfortable and experienced at this format.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Case Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Oral communication  
Implementation Description: We have no authority to force the adoption of this plan on department faculty. We will strongly recommend that it be implemented and included in syllabuses and seek as wide cooperation as possible.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Additional Resources: None

**Require Marketing Metrics Course**

As of Fall Semester 2009, all students entering the Marketing Major have been required to take Marketing Metrics as part of their plan of study, and prior to enrolling in the capstone course (MK 4900). The 2010-2011 Academic Term will be the first in which the majority of majors should have taken this course at the time of assessment via the instruments employed in MK 4900. We also will be recommending that marketing metrics be included in all required courses for the department.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools  
Implementation Description: Requirement for Marketing Metrics has been implemented.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Additional Resources: None  
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?  
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 substantial changes. We have been awaiting the final report from an ad hoc undergraduate curriculum task force. This has, frankly, been frustrating as this task force began collecting data over one year ago.

**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 expect no changes to be implemented before January 2011. This academic year will probably be when we see the full fruits of our new mandatory course in Marketing Metrics. Probably, more so in the Spring 2011 semester. Our expectation is that performance on marketing metrics should improve.
### Georgia State University
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2009-2010 Marketing MS**
(As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 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 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-MKT graduate will be able to identify marketing opportunities and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions (M: 4, 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MS-MKT graduate will be able to fashion appropriate and effective marketing solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation (M: 6, 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate a customer/client orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information (M: 8, 9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret appropriate information for solving marketing problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measures, Targets, and Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Application of Segmentation Analysis (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of segmentation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of viable target market(s) and positioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Impact of Competition (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of impact of competition on the firm's actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Solution Consistent with analysis. (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Consistent with analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Realistic implementation plan. (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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.

**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.

**M 8: Student defines the necessary information (O: 4)**
Student defines the necessary information 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.

**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.

---

### 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: Student defines the necessary information | 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: Realistic implementation plan. | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MS Coordinator(Bruce Pilling)
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Mathematics & Statistics Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 03:57 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

"Basic quantitative literacy depends on students being introduced to the foundations of quantitative reasoning and then given reinforcement experiences which develop and deepen in the student the habits of thinking which the student has been encouraged to develop. Taking one course is not enough to endow a student with a habit of mind, but completing a carefully devised program can provide sufficient practice to make a pattern of thought part of the student's intellectual tools. The construction of such a program requires leadership from the mathematics faculty and other faculty as well as commitment to the three other major points of this report." 1 The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is fully committed to providing all of the students of Georgia State University with these foundations in the core courses and providing the university with baseline data for its students' abilities to perform quantitative reasoning. In particular, the department will use placement testing to help determine appropriate entry into the quantitative literacy program; and, provide foundational experience(s) within (usually) the first year of the student's college work.

1 From the Preface of Quantitative Reasoning for College Graduates: A Complement to the Standards, Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics (CUPM), MAA. http://www.maa.org/past/ql/ql_toc.html

Goals

G 1: Quantitative Literacy
Quantitative literacy is knowledge of and confidence with basic mathematical/analytical concepts and operations required for problem-solving, decision-making, and real-world applications.

G 2: Translation
Students effectively translate problem situations into their symbolic representations and use those representations to solve problems.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Computation (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
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 (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Quantitative Literacy quizzes were made available to all MATH 1070, 1101, 1111, 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. Our goal of response rates of 50% were met only by MATH 1111 and 1113 in the fall and spring. 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. Most 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Our goal of response rates of 50% were met only by MATH 1111 and 1113 in the fall and spring. 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. Most 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Computation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Class Summary Tables (O: 1, 2)
Looking at a more condensed version of the data by class makes it a bit easier to determine improvement levels of the students. Student performance is remarkably similar from Fall to Spring.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

| Target for O2: Translation |

### 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 continue to be challenged by ULearn itself – there are often problems exporting the data if more students get a problem wrong than right. In Fall 2009 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.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

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.
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 learn to solve practically important problems

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 3: Technology (G: 1) (M: 4)
The ability to use technology for solving real world problems and presenting the results.

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 5: Algorithms for solving applied problems (G: 1) (M: 1)
The ability to solve applied problems using mathematical tools, solid understanding of related subjects, and various other skills needed to implement 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 7: Mathematical proofs (G: 2) (M: 2)
The ability to read, analyze and write mathematical proofs, which constitute the heart and foundation of mathematics.

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: Oral Presentations (O: 5)
Oral presentations in class on solving specific mathematical problems. Format of these presentations may involve the use of a computer projector, slides or writing on a whiteboard.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O5: Algorithms for solving applied problems
ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), are expected to be able to solve a specific applied problem and present it professionally (clear statement, clear solution, clear interaction). EACH student is expected to give at least two oral presentations in the duration of the course.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
There were three presentations on solving applied problems given by students in Math 4991 in each semester. The first presentation asked them to do theoretical analysis of existence and uniqueness for a chosen problem. All five students in fall presented well, receiving 4 ~ 4.5 (out of 5). Among ten students in spring, five presented very well receiving 5, two got 4 ~ 4.5, one 3 ~ 3.5, and two 2 ~ 3. The second project was a computational project that required solving an applied problem numerically. All five students in fall received 4 ~ 5 (out of 5). Among ten students in spring, eight scored at least 3.5, while the other two received 2 ~ 3. The last project was presenting an applied research paper of at least 5 pages. All five students in fall did reasonably well, receiving at least 74% of the grade. All but one student in spring did reasonably well (75% or better).

M 2: Homework and Class Participation (O: 7)
Selected homework problems are assigned to develop the critical thinking and writing skills necessary for reading, analyzing and writing mathematical proofs.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O7: Mathematical proofs
ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), are expected to successfully complete at least two homework assignments on writing mathematical proofs (to show the ability to write). EACH student is required to actively participate in the discussion of mathematical proofs in class (to show the ability to understand).

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
There have been three homework assignments to master the proof writing skills throughout the semester. One assignment was based on a chapter from the textbook “Proofs from the book” and two on published papers written by undergraduate students. Most students did well on these assignments. All of the five students in fall received at least 3.5 (out of 5) for the first assignment, and at least 18 (out of 20) in the second two assignments. Among ten students in spring, all but one scored at least 3.5 (out of 5) in the first assignment; all of them received at least 14 (out of 20) in the second two assignments. Almost all the students read the material carefully before doing the homework and asked the instructor if they could not justify a step. Among total 15 students in fall and spring, all but one student actively, enthusiastically, and creatively participated in the class discussions of proofs. Many of them frequently came to the instructor's office hours. Three students were absent more than twice

M 4: Technology Projects (O: 3)
All students should be able to use Maple, Matlab and LATEX while working on various problems and presenting their solutions.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Technology
ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were expected to learn Power Point and Latex Beamer for presenting the results, and Matlab and Maple to solve practically oriented problems. They were also expected to learn two basic LATEX styles to write a research paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Math 4991 course was taught in a classroom with computers and computer projectors. Students used the latest version of Maple to solve a mathematical problem, and used LaTeX to write papers. They used PowerPoint and LaTeX Beamer to give presentations. Among total 15 students, all but one student could use Maple well. All students could write in LaTeX. The LaTeX project was to write a research paper of at least 5 pages in LaTeX.

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

Engagement of the Undergraduate Mathematics Commit
A special meeting of the Undergraduate Mathematics Committee will be called to discuss the assessment for Math BS program for 2010-2011. The members of the committee will be asked to make their suggestions on effective ways to do assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: AY10-11
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Improvement of student proof writing skills

It has been observed by a number of Senior Seminar (4991) instructors that math majors come to this class unprepared to comprehend and perform mathematical proofs. Therefore it is necessary to make the prerequisite courses, Math 3435 (Introductory Linear Algebra) and Math 3000 (Bridge to Higher Mathematics), significantly more effective in order to give our students a better opportunity to master their proof writing skills and to integrate their knowledge in the subsequent coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Homework and Class Participation | Outcome/Objective: Mathematical proofs

Implementation Description: AY10-11
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Guantao Chen (chair of the Department)

Introduction to the software

Students should be introduced to various types of mathematics software, which is needed 1. to solve mathematical problems numerically and display the results (Maple, Matlab); 2. to typeset a project report, a paper, or any other math text (LaTeX); 3. to make a quality presentation on a topic in undergraduate math (LaTeX-Beamer, LaTeX-Proseminar). It is critical to make sure that the Department has all the necessary resources

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Technology Projects | Outcome/Objective: Technology

Implementation Description: AY10-11
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Guantao Chen, the Department chair
Additional Resources: Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) should always be taught in a computer lab. Maple, Matlab and LaTeX must be installed on every machine.

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 reformulated our learning outcomes in order to make them consistent and measurable.

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.

Three curriculum change proposals have been submitted for Math 3435, 4435 and 4441. Math 3000 was added as prerequisite/corequisite to improve student's proof-writing 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?

The Undergraduate Math Committee is overseeing the Deparmental 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?

Assessment report is one of many factors we consider.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics will continue to use the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) as the primary means to assess the achievements of mathematics majors. The course will be improved so that all measures, embedded in this course, align to specific learning outcomes.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

| SLO 1: Unknown (M: 8, 10)       | Unknown                      |
| SLO 2: Unknown (M: 2, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19) | Unknown                      |
| SLO 3: Unknown (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 11) | Unknown                      |
| SLO 4: Unknown (M: 1, 3, 4, 9, 13) | Unknown                      |
| SLO 5: Can apply expertise for learning and development (M: 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18) | The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development. |
| SLO 6: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 2, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18) | The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development. |

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research (O: 3, 4)**
Seeks the advice of others and draws on relevant research to improve his/her practice.

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

**Target for O3: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O4: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 2: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development (O: 2, 3, 5, 6)**
Uses specialized knowledge to promote learning/development

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

**Target for O2: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O3: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

---

**Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

---

**M 3: Values personal reflection in his/her professional (O: 4)**

Values personal reflection in his/her professional development.

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

**Target for O4: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

---

**M 4: Appreciates how knowledge field is created (O: 4)**

Appreciates how knowledge in his/her field is created, organized and linked to other disciplines

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

**Target for O4: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

---

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings (O: 3, 5)**

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: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

---

**M 6: Values collaborating with others (O: 3)**

Values the importance of collaborating with other professionals in the school

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

**Target for O3: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
M 7: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development (O: 2, 5, 6)

Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

M 8: Works collaboratively with parents (O: 1)

Works collaboratively with parents
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development (O: 2, 4, 5, 6)

Generates multiple paths to learning/development
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O4: Unknown**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 10: Takes advantage of community resources (O: 1)**
Takes advantage of community resources.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 11: Has an understanding of how students develop (O: 3, 5)**
Has an understanding of how students develop and learn
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 12: Places a premium on student learning (O: 2, 6)**
Places a premium on student involvement in the process of learning/development.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 13: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating (O: 4)**
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 14: Recognizes individual differences in students (O: 2)**
Recognizes individual differences in students
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 15: Can promote learning/development in group settings (O: 2, 5, 6)**
Can promote learning/development in group settings.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 16: Regularly assesses student progress (O: 6)**
Regularly assesses student progress.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 17: Values the whole student (O: 2, 5, 6)**
Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical).
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: Unknown**
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010
academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target:  Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target:  Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

M 18: Is mindful of objectives of learning (O: 2, 5, 6)
Is mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Unknown
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target:  Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target:  Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Target for O6: Manages and monitors student learning/development
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target:  Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

M 19: Treats students equitably (O: 2)
Treats students equitably, through understanding fairness.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Unknown
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target:  Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development
  - Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development
  - Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Generates multiple paths to learning/development
  - Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research
  - Outcome/Objective: Unknown

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research
  - Outcome/Objective: Unknown

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Is mindful of objectives of learning | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Generates multiple paths to learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
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 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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Values the whole student | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Is mindful of objectives of learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 third 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 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Places a premium on student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

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 third 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 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Can apply expertise for learning and development | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Generates multiple paths to learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Takes advantage of community resources | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Is mindful of objectives of learning | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Places a premium on student learning | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Appreciates how knowledge field is created | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Values personal reflection in his/her professional | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 AY marks the third 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Has an understanding of how students develop | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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 2009-2010 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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
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

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target. There were no changes and/or modifications made or planned with assessment procedures.

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 students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program.
The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target. There are no planned changes to the program at this time; as reported, all student met target.

**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
2009-2010 Mathematics Education Online MEd
As of: 12/12/2010 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

### 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.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
**SLO 1: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge (M: 1)**
Students in MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education are expected implement successful techniques to promote higher order thinking and effective problem solving skills with using student centered, technology-intensive and differentiated instruction in diverse classroom settings.

**SLO 2: Understands and uses effective assessment techniques (M: 2)**
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will use a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate students' academic, social and personal development in all aspects of mathematics.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates effective planning for instruction (M: 3)**
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that promotes problem solving and is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
**M 1: Portfolio section "Mathematical Preparation" (O: 1)**
Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of pedagogical knowledge which will include planning, instructional skills, and content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge**
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

**M 2: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning" (O: 2)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Understands and uses effective assessment techniques**

Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

**M 3: Portfolio section "Instructional Strategies" (O: 3)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of curriculum, and instructional and professional practice.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Demonstrates effective planning for instruction**

Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?**

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?**

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.**

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?**

N/A

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

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?

Students in the program are required to complete a comprehensive portfolio as an exit requirement. Faculty will assign the portfolio standards as part of pedagogy courses since several students had to resubmit the required documents to achieve the expected targets.

**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, all students had to resubmit the required documents/artifacts. Plans have been made to embed principles of curriculum, problem solving strategies, planning lessons that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues in all of the pedagogy courses offered in the program. Faculty will develop a common approach to students understanding of planning
lessons that promote problem solving skills and focus on diversity with an effective use of technology. This type of planning will be embedded in all pedagogy courses with more emphasis in EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Education, and EDMT 7360 Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

**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**

**2009-2010 Mathematics Education--TEEMS MAT**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST

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

**Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge in Mathematics with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate possesses a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate creates a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate demonstrates an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 1: INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 2: INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

87% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**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**

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

91% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**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**

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

87% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**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 live text for Standard 5.

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

**Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator**

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

91% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

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?

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. For next year, assessments will be mainstreamed in Livetext.

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 assessments 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. For next year, assessments will be mainstreamed in Livetext.

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
**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, 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 compentency. (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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 8: 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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 9: Show the ability to solve problems. (O: 3)**
Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 11: To formulate research hypothesis. (O: 1, 3)**
Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 13: 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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
M 14: Analyze and interpret data through proofs. (O: 1, 3, 4)
Students should be able to analyze and interpret data through either proofs or algorithms.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

M 15: Show effective written communication. (O: 2)
Students should be able to write technical reports or articles.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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 8120

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8200
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8200 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.
- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8200

Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8220
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8220 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.
- Established in Cycle: 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
### Mission / Purpose

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 Commission 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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: GPA of each HA student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA of each HA student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Percent CAHME educational content provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Quality of instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Student evaluation of HA program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation of HA program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of residents by HA faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Student assessment of residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>

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

#### Assurance of competencies

During AY 2010 the HA faculty will be mapping competencies based on the HLA model to specific course content of MHA and MBA courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **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
Mission / Purpose
The M.Ed. major in Middle Childhood Education provides for master's level study in Middle Childhood Education and advanced content knowledge in English, Mathematics, Science, or Social Studies, and leads to T-5 certification in Middle Childhood Education (Grades 4-8). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge as well as pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle 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 Middle Childhood education. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. 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: 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, comps, 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 of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

#### 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 of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

#### 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 of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

#### 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 of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

#### 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 of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

### 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)

Program Deactivation
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: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?

Our program faculty redesigned the program exit portfolio to more closely align with PSC 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.

We are still in the process of deactivating this M.Ed degree program in order to create a combined M.Ed with the Department of Policy Studies in the College of Education. This combined degree will focus more specifically on leadership skills, but will still retain a focus on middle grades curriculum for those who select this concentration. The proposal for this new degree program (along with the deactivation of the M.Ed program) will occur in October 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?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful
| 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**

**2009-2010 Middle Grades Education (LA and SS) TEEMS MAT**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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: Goals for teacher candidates enrolled in MCE LA/SS**

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of:

1. a strong knowledge base about and sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students;
2. pedagogical content knowledge in Language Arts and Social Studies with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons;
3. the ability to create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities; and
4. the belief that all students can learn and an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Domain 1: Content Knowledge (M: 1)**

Possess a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students.

**SLO 2: Domain 2: Knowledge of Students: (M: 1)**

Domain 2: Knowledge of Students:

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 5: Domain 5: Planning and Instruction: (M: 1)**

Domain 5: Planning and Instruction:

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 6: Domain 6: Professionalism: (M: 1)**

Domain 6: Professionalism:

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.

#### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Domain 3: Learning Environments: (M: 1)**

Domain 3: Learning Environments:

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...
motivates 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.

**O/O 4: Domain 4: Assessment: (M: 1)**

Domain 4: Assessment: 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: Domain 1: Content Knowledge**

Domain 1: Content and Curriculum: 85% of teacher candidates demonstrate content knowledge; adapt content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; build teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; make content relevant to students; use available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follow state and local curriculum.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 10 students 6 demonstrated knowledge of content at the Exemplary level, 4 demonstrated content knowledge at the Acceptable level.

**Target for O2: Domain 2: Knowledge of Students**

Domain 2: Knowledge of Students: 85% of teacher candidates believe that all students can learn; understand and use basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicate respect for and develop rapport with all students; analyze student data; identify students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and develop and use a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs; communicate with student families/guardians; understand the major principles and theories of adolescent development; understand 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 10 students 8 demonstrated their ability with regard to knowledge of students at the Exemplary level, 2 demonstrated their ability with regard to knowledge of students at the Acceptable level.

**Target for O3: Domain 3: Learning Environments**

Domain 3: Learning Environments: 85% of teacher candidates create a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organize and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understand the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seek, use, and refine strategies for motivating learners; create a culturally responsive classroom; learn about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develop appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 10 students 6 demonstrated their ability with regard to learning environments at the Exemplary level, 4 demonstrated their ability with regard to learning environments at the Acceptable level.

**Target for O4: Domain 4: Assessment**

Domain 4: Assessment: 85% of teacher candidates 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 10 students 4 demonstrated their ability with regard to assessment at the Exemplary level, 6 demonstrated their ability with regard to assessment at the Acceptable level.

**Target for O5: Domain 5: Planning and Instruction**

Domain 5: Planning and Instruction: 85% of teacher candidates locate, comprehend, and build rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plan and carry out instruction based on state and local performance standards; select and vary instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observe students closely and acknowledge how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explore teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assess individual learners' needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning; learn to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Of 10 students 7 demonstrated their ability with regard to Planning and Instruction at the Exemplary level, 3 demonstrated their ability with regard to Planning and Instruction at the Acceptable level.

Target for O6: Domain 6: Professionalism:

Domain 6: Professionalism: 85% of teacher candidates learn basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learn about, locate resources for, and follow laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adhere to state and local Codes of Ethics, and model ethical behavior for students; reflect on teaching practice and examine the connections to student learning; self-assess teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seek and use guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; work through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accept entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Of 10 students 6 demonstrated their ability with regard to Professionalism at the Exemplary level, 4 demonstrated their ability with regard to Professionalism at the Acceptable level.

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

Strengthening assessment knowledge

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of assessment via additional coursework (readings and assignments) in the area of student assessment. A teacher work sample will further be required as part of the portfolio, which contains several components of student assessment. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of student assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: Domain 3: Learning Environments:

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates' MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Strengthening knowledge of Learning Environments

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of learning environments via additional coursework (readings and assignments, particularly in classroom management and English for Second Language Learners). Our revised curriculum includes more technological pedagogical approaches using technology. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of learning environments.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: Domain 3: Learning Environments:

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates' MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Strengthening knowledge of professionalism

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of professionalism via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in the history of education). A revised plan of submitting and responding to reflections will further be required as part of the course assignments as well as studying models for applying appropriate efforts to corrective/improve practice based on reflective exercises. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of professionalism.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: Domain 6: Professionalism:

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates' MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge
Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates’ knowledge and performance in planning and instruction we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of planning and instruction via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in lesson plan writing/alignment) and changing the materials used to Understanding by Design by Wiggins & McTighe. A teacher work sample will further be required as part of the portfolio, which contains several components of lesson planning and differentiation in instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Ratings
- Outcome/Objective: Domain 5: Planning and Instruction

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates’ MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition:  How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:  What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year?  How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year?  What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:  How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year?  Who attended, what happened, what was decided?  Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:  How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started?  What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?  What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?
No changes have been made in a procedural manner to the assessment process with the exception of using LiveText for data collection of all of the domains (instead of the STARS system). We will continue to improve the data collection system as designed by departmental collaboration.

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 curriculum changes made are with specific materials and assignments which are designed to be used consistently throughout the coursework and practicum to reinforce principles of planning/instruction and 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?
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
2009-2010 Middle Grades Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Goals

G 4: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
To develop pedagogical content knowledge in mathematics and science with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Content and Curriculum (M: 1)
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: 2)
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: 5)
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: 6)
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: 3)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4
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: 4)
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: Portfolio Standard 1-Content and Curriculum (O: 1)
Demonstrates a strong knowledge of content and curriculum that are appropriate in assigned content areas through satisfactory completion of portfolio standard 1.
Target for O1: Content and Curriculum
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 1.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 1.

M 2: Portfolio Standard 2-Knowledge of Student and Learning (O: 2)
Demonstrates knowledge of students and their learning to support all students’ intellectual, social, physical and personal development.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Knowledge of Students and Learning
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 2.

M 3: Portfolio Standard 3-Learning Environments (O: 5)
Demonstrates knowledge to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O5: Learning Environments
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 3.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 3.

M 4: Portfolio Standard 4-Assessment (O: 6)
Demonstrate knowledge and skills to use a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O6: Assessment
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 4.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 4.

M 5: Portfolio Standard 5-Planning and Instruction (O: 3)
Demonstrate knowledge and skills to design and create instructional experiences based on their knowledge of content and curriculum, students, learning environments, and assessments.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O3: Planning and Instruction
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 5.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 5.

M 6: Portfolio Standard 6-Professionalism (O: 4)
Recognize, participate in, and contribute to teaching as a profession by systematically and continuously reflecting on teaching and learning to improve their own practice and seeking opportunities to learn based upon reflection, input from others, and career goals.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O4: Professionalism
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 6.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 6.

**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.
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.

Provide more support for students related to classroom management

The MAT MCE Math and Science students take two methods courses: One with a math focus and one with a science focus. It is difficult as it is for the instructors to prepare students in the methodologies specific to those two disciplines in single courses. And without a third course which could introduce general features of pedagogy such as notions of lesson planning, classroom management, etc., it falls on the instructors of the two methods courses to try to add that content in as well. As a result, it is likely that insufficient attention is being paid to those areas, because students have provided feedback to that effect. The preferred solution would be to find a way to add a third methods course such as exists in the MAT SCE Science program. However, until a way to do that with a schedule which is already over-crowded is determined, some kind of patchwork solutions will be required. One is to require students to read a book related to classroom management to go along with the discipline-specific methods books they are now required to read. Another is something that will be tried this semester: Bringing in a guest speaker (in this case a teacher trained in behavior management techniques). We will continue to look for other options.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?

There were no changes to the assessment process of which that the previous coordinator was aware. As a new coordinator for this program, I will be trying to determine how well the assessments capture things that I recognize are of fundamental importance to
individuals on a track to become middle-school teachers. I have placed a lot of emphasis on the classroom learning environment so that candidates realize that classroom management is just one aspect of a larger entity (the CLE). I have given a specific assignment in the EDCI 7540 course related to this and will watch carefully to see how the candidates' performances on this assignment align (or fail to do so) with other assessments that look at the CLE. I also have devoted much attention to structuring meaningful classroom interactions including how to design effective cooperative learning experiences and how to facilitate productive disciplinary discussions. Again, I will be looking to see if our assessment data captures the candidates' levels of proficiency with respect to these aspects of the teaching practice.

**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 changes to the curriculum have been made or even proposed. However, there is one thing I will be watching carefully: The effect of having two methods classes (in different disciplines in the MCE program vs. having three methods classes (all in the same discipline) in the SCE program. I am wondering if this may result in deficiencies in the area of classroom management and curriculum planning for the MCE students since both myself and the instructor for the summer (Math Methods) course have tried to get away with weaving these topics into other discussions instead of giving significant blocks of time to them. It may be that we have to think about changes that would allow us to give students sufficient PCK within the two discipline-methods courses while still attending to these critical areas of teaching. I know that there is not room in the schedule for another course in the program, but it seems that a course focused on the basics of curriculum, assessment and evaluation would allow the discipline-specific methods courses to provide more substantive math- and science-education content to candidates.

**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
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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: 2001 Level Oral Interview in MCL core French, German, and Spanish courses (O: 1)
In the 2009-2010 cycle, an oral interview was introduced to assess the core French, German, and Spanish courses. In the previous cycle it was established that students would demonstrate their ability to speak (the most comprehensive language skill) the target language with a varied vocabulary (albeit limited to the situations and language domains covered up to the 2001 level), good pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy (also limited to the situations and language domains covered up to the 2001 level). The 2001 (third semester) level was chosen for the interview assessment since at this time students will have already completed two semesters of language training—since the interviews were held at the end of the 2001 semester, students had in fact completed three semesters of language training. Also, 2001 would still allow the faculty to repeat the assessment in 2002 (fourth semester), the last course in the Lower Division language sequence and an ideal time to introduce an exit assessment tool, such as an oral interview. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS AND FINDINGS The oral interview rubric consists of seven categories (or factors) being measured (see the assessment summaries attached for each language). For illustration purposes, these categories were finally converted into a four-range scale: 10 range = Optimal performance 9 range = Good performance 8 range = Middle point performance 7 range = Needs improvement Optimal and Good performance mean ideal progress toward developing skills in the target language and acquiring knowledge about the language and its related culture(s). A student in a Middle point range shows achievement that is fair, needs to continue to work on some areas (see the seven-factor summaries attached), but his/her performance meets expectation for a student who is in the process of acquiring the target language. A range of Needs improvement shows more significant difficulties and challenge to acquire the target language and knowledge of its related culture(s). A student in this range does not meet expectation for the level. RESULTS Language Number of students interviewed out of total (as posted in Cosolar for Spring 2010) Percentage of interviewed students Average Four-range average French 16/91 17.6% 8.1 GOOD German 7/28 25.0% 8.5 GOOD Spanish 13/180 7.2% 9.4 OPTIMAL The results appear as highly positive. No particular skill is identified as in need of more attention by the faculty. Rather, these figures show particular students, especially in French (with 4 out of 16 students in the range of 7), who either need to continue to work (harder) on all the language areas. However, there are three areas of concern about the validity of these figures. First, though a figure that is representative of the target population is still to be determined for the MCL core course assessment, the low number of interviewed students—perhaps with the only exception of German—suggests that the number of students who were interviewed, especially in Spanish and French, is not representative of the number of students in the 2001 level. Secondly, these figures appear to indicate that the core courses in French, German, and especially in such a large program as Spanish, are highly effective, which thus suggests, contrary to the perception of some faculty members, that no improvement or change is needed. Third, the students who were interviewed were volunteers, and the sample was thus limited to those who were willing to, or could, be available for the interview at a time when students in general were busy and preparing and/or taking their final exams. A large number of students who work also make it conspicuously hard to find students who can be available at times other than class time. Thus, the sample may include, especially in Spanish, only those highly motivated students who routinely score high in the core courses and who most likely are or are likely to become majors and minors. This, unfortunately, leaves out a significant number of non-major, non-minor students who may need to be served more adequately and whose feedback is essential to improve the MCL core curriculum.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
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

**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 Measures & Findings section, and should be improved for the assessment in the next cycle: First, a number has to be determined for what constitutes a representative sample of the target population per language level in MCL. Secondly, the interviews should be integrated into the language programs more significantly so that the results and findings can be based not only on the highly motivated students who volunteer to participate in the assessment process. These students are very likely to be the ones who are or will become majors and minors in the target language; the sample is thus naturally skewed to show only, or more of, those who acquire a foreign language faster and more efficiently. In this regard, Spanish, with 11 out of 13 students in the range of Optimal, is of particular interest. Clearly, though, in a large program serving mostly students from other academic programs, these figures not only are counterintuitive but may also show that many students in the program are taking courses for which they are overqualified. An official and fully enforced placement policy (in the form of a placement test) is recommended. It seems that changes to the curriculum and instructional improvement may be recommended only after the changes above have been ensured.

---
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**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 from Summer 08 through Spring 09. During the current 09-10 year, the program had approximately 114 students; 40 completed the master’s program from Summer 09 through Spring 10.

**Goals**

**G 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.**
Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

**G 2: Understands student development regarding learning.**
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 for and assess instruction.**
Can effectively plan for and assess instruction.

**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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 2: 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.

**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

**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.

**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

**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.

**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
4.41 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

With an N of 24 students, 92% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric. The range was 2.3-4. The mean score was 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% or more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the pupil change project rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

With an N of 27 students, 89% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the pupil change project rubric. The range was 2-4. The mean score was 3.5.

**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% or more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

With an N of 27 students, 96% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 2.8-4. 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 plans for instruction.**

90% or more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

With an N of 27 students, 89% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The range was 2.6-4. The mean score was 3.6.

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

**Action Plan for All Indicators**

Data for the MSD program continued to be collected on the new indicators from 08-09 as recommended in our APR plan. The data indicate that student performance remains above the 90% target mark for 2 of the 4 measures and at 89% for the other two measures (pupil change project and lesson planning). The faculty have indicated that student performance on these measures is adequate and a representative reflection of student abilities and skills. The faculty will continue to use the new indicators and the target rate of 90% for the upcoming year. Also, the faculty are using the new rubric for performance that aligns with the Georgia Framework for Teaching in order to better establish alignment with state standards.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Pupil Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn
  - Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
  - Responsible Person/Group: Alberto, MSD Coordinator, and MSD faculty

**No plans indicated**

No plans are indicated for this measure as it came in at 89%. We will continue to monitor the rubric.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Lesson Plan | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plans for instruction.
  - Responsible Person/Group: MSD Program coordinator and faculty

**Provide sample projects so that students can better understand expectations**

Faculty will provide sample plans to the students as they review their expectations for the student assignments with the students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Pupil Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn
Implementation Description: Instructor will provide several confidential graded projects with attached rubrics so that the students can better understand what is expected of them in completing their P-12 change project.

Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator and course Instructor

Revise rubric
After discussion, the MSD faculty decided to look at and possibly revise the rubric for the P-12 change project.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Pupil Change Project
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Susan Easterbrooks and MSD faculty.

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 updated weave data continue to be more meaningful and consistent with that collected for our accrediting body, NCATE. For MSD programs, with a target of 90% of student scoring at or above a 3 on a rubric of 1-4, students met the goal of 90% or above for 2 of the 4 goals, with the other two goals being met at 89%. For the 10-11 cycle, MSD faculty members will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90%.

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 discussion, the MSD faculty members decided to look at and possibly revise the rubric for the P-12 change project.

---

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

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence for all students.

Goals
G 1: Use of Music to Assist Reading, Writing and Speaking Skills
Students enrolled in MUA courses will learn reading, writing and speaking skills that will assist in their general education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Thinking Through Music (G: 1) (M: 1)
Assessment was determined by how well students obtained reading, writing and thinking skills in MUA 1930/3930 (Music in Society and Culture).

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

Strategic Plan Associations
3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs
3.3 International Initiatives
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Music Society and Culture (O: 1)**

All students enrolled in Music, Society and Culture were required to write a report on a large ensemble concert they had attended. Eligible ensembles were limited to School of Music groups only giving the students seven ensembles from which to choose. The report is graded on grammar and sentence structure, accuracy of musical terminology, and overall insight.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking Through Music**

The target is for 95% of students to receive a grade of A or B on this essay.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The target is for 95% of students to receive a grade of A or B on this essay. In the past year 124 students were enrolled in Music, Society and Culture. Of these, 98 (79%) received a grade of A on the report, 15 (12%) received a grade of B, and 11 (9%) received a grade of C or lower.

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

**Learning Outcomes**

Develop learning outcomes and a rubric for assessment to offer more particular data for ongoing tracking of student progress

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Music Society and Culture
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking Through Music

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty who teach core

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence for all students.

**Goals**

**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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Places Music in Historical and Cultural Context (G: 1) (M: 2)**

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 2: Performs at Advanced Level (G: 1)**

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 3: Conducting Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**
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 4: Improvising Skills (G: 1) (M: 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: Conducting Proficiency (O: 3)**
Student possesses conducting knowledge and proficiency as evidenced by results of final examination in Basic Conducting Class (MUS 2490).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Conducting Skills**
At least 95% of students enrolled in Basic Conducting (MUS 2490) will receive a grade of B or higher on the final conducting performance.

**Findings 2009-2010** - Target: Met
100% of the students enrolled in Basic Conducting (MUS 2490) received a grade of B or higher. This may indicate that this measure is not rigorous enough or is not relevant. Alternatively, it could mean that the teaching of basic conducting is being done at an extremely high level.

**M 2: Repertoire Analysis (O: 1)**
Programs are reviewed for diversity of genres, eras, composers, and styles.

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

**Target for O1: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context**
Through large ensemble, small ensemble, and solo performance, students perform music representing at least 12 or more composers, genres, styles, and eras.

**Findings 2009-2010** - Target: Partially Met
For the current cycle (09/10) the target number of composers, eras, etc., was raised from 7 to 12 in order to make the measure more rigorous. Through examination of programs from all of the large ensembles (Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Wind Orchestra, Jazz Band, Jazz Band II), small ensembles (Percussion Ensemble, Brass Ensemble, chamber ensembles) and solo recitals the following data was gleaned: 1. Those students who are involved in a large ensemble, small ensemble, and applied lessons exceeded the required number. 2. Those students who were involved in a large ensemble and either a small ensemble or applied lessons met the required number. 3. Those students enrolled in large ensemble only met the required number. 4. Those students registered for small ensemble or lessons only, typically did not meet the required number.

**M 3: Piano Proficiency**
Students demonstrate satisfactory or better proficiency in Piano IV (MUS 2720). UPDATE - We would like to revisit and modify this measure in the future so that grades are not used for the measure. I am leaving it as current so that it is copied into next year’s report but do not plan to use it this year.

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

**M 4: Basic Improvisation Performance (O: 4)**
Basic Improvisation is a required course for all Bachelor of Music students. The course is taught by a single professor and is offered in every semester (spring, summer, fall). Each student is required to give a final improvisatory performance at the conclusion of the
semester. This performance is being used as the measure with the goal being 95% of the students receiving a passing grade. For the past year 41 out of the 43 registered students received an A on this examination and 43 of 43 received a B or higher. The measure has been met (and exceeded).

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

**Target for O4: Improvising Skills**

The student's final performance is being used as the measure with the goal being 95% of the students receiving a passing grade.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

For the past year 41 out of the 43 registered students received an A on this examination and 43 of 43 received a B or higher. The measure has been met (and exceeded).

**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
- **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
- **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

**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

**Repertoire Meetings**

In order to meet this measure for all students we are planning to have ensemble conductor, area coordinator, and applied teacher meetings to discuss repertoire choices at the beginning of each semester. During these meetings, repertoire choices will be discussed and modified in order to make sure that each student is being exposed to a diverse cross section of works. In addition, it is hoped that programming "themes" will emerge that can be utilized to help students synthesize knowledge from their various courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Additional Resources:** None
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 the Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the neuroscience doctoral program in the Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State University is to promote research and education in the set of disciplines that have a common interest in understanding the structure and function of the nervous systems of animals, including humans. The objective of the degree program is to provide comprehensive training in the neurosciences and professional development. This training is meant to prepare students for a variety of career paths involving research, teaching, and/or science advocacy.

Goals

G 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in neuroscience and in their research specialty area.

G 2: Critical Thinking Skills
Use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.

G 3: Communication and Collaboration
Be able to communicate scientific information and work effectively with peers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Apply knowledge from other scientific disciplines to the understanding of fundamental neuroscience principles. Use concepts in neuroscience to describe, explain, and evaluate phenomena and to generate new ideas.

SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Ask scientific questions and construct reasonable hypotheses. Establish a research focus that identifies and builds on primary interests in neuroscience. Practice scientific method and understand its limitations. Perform laboratory skills consistent with the requirements of their field. Use statistical reasoning routinely for evaluating research and develop appropriate applications of statistics and other analytical methods. Seek the most precise and parsimonious explanation. Use skepticism consistently as an
evaluative tool. Formulate and test alternative explanations and models on the basis of evidence. Evaluate relevant content from a broader range of available resources; show refined and flexible use of published research. Create compelling arguments with attention to subtle meaning of content; anticipate and defend against criticism, adapt arguments for wide range of audiences.

**SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Communicate effectively in oral and written forms. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature. Critique and analyze claims of others in a scientific context. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology. Work effectively in group situations.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students write a research grant application and defend it orally to their committee members. Students are evaluated by their examination committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository). Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content**
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Three students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all three passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Three students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all three passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration**
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Three students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all three passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

**M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students write and orally defend a comprehensive plan of future research that details the rationale, methods, and procedures for the proposed dissertation research. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository). Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content**
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
One student proposed a dissertation for the first time and it was approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposal approved the first time.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
One student proposed a dissertation for the first time and it was approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposal approved the first time.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration**
Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
One student proposed a dissertation for the first time and it was approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposal approved the first time.

**M 3: Dissertation Defense (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students write a dissertation and defend it orally. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository). Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Target for **O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content**
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
One student defended her dissertation for the first time and passed; therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defense.

Target for **O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
One student defended her dissertation for the first time and passed; therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defense.

Target for **O3: Communication and Collaboration**
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
One student defended her dissertation for the first time and passed; therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defense.

**M 4: Annual Review (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Each student's performance and progress is evaluated annually. At the end of each spring semester, students submit an annual report describing their research, academic activities, and accomplishments using a specific form designed for that purpose (Annual Report Form- see Document Repository). At the same time, the Director of Graduate Studies solicits feedback from graduate faculty regarding student performance in class, research activities, and/or as a teaching assistant. Based on the annual report and feedback from faculty, the advisor writes a letter to the student summarizing the student's accomplishments, feedback from other faculty, and provides feedback and advice for the future year. The annual report and the advisor's letter are reviewed in June by the graduate faculty at a meeting called for that purpose.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for **O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 26 students; therefore, there were concerns with 3.8% of the students.

Target for **O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 26 students; therefore, there were concerns with 3.8% of the students.

Target for **O3: Communication and Collaboration**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 26 students; therefore, there were concerns with 3.8% of the students.

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

No actions planned due to infancy of the graduate program
This program was approved by the Board of Regents in November, 2009 and the first cohort of students was admitted in January, 2010. As this program is still new, no actions are planned at this time.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**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 doctoral program was approved by the Board of Regents in November, 2009 and our first cohort of students were admitted in January, 2010. Consequently, this is our first report. Given that this is a new program, we will await further results before making any changes or improvements.
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 doctoral program was approved by the Board of Regents in November, 2009 and our first cohort of students were admitted in January, 2010. Consequently, this is our first report. Given that this is a new program, we will await further results before making any changes or improvements.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Nursing BS
As of: 12/13/2016 02:58 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

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.

**Relevant Associations:** The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential IX: Baccalaureate Generalist Nursing Practice: The baccalaureate graduate understands and respects the variations of care, the increased complexity, and the increased use of healthcare resources inherent in caring for patients.

**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.

**Relevant Associations:** The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential IX: Baccalaureate Generalist Nursing Practice: The baccalaureate-graduate nurse is prepared to practice with patients, including individuals, families, groups, communities and populations across the lifespan and across the continuum of healthcare environments.

**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
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 85% will be demonstrating 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.

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

**Target for O1: CTW**

All students enrolled and completing NURS2080 will complete the 4 required narratives. 85% of students completing the activity will show an increase in critical thinking as evidenced by an increased score on the 4th narrative.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

For Fall 2009, 85% (66 of 78) students had an improvement in their total score by the 4th clinical narrative; 15% (12 of 78) students had a decrease in their total score. For Spring 2010, 76% (51 of 67) students had an improvement in their total score by the 4th clinical narrative assignment; 4% (3 of 67) total scores remained the same, only 19% (13 of 67) total scores decreased. For the 2009-2010 academic year, 80.6% (117 of 145) of all student taking NURS2080 had an increase in critical thinking as evidenced by an increased score by the 4th narrative. Historically, it is noted that approximately 7-10% of students enrolled in the sophomore level nursing classes do not continue in the nursing program. For some, this is due to inability to progress due to grades, and for others the student realizes nursing is not a good career match for them. Considering this fact, it is not reasonable to expect all students to be successful in this exercise. Some students may have determined they cannot be successful grade wise, and others determine that nursing is not the correct profession for them. Regardless of the reason, students may not fully engage in the writing activity. A student can pass NURS2080 and not be successful in improving critical thinking as evidenced by an increased score on the narrative writing activity.

**M 2: CTW NURS 4600 (O: 1)**

95% of students enrolled and completing 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**

All students enrolled and completing NURS4600 will complete the CTW assignment. By the 3rd submission, 95% will achieve the required score of >74%.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

For Fall 2009, 96% (67 of 70) of students achieved at least the minimum score of 74% on the CTW assignment. For Spring 2010, 98% (58 of 59) of students achieved the minimum score. For academic year 2009-2010, 97% (125 of 129) of students achieved at least the minimum score of 74% on the CTW assignment. Students can pass NURS4600 and not achieve the minimum score on the CTW writing assignment. Additionally, it is noted by the instructor of NURS4600, the students who are unsuccessful at this assignment are typically ESL students, and they have struggled with writing consistently throughout the program. These students are constantly referred to the writing center at GSU. However, if they are passing the course, they are not required to seek help.

**M 3: Standardized critical thinking exam (O: 2)**

All students will take a standardized critical thinking exam during their last semester of nursing school. 85% of the graduating seniors 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 will receive a score at or above the national average on a standardized critical thinking exam on their first attempt.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

For Summer 2009, 13 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 30% (4 of 13) achieved a score at or above the national average. For Fall 2009, 38 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 65% (25 of 38) achieved a score at or above the national average. For Spring 2010, 58 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 63% achieved a score at or above the national average. Clearly, the students did not meet this target. According to the instructor responsible for seeing that the students complete this activity, there is no obvious reward or penalty for students meeting the national average on this test. Students can literally open the test, answer one question and close the test. Scores range from 2-80 on this national test. (note these are scores not percents)

M 4: Evidence based practice project (O: 3)

Students will complete an evidence based practice project in either NURS 3610 or NURS 3710. 90% 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

90% of students enrolled in NURS3610 or NURS3710 will achieve a score of 74% or better on an evidence based practice paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

For summer 2009, 81% (26 of 32) of students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based practice paper. For Fall 2009, 86% (49 of 57) of students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based practice paper. For Spring 2010 83% (34 of 41) of students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based practice paper. For the academic year 2009-2010, 84% (109 of 130) students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based paper. It should be noted that there are 5 reasons students do not achieve the minimum score on this assignment. 1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment. 2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment. 3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly. 4. Students do not comply with the APA format. 5. English is not the student's primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing.

M 5: Research Article Critique (O: 4)

All students completing NURS3500 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

90% of students completing NURS3500 will achieve a score of 74% or better on a research article critique.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

For Summer 2009, 94% (30 of 32) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For Fall 2009 100% (49 of 49) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For Spring 2010, 87% (51 of 58) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For the academic year 2009-2010, 94% (130 of 139) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique.

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. 90% of students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points the literature search activity as measured by the rubric.

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

Target for O5: Literature Search Activity

90% of students achieve at least the minimum score of 74% on the literature search activity paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

For Summer 2009, 97% (31 of 32) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the literature search activity paper. For Fall 2009 98% (48 of 49) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For Spring 2010, 97% (56 of 58) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For the academic year 2009-2010, 98% (135 of 138) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique.

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.

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

Target for O6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

85% of graduating nursing students will pass the NCLEX on the first attempt.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

89.29% (110/122) of students taking the NCLEX exam in Georgia passed the exam on the first attempt.

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).

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O7: Exit Survey
85% of graduating nursing students who complete the exit survey will indicate they were satisfactorily prepared to integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care to individuals, families, groups or the community.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Data was obtained from 50 graduating seniors from the 2009-2010 academic year. 100% of the graduating seniors from whom we have data indicated they felt satisfactorily prepared to integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing 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. 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
- **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 data base. 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 maximun success on a separate critical thinking exam.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **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
- **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
- **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 with guidance from the Undergraduate Program Committee
UPC will continue to monitor this measure. Course instructors in NURS 3610 and NURS 3710 will be instructed to continue to require this writing assignment. Bases on the reasons the course instructor gave for student's failure the following areas will be studied: 1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment 2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment. 3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly. 4. Students do not comply with the APA format 5. English is not the student's primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing.

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: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee along with input from the UPC
- Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The UPC
- 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 The Associate Director of the 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 The course administrator for NURS 3500
- 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 The Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program
- 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
Clinical narrative papers generated from NURS2080
It is commendable that the target was met for Fall 2009. However the target was not met for the Spring class. For this reason, the master evaluation committee of the BFLSON along with the undergraduate program committee (UPC) will review the results of this report and determine a course of action consistent with meeting the objective.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW
Implementation Description: TBD
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Master evaluation committee of the BFLSON The UPC of the BFLSON

Critical thinking exit activity
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee along with the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) will determine a method to ensure students take this exit activity seriously. This standardized test is currently associated with NURS4610.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam
Implementation Description: A grade associated with NURS4610 will encourage students to seriously consider this exam.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010

Evidence Based Paper Success
The faculty member responsible for this target identified the following reasons why students are not successful achieving the minimum score on this assignment. 1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment. 2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment. 3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly. 4. Students do not comply with the APA format. 5. English is not the student's primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing. The faculty member will consult with the Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee and the Undergraduate Program Committee to identify a mechanism to achieve this target.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Evidence based practice project | Outcome/Objective: Evidence Based Practice
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Administrator NURS3610 and NURS3710 The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee Undergraduate Program Committee

NCLEX pass rate assessment
While the target of 85% was achieved, 89.29% was a drop from the previous year. The undergraduate program committee along with the undergraduate program coordinator, will explore the characteristics of those students who were unsuccessful to determine if any curriculum or advisement changes need to occur.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate
Implementation Description: see above
Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate program committee undergraduate program coordinator
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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Goals
G 1: Integration of Knowledge
To integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in advanced practice nursing.

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, 4, 7) (M: 1, 9, 10, 11)**
At end-of-program, 80% of the masters students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of exhibiting an understanding of the value of professional commitment as reported on the end-of-program survey.

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 Specialities

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
5 Contemporary Issues

**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: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 12)**
100% of the master's students will demonstrate evidence of ethical and legal practice as demonstrated by evaluation of clinical practicum experiences.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice (G: 3, 4, 7) (M: 3)**
80% of the students will report that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing in advanced practice nursing as evidenced by end-of-program survey results.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
### SLO 4: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4, 8) (M: 2, 4)
At end-of-program, 100% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating behaviors consistent with their selected advanced practice nursing role.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 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
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### SLO 5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice (G: 4, 6, 7, 8) (M: 1, 2, 4)
At end-of-program, 80% of the master's students will meet/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.

**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

### SLO 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (G: 4, 8) (M: 6)
At end-of-program, 90% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others.

**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

### SLO 7: Participation in Research (G: 7, 9) (M: 7)
At the end-of-program, 80% students will indicate that they are prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 3 Collaboration
- 4 Critical Thinking
- 6 Quantitative Skills

**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

### SLO 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.) (G: 1, 7) (M: 8, 12)
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**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
4. Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4) (M: 2, 4, 6, 9)**
At end-of-program, 90% students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
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: 4, 6, 9)**
Graduates (90%) of the master's program will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
4. Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
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, 9) (M: 7, 10)**
Alumni survey results will be involved scholarly activities [participation in research (25%); publications (15%); presentations at professional meetings (50%)] by 5-years post-graduation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
6. Quantitative Skills

**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 11: Professional Membership (G: 1, 5, 6) (M: 11)**
Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will report membership in professional nursing organizations (80%).

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Collaboration
5. Contemporary Issues
### 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 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (G: 4, 5, 6) (M: 8, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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: Analyze Various Approaches to Nursing Practice (O: 1, 2, 5)

At end-of-program, 82% (40/51) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of analyzing various approaches to nursing practice.

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice**

In the end of program evaluation, 80% of the students will indicate that they met or exceeded the objective of analyzing a variety of approaches used in the practice of nursing.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

In the end of program evaluation, 78% (n=21) indicated that they met or exceeded the objective of analyzing a variety of approaches used in the practice of nursing.

#### M 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Practice (O: 2, 4, 5, 9)

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)

**Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing**

100% of the students enrolled in the clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students enrolled in the clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses.

#### Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice

The end of program evaluation will indicate that 85% of the students will report that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In the end of program survey, 89% (n - 24) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

#### M 3: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice (O: 3)

Only 73% (37/51) of the students reported they met/exceeded the criteria that they evaluated concepts and theories as a basis for advanced practice nursing. Benchmark not meet for this cycle; action plan will be established.

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice**

85% of the graduating students will report that they met/exceeded the objective of evaluating concepts and theories related to advanced practice nursing.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

81% (n = 22) of the students completing the end of program survey indicated that they met/exceeded the expectations of evaluating concepts and theories related to advanced nursing practice.
### M 4: Demonstration of Caring in Nursing Practice (O: 4, 5, 9, 9)

At end-of-program, 90% (44/51) of the students indicated that they demonstrated caring in nursing practice.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

### M 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (O: 6, 9, 9)

At end-of-program, 81% (41/51) 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, 10)

At the end-of-program, 82% (42/51) indicated that they were well/very well prepared to implement evidence-based practice; however, only 53% (26/51) 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, 12)

At end-of-program, 86% (43/51) 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: 1, 9, 9)

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

### M 10: Scholarly Productivity (O: 1, 10)

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

### M 11: Professional Membership (O: 1, 11)

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

### M 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (O: 2, 8, 12)

At the end-of-program, 71% (36/51) 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)

#### Using Theories in Advanced Practice Nursing

An action to be taken regarding this objective will be determined during the process of evaluation of the master's program--clinical specialties taking place during the academic year (2020-2011).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice | Outcome/Objective: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice

- **Implementation Description:** To be determined
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Nursing PhD
As of 12/12/2016 03:58 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
Plan and implement nursing research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

G 2: Theory Utilization
Link theory and research to the promotion of health in vulnerable populations.

G 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations
Analyze health promotion issues in vulnerable populations.

G 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry
Explore, develop, and apply diverse modes of inquiry to the discipline of nursing.

G 5: Scholarly Activities
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) (M: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9)
100% of the graduating students will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills

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
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

SLO 2: Theory Utilization (G: 2) (M: 2, 3, 4)
90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NJRS 8040 Theory Construction course.

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (G: 3) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the doctoral students will successfully link theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations as demonstrated by successful completion of the NURS 8100 Vulnerable Populations course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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 of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (G: 1, 4) (M: 1, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NURS 8035 Qualitative Research Course in which they apply skills of collecting qualitative data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</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>1.2 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>

<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: Application of Quantitative Research Methods (G: 4) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the students will successfully complete NURS 8050 Quantitative Research Methods I and NURS 8051 Quantitative Research Methods II in which they develop a quantitative research study proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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: Submission of Manuscripts for Publication (G: 5) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% of the students who have completed the core courses will submit manuscripts, either independently or co-authored by faculty, for publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding (G: 1, 5) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% of the students who have completed their comprehensive examinations will submit proposals for funding to support their doctoral dissertation research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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) (M: 8)
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) (M: 3, 9)
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
3 Collaboration
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: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (O: 3)**
In Spring 2009, 12 (100%) of the doctoral students enrolled in NUS 8100 Vulnerable Populations successfully linked theory and research to health issues in vulnerable populations as demonstrated by successful completion of the written assignments of the course.

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

**M 1: Qualitative Research Implementation (O: 1, 4)**
85.7% (n=6) 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

**M 2: Theory Utilization (O: 2)**
In Spring 2009 seven (100%) of the doctoral students enrolled in NURS 8035 Theoretical and Philosophical Foundations successfully explored theories related to research in their area of interest.

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

**M 3: Socially Relevant Research Implementation (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 9)**
Three doctoral students successfully implemented socially relevant research projects and graduated in 2008-2009.

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

**M 4: Theory Utilization 2 (O: 2)**
100% (n=6) successfully completed the NURS 8012 Theory Construction requirements.

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

**M 5: Application of Quantitative Research Methods (O: 1, 4, 5)**
Nine (100%) doctoral students successfully completed NURS 8050 Quantitative Research Methods I in Fall 2008. Eight (88.9%) of the students successfully completed NURS 8051 Quantitative Research Methods II in Spring 2009.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 6: Manuscript Submission (O: 6)
Of the 22 students who have completed their core courses, four (18.1%) have reported submitting manuscripts for publication.

Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

M 7: Grant Application Submission (O: 1, 7)
Of the 22 students who have completed their core course, five (22.7%) have reported submitting grant applications for research funding. To date, four have received funding.

Source of Evidence: Honors and awards outside the institution

M 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (O: 8)
Of the 22 students who have completed core courses, 18 (81.8%) have reported presenting oral or poster abstracts at professional meetings.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 9: Completion of PhD Program (O: 1, 9)
In Fall 2009, we had a total of 53 students. In Spring 2009, 30 students were enrolled in core courses, eight were taking comprehensive examinations, and fourteen were completing dissertations. One student withdrew from courses (personal reasons) and two students completed their dissertations.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

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 last year's data from students, we created a mechanism for students to take comprehensive examinations during the summer. As several students were in a position to take comprehensive examinations in the summer and most faculty do not work in the summer, and we wanted to facilitate student progression in the program, we developed a Comprehensive Examination Committee to conduct examinations during the summer. This process was well received and will probably be used again this 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 general, this assessment validated outcomes and processes that we expected. However, in the process of discussing this information, we did identify issues that we will address during the formal evaluation of the doctoral program in 2010-2011. For example, the doctoral program outcomes are tied to the conceptual framework that has since changed; this will need to be addressed. In addition, this Spring we will be reviewing and modifying, if necessary, the learning outcomes that we have been using to focus on processes and outcomes of students. Prior to this year we used alumni outcomes to describe the success of the doctoral program. We will continue to use alumni data for our accrediting body; however, response rates are inadequate due to the small number of graduates per 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?

As noted in a previous question, we did implement a Comprehensive Examination Committee to manage the comprehensive examination for students who wanted to complete it in the summer. This was successful and will be implemented again in Summer 2010. This strategy enhanced the students' progression through 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 provides us with information about student outcomes. Although we are aware of much of these findings in general, the specific data is useful. We plan on refining our learning outcomes for next year to enhance the assessment's usefulness.

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 will again activate the Comprehensive Examination Committee this summer to enhance student progression. Also by refining the assessment parameters, we will improve the information we receive from this process.

Annual Report Section Responses
Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Implementation of the Comprehensive Examination Committee to facilitate student progression.

**Challenges for Next Year**

Managing the number of doctoral students we have in process related faculty workloads.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Nutrition BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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 -- NUTR 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.

Relevant Associations: Established relationship with Hospitality Management Program. Nutrition undergraduate student enroll in HADM 3401 and HADM 3402 (Quantity Food Production). Students, in collaboration with Hospitality Management students plan an course capstone event that incorporates the principle of quantity food management and program planning.

**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
5. Contemporary Issues
6. Quantitative Skills

**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**

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

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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**
- Critical Thinking
- Quantitative Skills
- 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**
- 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**
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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**
- Oral Communication
- Collaboration
- Contemporary Issues

**Institutional Priority Associations**
- 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 (NJTR 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.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Overall, the class average score on the rubric was 78%, representing 47 points out of a total of 60 points. This equates to a...
4.7 which means that overall proficiency was achieved. With respect to the rationale and content sections, the average scores were 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. Although these targets were met, students did not score as well on the writing mechanics section.

**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, NUTR 3500, NUTR 3600, NUTR 3700) and senior courses (NUTR 3150, NUTR 3160, NUTR 4000, NUTR 4200, NUTR 4250, NUTR 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%.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
This target was not met since NUTR 3150 and NUTR 3160 were not taught for the academic year 2009-2010. However, data collected on courses NUTR 3500, 3600, and 3700 indicated a mean score of greater than 75% for the juniors.

**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 NUTR 3600 and the senior course NUTR 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 NUTR 3600 and conducting a paired comparison of those papers with papers from NUTR 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Communicate effectively

Implementation Description: Begins Fall semester 2009 with NUTR 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)
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

### 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 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Not reported.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Integrated recommendations: The results from the student group projects reflected a lack of solid integration in the changes being made inside the operations organization and the other disciplines inside the organization. If outside sourcing was being used, the results of the group project did not take into account the impact on these outside contractors.
**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: 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 to 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 to 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Identify 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 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Not reported. This measure was determined to be invalid. A new measure and rubric will be developed for the next cycle.

**M 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation Skills (O: 3)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US 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. Rubric for Measurements of Learning 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 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 2009-2010 - 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

**Target for O4: Become a Strong Team Member**

80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Objective 4: Become a Strong Team Member Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 6 Team Skills The student did not develop team skills by indicated by poor returns on peer evaluations. The student develops team skills by indicated by average returns on peer evaluations. The student develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

None reported in this cycle.

**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' long term growth. Evaluate after next offering.

An Environment Sustainability Viewpoint
With respect to the third learning outcome, develop an environment sustainability 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.

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.

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.
M 2: Intervention Assessment Critique
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

M 3: Change Management Case Pre and Post Measures
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

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

---

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

---

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.

---

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.
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 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 have the overall technical financial planning expertise of at least an entry-level planner. 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
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 all mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to all mock exam results for the current evaluation period. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0, but less than 3.0: No. 2 Concepts of Income Tax Planning No. 4 Concepts of Investment Planning The following criteria failed to meet the standard, with an average score of 1.33: No. 1 Concepts of Planning Fundamentals No. 3 Concepts of Insurance Planning No. 5 Concepts of Retirement Planning No. 6 Concepts of Estate Planning

**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 all mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to all mock exam results for the current evaluation period. The target was partially met. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0, but less than 3.0: No. 2 Concepts of Income Tax Planning No. 4 Concepts of Investment Planning The following criteria failed to meet the standard, with an average score of 1.33: No. 1 Concepts of Planning Fundamentals No. 3 Concepts of Insurance Planning No. 5 Concepts of Retirement Planning No. 6 Concepts of Estate Planning

**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 all Financial Plans submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The MEASURE TWO RUBRIC was applied to all financial plans submitted during the current evaluation period and results were examined by the evaluation committee. An average of 2.25 was obtained across all criteria, thus exceeding the 2.0 standard. The average score for criteria No. 3 Development of Objectives and Strategies to Address Critical Issues was above the 3.0 level and exceeded the standard.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The national CFP Exam pass rate for 2008-2009 was 55%. Our MS-PFP students obtained a 79% average pass rate, far exceeding the national pass rate.

**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 all Planner Files submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The MEASURE FOUR RUBRIC was applied to all Planner Files prepared in PFP 8520 Capstone Course for the current evaluation period. The evaluation committee found that the average scores for all criteria met the target standard of 2.0.

**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):**
  - **Measure:** Planner File prepared in PFP 8520 Capstone Course
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Identify a good client-planner fit

  **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** Conrad Ciccotello

**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
Reinforce CFP exam style questions
We will reinforce CFP exam style questions in Fundamentals, Insurance, retirement, and Estate Planning classes.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
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: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello

Reinforce CFP Exam style questions
We will reinforce CFP exam style questions in Fundamentals, Insurance, retirement, and Estate Planning classes.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
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: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello

Tie CFP "Body of Knowledge" closely to curriculum
An effort will be made to tie the CFP Body of Knowledge (comprising specific 89 areas) more closely to the PFP curriculum.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
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: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello

Tie CFP "Body of Knowledge" closely to curriculum
An effort will be made to tie the CFP Body of Knowledge (comprising specific 89 areas) more closely to the PFP curriculum.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
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: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello

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?

Since last year’s assessment report, MS-PFP faculty have increased monitoring of performance in the Advanced Studies course quizzes to determine student performance in each of the areas of the CFP body of knowledge. These areas include principles, insurance, income tax, investments, retirement planning, and estate planning. This change was made in order to identify areas where the student performance in the individual courses were relatively strong and weak. In the year to come, added assessment emphasis will be placed on a review of the Advanced Studies case assignment. Assessment will be made as to both the student's technical and emotional maturity as a planner.

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 the coming year, more case studies will be added to coursework, especially in insurance and retirement planning. The goal is to emphasize learning beyond object-level to higher synthesis and application levels. The impact will be to better prepare students for financial planning practice and for CFP exam questions that increasingly are contained in case study scenarios.
Goals

G 1: Phil 1010
Phil 1010 In Critical Thinking (Phil 1010 in Area B) students hone reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Furthermore, because it is (through this cycle) a writing intensive course, each section of Phil 1010 focuses developing the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays.

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

Improving 1010
In response to student and instructor feedback, the text for Phil 1010 is being substantially revised and a new version will be used in Fall 2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Rainbolt/Dwyer

Improving 2010
Improving 2010 The Department now allows a great deal of variety in the many sections of Phil 2010, both in terms of content taught and in terms of the assessment mechanisms used in the courses. We also have a variety of people teaching the courses—we have tenured and tenure-track professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, as well as visiting instructors, and in some cases GTAs. We currently have a policy that sets certain multiply-realizable requirements (for example, while some metaphysics must be included in the course, it is up to the instructor whether to teach about free will, the mind-body problem, or the existence of god; they can teach about other topics in metaphysics as well, as long as they teach about one of these). Given feedback from many majors who took 2010 early in their career at GA State, from outside reviewers, and from faculty who regularly teach the course, the Undergraduate Committee is currently in the process of revising this policy. We hope that the revised policy will help us to improve student learning in this course. One way we will foster this result is to significantly curtail (while not completely eliminating) the ability of non-regular faculty to choose the topics and readings they use.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Eddy Nahmias

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 (for 1010 and 2010) 4: 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 charitable and accurate 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.

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 a demonstrated ability to: provide an explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their own 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.

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 seems able 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.

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. 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).
demonstrated ability to: provide charitable and accurate 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. 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 a 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. 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 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 1.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student seems able 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. 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 need to use 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 proofed. 0: Papers assessed at a 0 for writing are similar to papers assessed at a 1.0, but contain so many grammar and/or spelling errors that 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 some of the 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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Andrew J. Cohen

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 begun using an assessment scoring rubric for all assessment purposes (attached). We have improved our classes in the core, 1010 and 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.

We are doing well, but can improve the student learning. 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 non-regular 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. We hence need funding for more regular (tenure track or lecturer) faculty.

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 improved Phil 1010 and Phil 2010. We have begun considering a further change to Phil 1010. Writing abilities may no longer be considered for the outcomes for Phil 1010.

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 always useful to see how our students perform. Our discussions of the drafts of this report encourage us to determine if and where we can improve.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you
Philosophy is the first academic discipline. We thus have a long history to draw on and so established pedagogical methods. These are refined, of course, but improvements are always incremental.

### 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 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
4. Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6. Recruitment
6. Undergraduate Experience

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 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. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1. Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2. Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
2. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

CTW courses
We continue to monitor CTW assignments; we are not yet certain whether changes to CTW assignments will be needed.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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.

Monitor Phil Skills closely
The fact that the evaluated papers by our majors did not meet our target this year is disheartening. However, the 2.0 is not very far from our target of 2.75 and that target was met for the last 3 years. We thus intend to watch the situation closely. If we see a repeat of this performance we will have to determine if changes are warranted, either in the target or in our teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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 begun using an an assessment scoring rubric for all assessment purposes.

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 always improve the student 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?
We have improved Phil 1010 and Phil 2010. We suspect the latter has contributed in important ways to the improvement of the major as a whole.

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 always useful to see how our students perform. Our discussions of the drafts of this report encourage us to determine if and where we can improve.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Philosophy is the first academic discipline. We thus have a long history to draw on and so established pedagogical methods. These are refined, of course, but improvements are always incremental.
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 clearly plays a significant role in undergraduate and graduate education and, as this report makes clear, contributes to these University-wide student-learning goals through the education it provides its graduate students.

Goals

G 1: Goals for MA Students

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.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 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

O/O 2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills (M: 2, 3)

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).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 1: Content**

MA theses should, on average, be evaluated as 3.0 in content knowledge.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The average score on MA theses for content knowledge was 3.63. For 2008-2009, it was 3.54. For 2007-2008, it was 3.82. For 2006-2007, it was 3.48. For 2005-2006, it was 3.29.

**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).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Learning Objectives for Philosophy MA 2: Skills**

MA theses should, on average, be evaluated as 3.0 in philosophical skills.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The average score on MA theses for philosophical skills was 3.44. For 2008-2009, it 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, 2)**

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

For the 2009 calendar year, we had 7 MA graduates apply to PhD programs. All were accepted to at least one school. (One was accepted to 8 schools, another was accepted to 4, 2 more were accepted to 3 and another was 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 and content. (Four graduates did not apply to PhD programs.)

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 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. 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 4: 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 clear, 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 an 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. 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 a 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. 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 a 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. How do we interpret these findings? When we interpret these findings, we 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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2009-2010 Assessment Cycle
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Andrew J. Cohen

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 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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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 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 begun using an assessment scoring rubric for all assessment purposes. We have implemented the use of an additional assessment criteria: monitoring the acceptance rate of our MA grads into PhD 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.

We are doing well, but can improve the student learning. We are particularly concerned to improve the education our MA students receive by separating their classes from our 4000 level classes.

**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 managed to become even more selective with our acceptances of new MA 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?

It is always useful to see how our students perform. Our discussions of the drafts of this report encourage us to determine if and where we can improve.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Philosophy is the first academic discipline. We thus have a long history to draw on and so established pedagogical methods. These are refined, of course, but improvements are always incremental.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Physical Therapy DPT
As of 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
**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.

**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**

**2009-2010 Physics & Astronomy Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/13/2010 03:58 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
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 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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed physics courses. Based on data from 699 students in Phys1111, the average score on the two final exam questions was 4.3 out of 10. Based on data from 280 students in Phys1112, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.0 out of 10. Based on data from 234 students in Phys2211, the average score on the two final exam questions was 6.2 out of 10. Based on data from 150 students in Phys2212, the average score on the two final exam questions was 7.3 out of 10.

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed astronomy courses. Based on data from 228 students in Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 56%. Based on data from 215 students in Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 57%.

Discussion
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 (G: 1) (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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed physics courses. Based on data from 699 students in Phys1111, the average score on the two final exam questions was 4.3 out of 10. Based on data from 280 students in Phys1112, the average score on the two final exam questions was 5.0 out of 10. Based on data from 234 students in Phys2211, the average score on the two final exam questions was 6.2 out of 10. Based on data from 150 students in Phys2212, the average score on the two final exam questions was 7.3 out of 10.

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed astronomy courses. Based on data from 228 students in Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 56%. Based on data from 215 students in Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 57%.
**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.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

**Changing Learning Outcome & Assessment Method**

New learning outcomes have been passed by the university senate. Instead of assessing critical thinking in the physics and astronomy Area D science sequences, the department will begin assessing the new Area D learning goal of “Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.” The method of assessment will remain the same in Astrophysics and Astronomical Science programs. Multiple choice exam questions will be used. However for the introductory physics courses (Phys1111 and Phys1112), we will no longer use the common final exam questions. Instead we will be administering some widely used diagnostic tests of conceptual understanding. For the mechanics courses (Phys1111 and Phys2211), a standard exam covering Newton’s Laws and Forces will be administered at the beginning of the semester and again at the end. For the electricity & magnetism courses (Phys1112 and Phys2212), the force test will be given at the beginning of the semester and a standard exam of E&M concepts will be given near the end of the course. These exams will generally be given in the laboratory portion of the course.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

**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 has not made any changes in it’s assessment process since last report. However, we will be making extensive changes for the coming year. First, since the university is adopting new General Education Learning Outcomes, the outcome for Area D sciences will change also. When we begin assessing the new outcome in the Fall of 2010, we will also be implementing a new assessment process. In Phys1111 and 1112 we will be using standard diagnostic tests that are widely used to assess learning of physics concepts taught in introductory sequences. Phys1111 and Phys1112 are taught in two modes, traditional lecture with separate lab and “studio” physics with an integrated lab. We have been using these standard diagnostic tests in Phys1111/1112 for the past few years in an effort to improve student learning and assess the effectiveness of the “studio” physics at GSU. In the traditional classes, the diagnostic tests have been given during lecture time when the instructor allows it. Starting this fall, diagnostic tests will be given during the separate lab portion of the traditional classes and not require instructor’s to give up lecture time. Where appropriate, pre-instruction and post-instruction testing will be performed.

**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 scores on the final exam critical thinking questions in Phys1111/1112 continue to be near but sometimes below the admittedly low targets we have set. We have concluded that the assessment requires a grasp of difficult physics concepts and does not yield clear information on critical thinking alone. The mastery of difficult concepts in combination with higher level critical thinking has proved to be a difficult goal to achieve. We believe that the new learning outcomes which focus on the concepts in the content area will help us focus on building up mastery in the content area. We have made significant changes in our courses to accomplish this goal. The implementation of the "studio" physics project which affects 300 to 350 students per semester has shown significant improvements in student learning. Along with the widespread use of diagnostic tests to give specific information on where the improved student learning is occurring will give us the information we need to make further improvements in student learning.
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 (Modern Physics I), 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 in the Document Repository and are linked below.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Classical Mechanics
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Ten physics majors completed Phys4600, Classical Mechanics, in the Spring 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.1 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 2.7 out of 5.0.

Target for O2: Electricity & Magnetism
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Ten physics majors completed Phys4700, Electricity & Magnetism, in the Fall 2009 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.6 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.3 out of 5.0.

Target for O3: Statistical & Thermal Physics
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Phys3850, Statistical Thermal Physics, was not offered in 2009-2010. This course is scheduled to be offered again in the Spring of 2011.

Target for O4: Quantum Physics
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Twelve physics majors completed Phys3401, Modern Physics I, in Fall 2009 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.3 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.3 out of 5.0.

M 2: Laboratory Reports in Advanced Physics Lab (O: 5, 7, 8, 9)
Physics Majors are also required to take a junior-level laboratory course, Phys3300 (Advanced Physics Laboratory). 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 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 this lab course 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 have been placed in the Document Repository and linked below.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Scientific Collaboration
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Eight physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in Fall 2009 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.3 out of 5.0 for scientific collaboration.
Target for **O7: Scientific Critical Thinking**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Eight physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2009 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.0 out of 5.0 for scientific critical thinking.

Target for **O8: Scientific Communication**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Eight physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2009 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.6 out of 5.0 for scientific communication.

Target for **O9: Scientific & Research Technology**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Eight physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in the Fall 2009 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.4 out of 5.0 for scientific and research technology.

**M 3: Senior Research Project (O: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

The capstone of the physics bachelor's degree program for catalog years prior to Fall 2009 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 student's 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 have been placed in the Document Repository and are also linked below. Beginning with the Fall 2009 catalog, physics majors will be required to complete a 3 credit hour CTW course, Phys4900, Research Project, instead of the 1 credit hour Senior Research. This course will be taught each spring semester and possibly also in the summer. However, no students under the new catalog were ready to take the new course in Spring 2010. Assessments were performed for 8 students under older catalog editions completing Senior Research projects. It is anticipated that next year most students will instead be completing the new Research Projects class.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for **O5: Scientific Collaboration**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Eight physics majors completed Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2009-2010. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.3 out of 5.0 for scientific collaboration.

Target for **O6: Research Implications**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Eight physics majors completed Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2009-2010. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.9 out of 5.0 for Research Implications.

Target for **O7: Scientific Critical Thinking**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Eight physics majors completed Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2009-2010. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.9 out of 5.0 for scientific critical thinking.

Target for **O8: Scientific Communication**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Eight physics majors completed Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2009-2010. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.0 out of 5.0 for scientific communication.
**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. Update: Phys4900 was not taught in Spring 2010 due to insufficient enrollment. It is expected to be taught in Spring 2011. Course syllabus for Phys3300 have been modified and writing and literature review portions of the class have been expanded to improve student's preparation for laboratory report writing.

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

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

- Measure: Laboratory Reports in Advanced Physics Lab | Outcome/Objective: Scientific & Research Technology
- Measure: Senior Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Research Implications

**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. Update: Phys4900 was not taught in Spring 2010 due to insufficient enrollment. It is expected to be taught in Spring 2011. Course syllabus for Phys3300 have been modified and writing and literature review portions of the class have been expanded to improve student's preparation for laboratory report writing.

**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 courses, we will examine the math prerequisites, 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Evaluations in Content Courses | Outcome/Objective: Classical Mechanics
- Measure: Evaluations in Content Courses | Outcome/Objective: 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Evaluations in Content Courses | Outcome/Objective: Classical Mechanics
- Measure: Evaluations in Content Courses | Outcome/Objective: 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

---

**Target for O9: Scientific & Research Technology**

Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Eight physics majors completed Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2009-2010. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.3 out of 5.0 for scientific and research technology.
**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 changes in our assessment in 2009-2010 revolved around course changes in implementing the CTW initiative. Prior to this year we preformed assessment of many skills in one or more one credit hour laboratory courses. We have now eliminated all the one credit hour lab courses and replaced them with a three credit hour CTW course. This course provides a much more coherent preparation of the students for working in a research lab during their required research project. It is also better preparation for the wide range of career paths our majors take that involve scientific writing, analysis, and critical thinking. The assessment instrument that we used previously is still in place but an additional rubric for evaluating critical thinking in scientific writing is now used in addition to assess written laboratory reports. The department also changed its research requirement and therefore also changed the way it assesses learning outcomes in that research work. Since there was insufficient enrollment to teach the second CTW course, Phys4900 - Research Project CTW, only the previous assessment used in Phys4950 - Senior Research was performed. In 2010-2011 the department expects to teach Phys4900 and to perform both the previous assessment (done by the research mentors) and the new assessment of critical thinking through writing.

**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.**

A number of changes are being made within Phys3300, Advanced Physics Lab, based on the assessments from 2009-2010. Although students generally did quite well in the CTW assignments, our assessment indicated that they needed more instruction in literature searching and referencing. We accomplished this with an expanded unit on library research, referencing, and literature searching methods that was held in a classroom at the library with the assistance of the library liaison for physics & astronomy. In addition, we added an additional module on critical thinking in experimental design to develop the student’s abilities to design appropriate experiments and analyze the results in a way that connects with the goal of the experiment. Both of these changes are being implemented in Fall 2010. Phys4900 will be taught for the first time in Spring 2011 and so this assessment will be performed for the first time in that semester.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Physics and Astronomy offers a masters of science in physics. This program has two tracks, one is primarily a physics track while the second has an astronomy concentration. While students in each track take some common courses, many of the courses are not in common and the research work will be guided by faculty members in either physics or astronomy depending on the track of the student. Admissions are performed separately for the two tracks and the TA responsibilities are also divided between physics and astronomy lab courses according to the track of the student. The mission of the program is mostly aimed at the preparation of students to perform research and teaching in physics and astronomy. Most of the MS students continue on to PhDs in either physics or astronomy. The mission of the M.S. in physics program is to prepare students for careers in teaching and/or research which require analysis, critical thinking, and the application of physical principles and scientific critical thinking to new situations. The program therefore emphasizes appropriate content knowledge, math skills, critical thinking skills as seen in the scientific process, and scientific communication.

**Goals**

**G 1: Physics & Astronomy Content Knowledge**

Students receiving a M.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, and their application to a specialized area of research. In particular, astronomy concentration students should know the foundations of astronomy and astrophysics and their relationship to the core principles of physics. Students should be able to apply appropriate mathematical tools to set-up and solve quantitative problems using those core principles.

**G 2: Research Skills**

Students receiving a M.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: Collaboration in Scientific Research (G: 2) (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 (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7)
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 (G: 2) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
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 (G: 1) (M: 1, 4, 6, 7)
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 (G: 2) (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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Three students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I. The average rating for Physics and Astronomy Knowledge was 4.7 out of 5.0 and the average rating for 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Five students were rated by their research advisor at the completion of their M.S. requirements. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 4.8 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Five students were rated by their research advisor at the completion of their M.S. requirements. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.8 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Five students were rated by their research advisor at the completion of their M.S. requirements. The average rating for Scientific Research Technology was 4.9 out of 5.0.
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.1 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine Physics M.S. students were rated by their research advisor. The average rating for Scientific Research Technology was 4.5 out of 5.0.

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 4.6 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 4.3 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 4.2 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.5 out of 5.0.

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.

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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 4.6 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 4.3 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 4.2 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Nine 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 Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.5 out of 5.0.
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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight 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 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.7 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.9 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Physics M.S. Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their committee based on their research paper. The average rating for Scientific Research Technology was 4.3 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight 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 4.4 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine 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 4.4 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine 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 4.4 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></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</th>
<th>2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine 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 4.5 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Astronomy Thesis Defense or Presentation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Physics M.S. with Astronomy concentration (thesis or non-thesis option) students present their research in a general colloquium
which is followed by a defense in front of their committee of three to five faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the defense are assessed by the committee at its completion by rating each student on each outcome with a scale 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 with Astronomy Concentration 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.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Two Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration 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 4.0 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Two Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration 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 4.3 out of 5.0.

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

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Two Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.8 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
Two Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration students were rated by their research committee (a total of 8 assessments performed) based on their general examination. Average rating for Physics and 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy Advisor</td>
<td>Collaboration in Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific &amp; Research Technology</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy Committee Research Paper</td>
<td>Motivations and Implications of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific &amp; Research Technology</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy Qualifying Exam</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific &amp; Research Technology</td>
<td>Scientific Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Presentation and General Examination</td>
<td>Motivations and Implications of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Advisor</td>
<td>Collaboration in Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific &amp; Research Technology</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
<td>Scientific Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
<td>Scientific Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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 Thorns

#### 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 has not made any changes to its assessment process since last year. We do not expect to make any changes to our assessment process for next 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.

Each of the two tracks of our MS program are relatively small. Last year's findings showed some low scores in a number of outcomes but mainly when a small number of students were being evaluated. This year there were a larger number of students completing their MS degrees and the scores were much better on each outcome. Only one outcome was not met in one measure although the same outcome was met using a different measure. No significant changes will be made based on the assessment findings. Two changes are being made for other reasons. First, graduate students will now be given extensive training in the responsible conduct of research based on new university requirements. Second, the preparation of physics graduate students to be teaching assistants has been changed. Incoming graduate students are now taking part in several days of instruction on effective teaching and are serving as the junior teaching assistant in our "studio" physics courses (interactive engagement style integrated lecture/lab introductory undergraduate physics courses). Throughout the first semester they are in the class with the instructor and a senior teaching assistant. In addition, they meet once each week with all TAs and instructors in the studio classes to reflect on and discuss the previous week and prepare for the next week.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Physics PhD**

*(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)**

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: 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.
M 1: Physics Qualifying Exam (O: 5)

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 & Magnetism, Statistical Mechanics, and Quantum Mechanics.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills

xxx

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

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

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

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 Knowledge and Math Skills | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
- 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Political Science Assessment of Core

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

### Goals

**G 1: Substantive Knowledge**
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.

**G 2: Analytic skills**
The department seeks to improve basic analytic skills through the core courses.

**G 3: Communication Skills**
The department seeks student learning in oral and written communication.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Substantive Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**
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.

**SLO 2: Analytic Skills (M: 2)**
Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Communication Skills (M: 3)**
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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Substantive Knowledge (O: 1)**
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. The department collects data involving the overall pass rate for these classes. In addition the department uses ten (10) common questions that all sections of POLS 1101 administer to students as part of various quizzes and examinations. student scores on these questions are compiled to show passing rate on these questions as a measure of learning outcomes for the course. 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. The department collects data involving the overall pass rate for these classes. In addition the department uses ten (10) common questions that all sections of POLS 2401 administer to students as part of various quizzes and examinations. student scores on these questions are compiled to show passing rate on these questions as a measure of learning outcomes for the course.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Substantive Knowledge**
The department seeks to achieve a pass rate (with a grade of C or above) of 80% in POLS 1101. The department also seeks a pass rate of 60% for each individual common question. The department seeks to achieve a pass rate (with a grade of C or above) of 80% in POLS 2401. The department also seeks a pass rate of 60% for each individual common question.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Please see Findings for POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 in attached document

**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 an overall pass rate of 70% (6 out of 10 questions right) or more on the 10 common questions for POLS 1101 and POLS 2401

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The overall passing rate on the 10 common questions for POLS 1101 was 75% The overall passing rate on the 10 common questions for POLS 2401 was 82%

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

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Instructors for POLS 2401 were asked to assess each student's performance on a written assignment and rate it on a scale of 1 to 4 as follows Sophisticated 4 Competent 3 weak 2 Poor 1 See written assignments attached

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Communication Skills**

The department seeks an average score of 2.5 or higher on the four point assessment of the written assignment

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

All sections of POLS 2401 were not able to supply the data needed for this assessment. The average score for the written assignment for POLS 2401 was 2.9

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

**Electronic text for Global Issues POLS 2401**

One of the major challenges of teaching the Global Issues course POLS 2401 has been the absence of a text which would cover all the core issues discussed at an appropriate level and the outdated nature of much material in traditional texts. It was decided that the best way to solve these issues was to develop an electronic text to be used in the course.

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

*Implementation Status: In-Progress*

*Priority: High*

*Implementation Description:* The department (in conjunction with a major publisher) has developed an electronic text which will be used starting spring 2011. This will enable us to select appropriate material from a variety of different sources as well as to update the material more rapidly.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Political Science BA**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE 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 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 of US and global institutions and behavior**

All students in the BA program in Political Science should demonstrate basic understanding of institutions and behavior both in the United States and globally.

**G 4: Developing critical thinking**

All students in the BA program in Political Science should demonstrate critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline
G 3: Effective written and oral communications
All students in the BA program in Political Science should demonstrate effective writing and oral presentation skills

G 2: Methodological and quantitative analysis skills
All students in the BA program in Political Science should demonstrate a good grasp of methodological and quantitative analysis skills

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Substantive knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
1. Substantive Knowledge--Global Perspectives: Students will 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 will demonstrate an understanding of comparative perspectives and the international system.
2. Substantive Knowledge--Structures and Processes: Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of the institutions of government and the behavior of governmental and non-governmental actors. Specifically, students will demonstrate 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.

SLO 2: Methodological Skills (G: 2) (M: 2)
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 4: Effective Communication (G: 3) (M: 4)
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 3: Analytical Skills (G: 2, 4) (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.

O/O 5: Critical thinking (G: 4) (M: 5)
Students will demonstrate competence in seven critical thinking skills identified as central to the discipline of political science - identification of question or issue, consideration of assumptions and/or context, formulation of a testable hypothesis, collection and presentation of facts/data, analysis of facts and data, integration and synthesis of other perspectives and presentation of conclusions.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Substantive Knowledge (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Substantive knowledge
The department seeks an average learning outcome of 3 or better in each area of substantive knowledge

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

M 2: 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. Instructors in POLS 3200, POLS 3400, POLS 3140 and POLS 3800 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 area of methodological skills. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates an absence of methodological skills 2. Demonstrates basic understanding and use of methodological skills 3. Demonstrates competency in methodological skills 4. Demonstrates mastery of methodological skills 5. Demonstrates sophistication in methodological skills
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Methodological Skills
The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in methodological skills appropriate to the major
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). This element of the action plan has yielded less than desired results mainly because students have not come in for advisement in the numbers that the plan had hoped for. In the coming cycle two measures will be instituted to improve advisee participation. First, Incentives have been introduced for both faculty and students to encourage larger turnout during ‘advisement week’. Secondly, starting Spring semester 2011 sign up for advising will be available online. Both these measures should boost the number of students coming in for advisement.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In the coming cycle two measures will be instituted to improve advisee participation. First, Incentives have been introduced for both faculty and students to encourage larger turnout during ‘advisement week’. Secondly, starting Spring semester 2011 sign up for advising will be available online. Both these measures should boost the number of students coming in for advisement.

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

**M 3: Analytic Skills (O: 3)**
Instructors in POLS 3200, POLS 3400, POLS 3140 and POLS 3800 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 area of analytic skills. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates an absence of analytical skills 2. Demonstrates basic analytical skills 3. Demonstrates competency in analytical skills 4. Demonstrates mastery in analytical skills 5. Demonstrates sophistication in analytical skills. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analytical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks average student learning outcomes of three (3) or better indicating understanding of basic analytical skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcome scores: POLS 3140: 3.80 POLS 3200: 4.10 POLS 3400: 3.98 POLS 3800: 3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Effective Communication (O: 4)**
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. Instructors in POLS 3200, POLS 3400, POLS 3140 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 oral communication and written communication. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates an absence of oral/written communication skills 2. Demonstrates basic knowledge of oral/written communication skills 3. Demonstrates competency in oral/written communication skills 4. Demonstrates mastery of oral/written communication skills 5. Demonstrates sophistication in oral/written communication skills.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Effective Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better indicating effective oral communication skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Oral Communications Skills POLS 3140: 4.56 POLS 3200: 4.60 POLS 3400: 3.80 POLS 3800: 3.00 Effective Written Communications skills POLS 3140: 4.40 POLS 3200: 3.95 POLS 3400: 3.90 POLS 3800: 3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Critical Thinking measures (O: 5)**
This measure evaluates student achievement in terms of critical thinking skills identified by the department as critical thinking skills appropriate to the major. Instructors in POLS 4900 were asked to evaluate student outcomes in each of the seven areas of critical thinking on the following five (5) point scale. 1. Demonstrates an absence of skill (0 points) 2. Demonstrates that skills are developing (1-2 points) 3. Demonstrates competency in skills (3-4 points) 5. Demonstrates sophistication of skills (5 points)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks average student learning outcome of three (3) in each of the seven areas of critical thinking appropriate to the major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note this course is only required of majors entering the program starting Fall 2009. The scores were as follow Identification of question: 4.44 Consideration of assumptions/context: 4.44 Formulation of testable hypothesis: 4.06 Collection and presentation of data/facts: 4.60 Analysis of data/facts: 4.09 Integration and synthesis of other perspectives: 3.94 Presentation of Conclusions: 4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Methodological skills appropriate to the major: POLS 3800: 3.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department seeks average student learning outcomes of three (3) or better indicating understanding of basic analytical skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcome scores: POLS 3140: 3.80 POLS 3200: 4.10 POLS 3400: 3.98 POLS 3800: 3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Oral Communications Skills POLS 3140: 4.56 POLS 3200: 4.60 POLS 3400: 3.80 POLS 3800: 3.00 Effective Written Communications skills POLS 3140: 4.40 POLS 3200: 3.95 POLS 3400: 3.90 POLS 3800: 3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note this course is only required of majors entering the program starting Fall 2009. The scores were as follow Identification of question: 4.44 Consideration of assumptions/context: 4.44 Formulation of testable hypothesis: 4.06 Collection and presentation of data/facts: 4.60 Analysis of data/facts: 4.09 Integration and synthesis of other perspectives: 3.94 Presentation of Conclusions: 4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been introduced for both faculty and students to encourage larger turnout during ‘advisement week’. Secondly, starting Spring semester 2011 sign up for advising will be available online. Both these measures should boost the number of students coming in for advisement.

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.
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Mission / Purpose
The Department of Political Science offers comprehensive programs leading to the Master of Arts degree. Covering all of the discipline's major fields - American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, 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: Strengthening of Analytical Skills
MA students should demonstrate improved analytical skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

G 2: Deepening of Substantive Knowledge
MA students should demonstrate a deepening in their knowledge of the research literature in political science.

G 3: Deepening of Method Skills
MA students should demonstrate a deepening in their social scientific methods skills, both quantitative and qualitative.

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**

**M1: 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Seven thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2009 through summer 2010). All projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects, all but one met the department’s stated objective of averaging 3.5 or more on a learning outcomes scale of 1-5. Among these seven theses were some that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU, including two that rated 4.5 or better and one that received a perfect 5. At the lower end of the spectrum, one thesis averaged a 2.3 on all five objectives. Faculty on that committee considered the project to be minimally acceptable.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Seven thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2009 through summer 2010). All projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects, all but one met the department’s stated objective of averaging 3.5 or more on a learning outcomes scale of 1-5. Among these seven theses were some that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU, including two that rated 4.5 or better and one that received a perfect 5. At the lower end of the spectrum, one thesis averaged a 2.3 on all five objectives. Faculty on that committee considered the project to be minimally acceptable.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Seven thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2009 through summer 2010). All projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects, all but one met the department’s stated objective of averaging 3.5 or more on a learning outcomes scale of 1-5. Among these seven theses were some that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU, including two that rated 4.5 or better and one that received a perfect 5. At the lower end of the spectrum, one thesis averaged a 2.3 on all five objectives. Faculty on that committee considered the project to be minimally acceptable.

**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.

**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.
**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.

**"C" grade minimum**
The department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** It has been added to the graduate catalog and will be enforced by the graduate director and the college graduate office.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director

**Admissions procedure reform**
Last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship resources.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The graduate director and graduate committee meet to decide admissions and assistantships.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director

**Elimination of Public Policy and Administration**
The department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Graduate director and college graduate office will enforce
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director

**Elimination of Spring Intake**
We have eliminated spring intake for our MA program. We were finding that students who entered our program in January were (1) having trouble following their courses because they had not yet taken POLS 8800, and (2) having trouble socially fitting into their cohorts.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Graduate office will stop accepting applications.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate office; graduate director

**Faculty advisors**
The department has decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Graduate director will assign advisors to incoming graduate students.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director; faculty.

**Joint MA / JD**
We are in the process of negotiating the creation of a joint MA / JD degree program with the law school. This joint agree will attract students that are interested in both law and politics.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** A sub-committee of the graduate committee is currently leading the discussions.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate director; sub-committee of graduate committee.

**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?

While the department has not made any changes in the assessment process reported on Weave, we have made several important
changes to the program related to assessment. First, the department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change. Second, the department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department. Finally, last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship 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.

The department is in the process of undertaking several important reforms to the graduate program. First, we have decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice. We are also in the process of negotiating a new joint MA / JD degree program with the Law School. Third, the department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change. Fourth, the department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department. Fifth, we have eliminated spring intake for our MA program. We were finding that students who entered our program in January were (1) having trouble following their courses because they had not yet taken POLS 8800, and (2) having trouble socially fitting into their cohorts. Finally, last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship resources.
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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)
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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (M: 4)**
Students should demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: 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. Comprehensive exams test students’ knowledge of, at minimum, two fields in the discipline.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
Comprehensive exams are normally offered twice a year, in December and May. This academic year, a total of 6 students
took comprehensive exams, and 3 passed all three of their exams (50%). All but one of the six students who took exams were taking them for the first time. This represents a reduction in the pass rate over last year, which was 87.5%. At the same time, it is not surprising that there should be significant fluctuation in the comp pass rate given the small sample size. In addition, it is likely that the department's quality standards for comprehensive exams are increasing slowly every year, along with the growing reputation of the department. Also, on the positive side of the ledger, two of the three students who passed their exams received a "high pass" on at least one of them, something that is extremely rare in our department, and one of the students who failed only failed one of three exams because he simply ran out of time. Therefore, only two of the six exams demonstrated serious problems in quality. Sample of readers' comments on passing exams in the student's primary field:

"Overall, this is an outstanding answer. It begins with a clear statement of the student's argument – that systemic explanations (especially institutionalism) have more explanatory power than domestic level explanations, but that domestic level explanations help to fill in the gaps. The student then moves into sophisticated explanations of the various theoretical traditions (realism, institutionalism, liberalism, and constructivism) relying on generous citations. The answer's real strength, however, is that it uses these descriptions to make an argument for the relative strengths and weaknesses of each tradition."

"The committee grades this exam as a Pass. The student touches on all the major works, and shows an adequate level of competency. It is not a mind-blowing exam, but it is solid enough to warrant a Pass in our opinion. The exam showed knowledge of the basic literature and findings, but is not so impressive in terms of grasp of theoretical issues, the specific contours of disagreements in the literature, or being able to take a strong side in terms of aligning up on one side or another on these divides."

Target for O2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield

The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting. Comprehensive exams test students' knowledge of, at minimum, two fields in the discipline.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

Comprehensive exams are normally offered twice a year, in December and May. This academic year, a total of 6 students took comprehensive exams, and 3 passed all three of their exams (50%). All but one of the six students who took exams were taking them for the first time. This represents a reduction in the pass rate over last year, which was 87.5%. At the same time, it is not surprising that there should be significant fluctuation in the comp pass rate given the small sample size. In addition, it is likely that the department's quality standards for comprehensive exams are increasing slowly every year, along with the growing reputation of the department. Also, on the positive side of the ledger, two of the three students who passed their exams received a "high pass" on at least one of them, something that is extremely rare in our department, and one of the students who failed only failed one of three exams because he simply ran out of time. Therefore, only two of the six exams demonstrated serious problems in quality. Sample of readers' comments on passing exams in the student's primary field:

"Overall, this is an outstanding answer. It begins with a clear statement of the student's argument – that systemic explanations (especially institutionalism) have more explanatory power than domestic level explanations, but that domestic level explanations help to fill in the gaps. The student then moves into sophisticated explanations of the various theoretical traditions (realism, institutionalism, liberalism, and constructivism) relying on generous citations. The answer's real strength, however, is that it uses these descriptions to make an argument for the relative strengths and weaknesses of each tradition."

"The committee grades this exam as a Pass. The student touches on all the major works, and shows an adequate level of competency. It is not a mind-blowing exam, but it is solid enough to warrant a Pass in our opinion. The exam showed knowledge of the basic literature and findings, but is not so impressive in terms of grasp of theoretical issues, the specific contours of disagreements in the literature, or being able to take a strong side in terms of aligning up on one side or another on these divides."

M 2: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations (O: 1, 3, 4)

The members of each doctoral dissertation committee will individually provide to the Director of Graduate Studies a written assessment stating the degree to which the dissertation and its defense indicate success in achievement of the program's stated learning outcomes.

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

Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others' work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Three doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2009 through summer 2010). Based on averaging the assessments completed by each student's dissertation committee members, all three of the dissertations met the department's goal of scoring at least 3.5 better on the 5 point performance scales established for each of the five learning objectives (average scores were 3.6, 3.6, and 4.8). The highest ranked dissertation was an outstanding one that met or exceeded all of the department's learning goals. The weaker two dissertations were judged by their committees to be acceptable but still weak on some dimensions. The committee members all expressed the opinion that considerable revision would be needed for these projects to be published. In general, all three dissertations tended to be weakest in their demonstration of competency in a minor field and (with one exception) strongest in the student's field of expertise.

Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others' work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

Three doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2009 through summer 2010). The dissertations were ranked 3, 3.33, and 5 on the research methods dimension, indicating that there is room for improvement in strengthening students’ methodological skills (see action plan for details on proposed changes to the methods sequence).
**Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

It is the Department’s target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student’s major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others’ work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Three doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2009 through summer 2010). Based on averaging the assessments completed by each student’s dissertation committee members, all three 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 (average scores were 3.6, 3.6, and 4.8). The highest ranked dissertation was an outstanding one that met or exceeded all of the department’s learning goals. The weaker two dissertations were judged by their committees to be acceptable but still weak on some dimensions. The committee members all expressed the opinion that considerable revision would be needed for these projects to be published. In general, all three dissertations tended to be weakest in their demonstration of competency in a minor field and (with one exception) strongest in the student’s field of expertise.

**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 students should regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

At least 13 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on department funding records). 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, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. The GSA plans to make the research conference an annual event, and the third one is planned for this year. Last year we also placed two former PhD students in tenure-track positions in out of state universities, and at least nine of our graduate students published an article or book review in 2009-2010. We also had a number of our students applying for grants, including from the National Science Foundation. Finally, one of our PhD student received an award in 2009 from the Southern Political Science Association for the best paper presented by a graduate student at the conference.

**Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students should regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

At least 13 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on department funding records). 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, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. The GSA plans to make the research conference an annual event, and the third one is planned for this year. Last year we also placed two former PhD students in tenure-track positions in out of state universities, and at least nine of our graduate students published an article or book review in 2009-2010. We also had a number of our students applying for grants, including from the National Science Foundation. Finally, one of our PhD student received an award in 2009 from the Southern Political Science Association for the best paper presented by a graduate student at the conference.

**Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral students should regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

At least 13 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on department funding records). 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, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. The GSA plans to make the research conference an annual event, and the third one is planned for this year. Last year we also placed two former PhD students in tenure-track positions in out of state universities, and at least nine of our graduate students published an article or book review in 2009-2010. We also had a number of our students applying for grants, including from the National Science Foundation. Finally, one of our PhD student received an award in 2009 from the Southern Political Science Association for the best paper presented by a graduate student at the conference.

**M 4: Teaching Effectiveness (O: 5)**

Utilizing syllabi and data from student evaluations of graduate students teaching courses, the Director of Graduate Studies shall assess the competence of the doctoral graduate students in teaching courses.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Sixteen instructors taught a total of 19 sections in fall, spring, and summer of 2009-10. Eight instructors taught 8 sections in fall 2009, 6 instructors taught 8 sections in spring 2010, and 3 instructors taught 3 sections in summer 2010. Eight instructors taught nine sections of POLS 1101 (Introduction to American Politics) and eight instructors taught ten sections of POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Only two of these 19 sections were large (99 and 113 students) and three were small (24, 26, and 30 students). Syllabi were examined by the 2401 and 1101 coordinators and found to be substantially in compliance with departmental, College and University standards. In addition, these coordinators have developed a set of common learning outcomes for 2401 and are currently in the process of doing the same for 1101. The average score for overall teaching effectiveness (question 17) was 4.5 for 1101 and 4.0 for 2401; it ranged from 3.6 to 4.5 for 1101 and from 3.6 to 4.9 for 2401. These numbers are quite impressive for graduate instruction in introductory courses, particularly in 1101, and show clearly that our graduate students are providing high quality instruction. Nevertheless, several instructors received lower marks than we would like on question 17, including a couple of new instructors, but each of the three instructors who taught more than once received better evaluations the second time (3.5 to 3.9, 3.6 to 4.4, and 3.7 to 4.3), indicating that learning is happening. The department has also instituted an in-house teacher training course targeted to political science instruction. This course met for the first time last May, and we anticipate that it will help improve teaching scores substantially.

**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:** In-Progress
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Teaching Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Teaching Effectiveness
- **Implementation 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
- **Implementation 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.

"C" Grade Limit

The department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Added to the graduate catalog and enforced by the college graduate office and the department graduate director.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Director.
- **Additional Resources:** None.
Admission reform
Last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship resources.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Graduate director and graduate committee organizes a single meeting to discuss applicants and assistantships.
Projected Completion Date: 02/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director and graduate committee.

Elimination of Public Policy and Administration
The department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules in line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Added to graduate catalog and enforced by graduate director and college graduate office.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Faculty advisors
The department has decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice until they can choose their own thesis or dissertation advisors.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Graduate director assigns advisors
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Methods Sequence Reform
The department plans to add a third course to the required methods sequence for PhD students. This is partially in response to data gathered through the assessment process that shows that some of our PhD students do not have adequate methodological skills. The specific details of the proposal are as follows. 1. The 8800 and 8810 requirements would be maintained as they exist now, such that students must take 8800 in their first semester and 8810 in their second. 2. PhD students (not MA students) would be required to take a third methods course, either “Advanced Quantitative Methods” or “Advanced Qualitative Methods”, as they prefer. 3. “Advanced Qualitative Methods” would be offered every other spring semester and could be taken at the same time as 8810. This sequence would allow students to take the course within two years of beginning the program. 4. “Advanced Quantitative Methods” would be offered every other fall semester and would have to be taken after completion of 8810. Students entering the program in the year it is not offered could take it the following fall. Those entering in the year it is offered would have to wait until the first semester of their third years to take the course. For this reason it would be better to offer the course every year, but if resources (or enrollment concerns) make that impossible, we can allow students in this position to go forward with comps at the end of their second year even without having taken the course. That way, their progress would not be slowed. 5. “Advanced Quantitative Methods” would cover the most commonly used statistical methods not fully discussed in 8800 or 8810, as determined by the instructor. These could include, for example, maximum likelihood estimation, duration models, panel models, and hierarchical models. The focus of the course would be on giving students a practical, applied knowledge of these techniques. 6. “Advanced Qualitative Methods” would cover the most used qualitative techniques not fully discussed in 8800 and 8810, as determined by the instructor. These could include greater depth on case selection and process tracing as well as discussion of QCA, content analysis, elite interviewing, and other topics. 7. Students would be required either to complete a fourth methods course or to pass a foreign language exam, with students of comparative politics required to choose the latter option. 8. The new course would count as a methods course for the purposes of the distribution requirement, such that students would only need to complete courses in two other subfields of political science (IR, CP, AP, or Theory) to fulfill that requirement. This would allow students to fulfill the distribution requirement and the requirement to complete three courses per comp field without exceeding the required 30 hours of coursework and extending the length of the program. 9. Students wishing to take the comprehensive exam in methods would need to complete one methods course beyond the newly required course. Justification 1. The large majority of political science departments at peer and aspirational universities require three methods courses (see other attachment). 2. Methods training, whether qualitative or quantitative, is increasingly central to placing our graduates in tenure track positions. At the moment, many of our students are not adequately trained in the most common techniques. 3. While we sometimes offer methods courses beyond 8810, these tend to cover very specific topics. As a result, these courses often have difficulty attracting enough students to make, and they still leave our PhD students with no formal way of learning many of the most common methodological approaches out there. Students have sought to plug these gaps in their education by taking directed readings (such as Sean’s multilevel modeling directed reading this semester, which was almost large enough to make as an actual class). As we all know, directed readings courses are time consuming for faculty and offer few rewards; implementing this proposal would likely reduce the demand for them while simultaneously expanding our coverage of methods. Our more specific methods courses could continue to be offered to allow students without foreign language skills to complete their fourth methods requirement and to prepare students for comps in methods. 4. At the moment, students who wish to expand their knowledge of methods (especially qualitative methods) are often forced to take courses at Emory. As a full service PhD granting department, we should be offering this training in-house. 5. There would be no concern about the new methods courses attracting enough students to make as they would be required. In addition, implementing the proposal would only require that we offer one new course per year. 6. In my conversations with current graduate students this semester, our limited methods offering was the single most common complaint I received.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We need a new faculty member to offer one of the courses, and we are hiring the position now. The
Teaching Course for Graduate Students

The department introduced a new teacher training course for our graduate instructors in May 2010. This course targets political science instruction and allows students multiple opportunities to practice their teaching, and we believe that it will further improve our already good graduate student teaching evaluations.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** This course was introduced in May  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Rashid Naim is teaching the course.

### 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?

While the department has not made any changes in the assessment process reported on Weave, we have made several important changes to the program related to assessment. First, the department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change. Second, the department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department. Finally, last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship 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.

The department is in the process of undertaking several important reforms to the graduate program. First, we are planning to make some significant changes to the methods sequence that all of our MA and PhD students are required to take. At the moment, all of our students begin with POLS 8800, a broad philosophy of science and research design course, and then move on to POLS 8810, a quantitative methods course. After conducting an analysis of the practices of departments at our peer and aspirational institutions, we have decided to work towards adding a third required course to the methods sequence for our PhD (but not for our MA) students. This proposed change was also inspired by assessment data that indicate that some of our current PhD students do not have adequate methodological skills. Under this new system, which may require hiring a new faculty member to implement, students would take a third course either in advanced qualitative or in advanced quantitative methods. In addition to this important change the department has decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice. Second, the department voted this spring that no course grade under "C" could be used for credit towards the MA or PhD, and the graduate catalog has now been updated to reflect the change. Third, the department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course distribution field. This change reflects the current lack of faculty in that field as well as the growth of the public management and policy department in the Andrew Young School and brings the official rules into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department. Finally, last spring the department adopted a "single meeting" approach to evaluating our MA and PhD applicants in lieu of the rolling procedure of the past. This new approach allowed us to rationalize our admissions decisions and to make better use of our scarce assistantship resources.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Professional Accountancy-Financial Reporting & Assurance MPA**  
**As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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**

**O/O 9: Financial Reporting Skills - Interpret and Predict**
A mean score of 80% or above on selected exam questions related to this Objective

**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

**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

**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 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

**Target for O6: Communication Skills**
At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade

**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

**Target for O5: Collaboration Skills**
Instructor meeting with each student project group and with individual students to discuss progress on project and any problems with group interaction. Submission of group project on or before the deadline. Target Performance Level for Program: No unresolved complaints regarding the performance of a group member and all projects submitted with all group member names All group projects 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

**Target for O8: Technological Skills**
A mean score of 80% or above on the technology skills component of the group project

**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.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Professional Counseling EdS**

**As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST**

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

**Mission / Purpose**
Based on our commitment to diversity, advocacy, and the belief that change is possible, the mission of the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services is to prepare competent counseling professional to contribute to the body of knowledge that under girds the profession and to provide service to the profession and the community.

**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, intervening 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 all students enrolled in the Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling will belong to the American Counseling Association and have participated in some form of community and/or professional activities.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in the Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling belong to the American Counseling Association and have participated in some form of community and/or professional activities.

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**
90% of all students enrolled in the Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling will belong to the American Counseling Association and have participated in some form of community and/or professional activities.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in the Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling belong to the American Counseling Association and have participated in some form of community and/or professional activities.

**Target for O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.**
90% of all students enrolled in the Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling will belong to the American Counseling Association and have participated in some form of community and/or professional activities.
## Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All students enrolled in the Ed.S. Program in Professional Counseling belong to the American Counseling Association and have participated in some form of community and/or professional activities.

### 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.

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Target for O1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Target for O2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Target for O3: Apply group theory through research.

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Target for O4: Co-leader functions

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

### Target for O10: Implement advanced counseling skills.

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their
students and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

**Target for O1: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will successfully lead personal growth groups and receive supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students will audio tape their personal groups and share these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully lead personal growth groups and received supervision on their leadership style and techniques. Students audio taped their personal groups and shared these tapes with the instructor and other students in the class.

**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.**

All students will integrate their preferred theoretical orientation while successfully leading their personal growth groups. Students will receive feedback from their instructor and peers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of Ed.S. students integrated their preferred theoretical orientation into their group leadership experiences. Students received feedback and suggestions for improvement from instructor and peers.

**Target for O2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA**

All students will integrate their preferred theoretical orientation while successfully leading their personal growth groups. Students will receive feedback from their instructor and peers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of Ed.S. students integrated their preferred theoretical orientation into their group leadership experiences. Students received feedback and suggestions for improvement from instructor and peers.

**Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures**

All students will integrate their preferred theoretical orientation while successfully leading their personal growth groups. Students will receive feedback from their instructor and peers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of Ed.S. students integrated their preferred theoretical orientation into their group leadership experiences. Students received feedback and suggestions for improvement from instructor and peers.

**Target for O6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**

All students will integrate their preferred theoretical orientation while successfully leading their personal growth groups. Students will receive feedback from their instructor and peers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of Ed.S. students integrated their preferred theoretical orientation into their group leadership experiences. Students received feedback and suggestions for improvement from instructor and peers.

**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.

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

**Target for O1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will, successfully co-facilitate a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully co-facilitated a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.

**Target for O3: Apply group theory through research.**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will, successfully co-facilitate a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters...
students in Professional Counseling.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully co-facilitated a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling. |

**Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will, successfully co-facilitate a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully co-facilitated a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling. |

**Target for O6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will, successfully co-facilitate a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully co-facilitated a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling. |

**Target for O7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will, successfully co-facilitate a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully co-facilitated a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling. |

**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)

**Target for O1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others**

Students will explore their own biases and stereotypes, as well as learn how these biases/stereotypes impact their interpersonal relationships within a group environment.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully completed two experiential exercises in CPS 8450 that heightened awareness of personal biases/stereotypes and their implications on the facilitating groups. |

**Target for O2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA**

Students will explore their own biases and stereotypes, as well as learn how these biases/stereotypes impact their interpersonal relationships within a group environment.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully completed two experiential exercises in CPS 8450 that heightened awareness of personal biases/stereotypes and their implications on the facilitating groups. |

**Target for O5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures**

Students will explore their own biases and stereotypes, as well as learn how these biases/stereotypes impact their interpersonal relationships within a group environment.

| Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met |
| All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully completed two experiential exercises in CPS 8450 that heightened awareness of personal biases/stereotypes and their implications on the facilitating groups. |

**Target for O7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis**

Students will explore their own biases and stereotypes, as well as learn how these biases/stereotypes impact their interpersonal relationships within a group environment.
relationships within a group environment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully completed two experiential exercises in CPS 8450 that heightened awareness of personal biases/stereotypes and their implications on the facilitating groups.

**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 all Ed.S. students enrolled in practicum/internship will earn a minimum of 3.0 on Form 1010.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of all Ed.S. students enrolled in practicum/internship earned a minimum of 3.0 on Form 1010.

**Target for O10: Implement advanced counseling skills.**
90% of all Ed.S. students enrolled in practicum/internship will earn a minimum of 3.0 on Form 1010.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of all Ed.S. students enrolled in practicum/internship earned a minimum of 3.0 on Form 1010.

**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.**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor will earn a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor earned a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.

**Target for O10: Implement advanced counseling skills.**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor will earn a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor earned a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.

**Target for O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor will earn a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor earned a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.

**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.**
All students will participate in a minimum of two residency-related activities while they are enrolled in the Ed.S. program in Professional Counseling.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of our Ed.S. students who have been in the program for a minimum of one year have participated in a minimum of two residency-related activities.

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**
All students will participate in a minimum of two residency-related activities while they are enrolled in the Ed.S. program in Professional Counseling.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of our Ed.S. students who have been in the program for a minimum of one year have participated in a minimum of two residency-related activities.

**M 9: CPS 8450 (O: 6, 9, 11)**
Students will successfully participate (attendance) in an experiential part of CPS 8450
Target for O6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity
All Ed.S. students enrolled in CPS 8450 will successfully complete the experiential components of the course.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All students who were enrolled in CPS 8450 (Advanced Group Counseling) in the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the experiential components of the course, including participating in a co-facilitator role for a 9 week personal growth week.

Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.
All Ed.S. students enrolled in CPS 8450 will successfully complete the experiential components of the course.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All students who were enrolled in CPS 8450 (Advanced Group Counseling) in the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the experiential components of the course, including participating in a co-facilitator role for a 9 week personal growth week.

Target for O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.
All Ed.S. students enrolled in CPS 8450 will successfully complete the experiential components of the course.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All students who were enrolled in CPS 8450 (Advanced Group Counseling) in the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the experiential components of the course, including participating in a co-facilitator role for a 9 week personal growth week.

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
Students will successfully complete the online Professional QPR training.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the online Professional QPR training.

Target for O7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis
Students will successfully complete the online Professional QPR training.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the online Professional QPR training.

Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.
Students will successfully complete the online Professional QPR training.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the online Professional QPR training.

Target for O10: Implement advanced counseling skills.
Students will successfully complete the online Professional QPR training.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the online Professional QPR training.

Target for O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.
Students will successfully complete the online Professional QPR training.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully completed the online Professional QPR training.

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.**

Students will successfully submit 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).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90% of all Ed.S. Professional Counseling students will receive a minimum score of 80 on the Personal Theory Paper.

**Target for O9: Share knowledge with professional community.**

Students will successfully submit 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).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90% of all Ed.S. Professional Counseling students will receive a minimum score of 80 on the Personal Theory Paper.

**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)

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Professional Counseling MS**

*(As of 12/12/2016 03:58 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.

**O/O 7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor (M: 1, 3, 5, 10, 14, 16, 18)**

Students will demonstrate an understanding through written and/or oral expression of their professional identity as a professional counselor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Internship Membership in ACA (O: 7)</strong></td>
<td>90% of the practicum-internship students will actively join ACA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</strong></td>
<td>90% of students who completed their internships within the 2009-10 academic year joined ACA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>98% of all professional counseling Masters students who completed their internships within the 2009-10 academic year joined ACA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: National Counselor's Examination (O: 2, 3)</strong></td>
<td>90% of the students (n= ) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</strong></td>
<td>90% of all students taking the National Counselor's Examination (NCE) 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 score for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP accredited programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>98% of all students enrolled in the Masters in Professional Counseling Program who took the NCE in April 2010 achieved greater than a 72% average on the exam. All students attained a mean score equal to or greater than the mean score for the national group, CACREP programs, and non-accredited programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: CPS Comprehensive Examination (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the ethics section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>86% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Ethics section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the ethics section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>84% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Ethics section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the Program Evaluation and Research section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>82% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Program Evaluation and Research section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Practices educational, social, &amp; career assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the Career assessment section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
86% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Career Assessment section.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**
A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the Multicultural/Diversity section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
84% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Multicultural/Diversity section.

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**
A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the Group Counseling section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
80% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Group Counseling section.

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the Counseling/Counselor Identity section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
88% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2009-10 scored at least a 75% on the Counseling/Counselor Identity section.

**M 4: Departmental Comprehensive Examination (O: 2, 4)**
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**
80% of all M.S. students in the Professional Counseling Program who take their Comprehensive Exam in 2009-2010 will score a minimum score of 75% on the Counseling Ethics section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
84% of all M.S. students in the Professional Counseling Program scored a minimum of 75% on the Counseling Ethics section of the 2009-2010 Comprehensive Exam.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**
80% of all M.S. students in the Professional Counseling Program who take their Comprehensive Exam in 2009-2010 will score a minimum score of 75% on the Career Assessment section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
86% of all M.S. students in the Professional Counseling Program scored a minimum of 75% on the Career Assessment section of the 2009-2010 Comprehensive Exam.

**M 5: Form 1015: Written and Oral External Evaluation (O: 2, 5, 6, 7)**
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**
Each student enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 average on the Ethics Section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned at least a 3.0 average on the Ethics Subscale section on Form 1015 (average grade: 4.3).

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**
Each student enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 average on the Multicultural/Diversity Section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned at least a 3.0 average on the Multicultural/Diversity Subscale section on Form 1015 (average grade: 4.6).
**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**
Each student enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 average on the Group Work section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned at least a 3.0 average on the Group Work Subscale section on Form 1015 (average grade: 4.0).

**Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor**
Each student enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 average on the Counselor Identity Section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned at least a 3.0 average on the Counselor Identity section on Form 1015 (average grade: 4.6).

**M 6: Form 1010 is a 1-6 rating scale for effectiveness. (O: 1, 2, 6)**
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.**
All practicum students will score a minimum of 3 on Counseling Effectiveness as evidenced by the Form 1010 1-6 rating subscale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students earned a minimum of 3 on the Form 1010 Counseling Effectiveness subscale (average score was 4.2 out of 6).

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
All practicum students will earn an average minimum score of 4 on the Counseling Ethics Form 1010 subscale.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students averaged higher than 4.0 on the Form 1010 subscale that assessed for Counseling Ethics (average score: 4.6 out of 6).

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**
All practicum students will earn a minimum average of 3.5 on the Group Counseling subscale (out of 6).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All practicum students enrolled in CPS 7660 earned a 3.5 or higher on the Group Counseling Subscale (out of 6). The average Group Counseling subscale score was 4.4.

**M 7: Form 1015 (1-5 Scale) for effectivenes re: ethics. (O: 2, 5)**
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**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will receive an average minimum score of 3.0 on the Form 1015 Ethics Section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned at least a 3.0 average on the Ethics Subscale section on Form 1015 (average grade: 4.3).

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will receive an average minimum score of 3.0 on the Form 1015 Multicultural/Diversity Section.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned at least a 3.0 average on the Multicultural/Diversity Subscale section on Form 1015 (average grade: 4.8).

**M 8: Comprehensive Examination Appraisal Subtest (O: 1, 2, 4)**
Appraisal subtest on the 150 departmental examination contains 12 questions relative to appraisal in vocational, educational, and psychological assessment.

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

**Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.**
80% of students taking the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2009-2010 academic year will answer 75% of the questions included in the Appraisal section correctly.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
84% of students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2009-2010 academic year answered 75% of the questions included in the Appraisal section correctly.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

80% of students taking the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2009-2010 academic year will answer 75% of the questions included in the Assessment and Ethics sections correctly.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

83% of students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2009-2010 academic year answered 75% of the questions included in the Assessment and Ethics sections correctly.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**

80% of students taking the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2009-2010 academic year will answer 75% of the questions included in the Assessment and Career sections correctly.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

82% of students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2009-2010 academic year answered 75% of the questions included in the Assessment and Career sections correctly.

**M 9: Form 1015 Clinical Reasoning (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

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.

**Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will score a minimum of 3.0 on the "Use of Technology" section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 scored a minimum of 3.0 on the "Use of Technology" section found in Form 1015.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will score a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 scored a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will score a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 scored a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will score a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 scored a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**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.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**

80% of all students will receive a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

84% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**

80% of all students will receive a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

84% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.
Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.
80% of all students will receive a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Findings** 2009-2010 - Target: Met
84% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
80% of all students will receive a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Findings** 2009-2010 - Target: Met
84% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
84% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**M 11: CPS 7260 Acquire knowledge specific to application. (O: 1, 2, 5, 6)**
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.
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.

**Findings** 2009-2010 - Target: Met
96% of our students who took the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Human Relations section.

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
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.

**Findings** 2009-2010 - Target: Met
96% of our students who took the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Human Relations section.

Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.
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.

**Findings** 2009-2010 - Target: Met
96% of our students who took the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Human Relations section.

Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.
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.

**Findings** 2009-2010 - Target: Met
96% of our students who took the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Human Relations section.

**M 12: National Counselors Examination (NCE) (O: 2)**
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
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Ethics section of the NCE.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
96% of our students who took the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Ethics section of the NCE.

M 13: National Counselors Examination (O: 2, 4)
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.

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Developmental Knowledge section of the NCE.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
92% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceeded the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Developmental Knowledge section of the NCE.

Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will averaged at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Developmental Knowledge section of the NCE.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
92% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceeded the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Developmental Knowledge section of the NCE.

M 14: NCE: External Review for Theory (O: 2, 5, 6, 7)
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.

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will average at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
94% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceeded the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will average at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
94% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceeded the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will average at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
94% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceeded the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor
85% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) will average at or exceed the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
94% of our students who take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) averaged at or exceeded the mean of the national sample, CACREP sample, and non-CACREP sample on the Humans Relations section of the NCE.

M 15: CPS Comprehensive Examinations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
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
**Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.**
90% of all Professional Counseling students who take their Comprehensive Exam in the 2009-2010 academic year will earn a total percentage score of 70.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
94% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
90% of all Professional Counseling students who take their Comprehensive Exam in the 2009-2010 academic year will earn a total percentage score of 70.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
94% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.

**Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
90% of all Professional Counseling students who take their Comprehensive Exam in the 2009-2010 academic year will earn a total percentage score of 70.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
94% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**
90% of all Professional Counseling students who take their Comprehensive Exam in the 2009-2010 academic year will earn a total percentage score of 70.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
94% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.

**Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.**
90% of all Professional Counseling students who take their Comprehensive Exam in the 2009-2010 academic year will earn a total percentage score of 70.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
94% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.

**Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.**
90% of all Professional Counseling students who take their Comprehensive Exam in the 2009-2010 academic year will earn a total percentage score of 70.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
94% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.

**M 16: Form 1015: Cumulative End of Year Evaluation Scale (O: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**
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**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: CPS Departmental Examination (O: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CPS Departmental Examination has 1 subtest measuring research knowledge. The research stubtest has 10 questions on the 150 comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</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>80% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination will score a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

81% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination scored a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination will score a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Form 1015 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Practices educational, social, &amp; career assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for **O5**: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Target for **O6**: Effectively works with groups of clients.

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Target for **O7**: Acquires an identity as a professional counselor

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will earn a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

---

**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)

**Transition from Professional Counseling to Mental Health Counseling**

Faculty and students will successfully transition from a 48 credit hour Professional Counseling Masters of Science Program to a 60 credit hour Mental Health Counseling Program. Required classes have been added, an additional semester of coursework is now required, and changes to the Comprehensive Examinations will be made. Our first cohort of MHC students will enter in the Fall 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mental Health Counseling Program Faculty

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Psychology Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Area D: Natural and Computational Sciences**
Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

**G 2: Area E: Social Science**

Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and change.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Knowledge Base of Physiological Mechanisms of Behavior (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and historical trends in the physiological basis of behavior.

**O/O 2: Knowledge Base of General Psychology (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.

#### Standard Associations

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

#### Strategic Plan Associations

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: PSYC1100 Core Terms Quiz (O: 1)**

Students in PSYC1100 - Natural Science Aspects of Psychology are asked to complete a matching test of their knowledge of definitions of biopsychological terms at the beginning and the end of the semester. A copy of the list of terms appears in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Knowledge Base of Physiological Mechanisms of Behavior**

Significant improvement in performance between pre- and post-testing with a moderate or better effect size.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Average score on the pretest was 11.8% correct. The average score on the post-test was 84.4% correct.

**M 2: PSYC1101 Mastery Test (O: 2)**

In all sections of PSYC1101, Introduction to Psychology, instructors are asked to include twenty questions on their final exam. These twenty questions constitute a mastery test which we use to measure progress toward outcome 1, Knowledge Base. A copy of the mastery test can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Knowledge Base of General Psychology**

Our target is that 70% of students will pass the mastery test with a score of 70% or better.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Sixty-eight percent of students sampled (n = 264 of 389) passed the mastery test with a score of 70% or better. Fifty-eight percent (227 of 389) passed with a score of 75% or better.
and values consistent with the science and application of psychology, specifically.

G 2: Knowledge, Skills, and Values Consistent with Liberal Arts Education that are Further Enhanced by Psychology
This broad goal includes specific outcomes that are usually a part of a general education program or liberal arts education, and which are enhanced by the discipline of Psychology. Conversely, liberal arts training in these areas contributes to a better understanding of the scientific study of behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Knowledge Base of Psychology (G: 1) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Priority Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Undergraduate Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLO 2: Research Methods in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 6, 7)**
Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation.

**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: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 5)**
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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 4: Application of Psychological Principles (G: 1) (M: 8, 9)**
Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 5: Values in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 7, 9)**
Students will be able to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values that are the underpinnings of psychology as a discipline.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 6: Information and Technological Literacy (G: 2) (M: 4)**
Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 7: Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)**
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

**SLO 8: Sociocultural and International Awareness (G: 2) (M: 7, 9)**
Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.
SLO 9: Personal Development (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students will develop insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.

SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (G: 2) (M: 6, 8)
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.

M 1: PSYC1101 - Mastery Test (O: 1)
In all sections of PSYC1101, Introduction to Psychology, instructors are asked to include twenty questions on their final exam. These twenty questions constitute a mastery test which we use to measure progress toward outcome 1, Knowledge Base. Our performance target for this measurement is greater than 70% average score. A copy of the mastery test can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O1: Knowledge Base of Psychology
Our achievement target is that 70% of students pass the mastery test (70% or better).
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
Sixty-eight percent of the sampled students (n=264 of 389) passed the mastery test with a score of 70% or better. Fifty-eight percent of the sampled students (n=227 of 389) passed with a score of 75% or better.

M 2: PSYC3110 - Behavioral Observation (O: 9)
Students in PSYC3110 - Interpersonal Behavior are asked to learn 3 interpersonal skills (listener, evaluator and talker) and perform a randomly selected skill for an instructor. Behavior is rated by a trained observer (not the instructor). The students are evaluated on their ability to display each of five listening and six talking skills at least once during the role-play. The behavioral measure is administered during the last week of class.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target for O9: Personal Development
Demonstrate at least 80% of both listening and talking skills.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Of 185 students sampled, 147 (79.5%) performed at the 100% level. Sixteen (9%) performed at the 90% level. Twelve (7%) performed at the 80% level and eight (4%) did not participate.

M 3: PSYC3110 - Pre/Post Self-Evaluation (O: 7)
The pre/post-test self-report measure, "Gauge My Progress," was drawn from the Core Communication (Miller & Miller, 1998) workbook used in the course. Students are asked to rate on a five-point scale his or her typical and desired behaviors regarding 11 communication skills. Improvement in communication skills is indicated by a smaller difference between ratings of typical and desired behaviors. 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 O7: Communication Skills
Statistically significant improvement between pre- and post-test; moderate or better effect size.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Students showed significant improvement between their average pre- (M=23.47; SD=9.46) and post- (M=20.64; SD=9.69) test scores, (p<.001). The effect size was moderate, (Cohen's d=.31).

M 4: PSYC3530 - PORT Tutorial Quiz (O: 6)
The Psychology Online Research Tools tutorial was developed by Kim Darnell, Lyn Thaxton and Chris Goode as an online tutorial to introduce students to the computer-based library research tools available for psychology. Students taking PSYC3530 - Advanced Research Design and Analysis take the tutorial near the beginning of the semester. A 20 point quiz is given to assess the effectiveness of the tutorial. A copy of the quiz can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O6: Information and Technological Literacy
Seventy-five percent passing with a grade of 75% or better.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
### Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology

Seventy percent scoring 6 of a possible 10 points or better on the two critical thinking dimensions of the rubric. This score indicates that, generally, grammatical errors are few and not disruptive, elements are arranged with some consideration to purpose and audience, and the student offers a variety of relevant and accurate details.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Of the students sampled, 75% (n = 67 of 89) scored 6 or better on the critical thinking through writing (CTW) sections of the rubric.

### Target for O7: Communication Skills

Seventy percent scoring with a total of 9 out of a possible 15 points on the grammar, organization and development sections of the rubric. This score indicates that generally, grammatical errors are few and not disruptive, elements are arranged with some consideration to purpose and audience, and the student offers a variety of relevant and accurate details.

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

Of the students sampled, 68% (n = 60 of 89) scored with a total of 9 points on the three communications sections of the rubric.

### M 6: PSYC4760 - Research Practicum Survey (of students) (O: 2, 10)

Students in PSYC4760, Research Practicum, are asked to fill out a survey about their experience. Certain sets of questions pertain to specific learning outcomes. Our measurements of some of these outcomes are currently under development. It is our goal to have at least a 1:1 ratio of measurements to outcomes. In the interim, we are using responses to portions of the practica evaluations to measure outcomes toward the following goals:

- 2: Research Methods in Psychology (research practicum only)
- 4: Application of Psychological Principles (applied practicum only)
- 5: Values in Psychology (both)
- 9: Personal Development (both)
- 10: Career Planning and Development (both)

The complete Research Practicum survey of students can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

#### Target for O2: Research Methods in Psychology

An average score of 3 or better for items probing research skills. This score indicates that statements such as "This experience helped me acquire or improve skills related to psychology (i.e. evaluating research, understanding how students are set up and conducted... etc.)" were "quite true" or "true most of the time."

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students in our sample reported these statements were "quite true" or "true most of the time" on average (M=3.68, n=70).

#### Target for O10: Career Planning and Development

An average score of 3 or better for items probing the application of psychological theory. This score indicates that statements such as "My practicum experience has had a positive impact on my professional development," and "The supervision I received helped me gain a deeper understanding of the pros and cons of having a research career, develop a sense of professional identity, etc." were "quite true" or "true most of the time."

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Students in our sample reported a high average score for items probing career planning and development (M=3.68, n=69).

### M 7: PSYC4760 - Research Practicum Survey (of supervisors) (O: 2, 5, 8)

Supervisors of students in PSYC4760, Research Practicum, are asked to fill out a survey about their practicum students. Certain sets of questions pertain to specific learning outcomes. Our measurements of some of these outcomes are currently under development. It is our goal to have at least a 1:1 ratio of measurements to outcomes. In the interim, we are using responses to portions of the practica evaluations to measure outcomes toward the following goals:

- 2: Research Methods in Psychology (research practicum only)
- 4: Application of Psychological Principles (applied practicum only)
- 5: Values in Psychology (both)
- 9: Personal Development (both)
- 10: Career Planning and Development (both)

A copy of the complete research practicum survey of supervisors can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

#### Target for O2: Research Methods in Psychology

Supervisors rate students with an average score of 4 or better for items probing research methods skills. This range of scores indicates that the supervisor rated students' performance on "design and conduct of quantitative or qualitative research studies in laboratory or field settings," and "appropriate use of statistics" as "good" or "excellent."

#### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

On average, supervisors rated students' use of research methods very highly (M = 4.60, n = 81).
**Target for **O5: Values in Psychology  
Supervisors rate students with an average score of 4 or better for items probing the ethical conduct of research. This range of scores indicates that the supervisor rated students' "ethical behavior" as "good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
On average, supervisors rated students' ethical conduct in research very highly (M = 4.90, n = 81).

---

**Target for **O8: Sociocultural and International Awareness  
Supervisors rate students with an average score of 4 or better for items probing sociocultural and international awareness. This range of scores indicates that the supervisor rated students' "sensitivity to or respect for diverse populations being served," as "good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
On average, supervisors rated students' sociocultural and international awareness very highly (M = 4.89, n = 81).

---

**M 8: PSYC4770 - Applied Practicum Survey (of students) (O: 4, 10)**  
Students in PSYC4770, Applied Practicum, are asked to fill out a survey about their experience. Certain sets of questions pertain to specific learning outcomes. Our measurements of some of these outcomes are currently under development. It is our goal to have at least a 1:1 ratio of measurements to outcomes. In the interim, we are using responses to portions of the practica evaluations to measure outcomes toward the following goals: 2: Research Methods in Psychology (research practicum only) 4: Application of Psychological Principles (applied practicum only) 8: Sociocultural and International Awareness (both) 5: Values in Psychology (both) 9: Personal Development (both) 10: Career Planning and Development (both) A copy of the complete applied practicum survey of students can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

---

**Target for **O4: Application of Psychological Principles  
An average score of 3 or better for items probing the application of psychological theory. This score indicates that statements such as "I was able to see and/or apply psychological principles and theories learned in the classroom to the real world" and "I acquired or improved skills associated with psychology, such as working more effectively with people, engaging in problem solving and communicating more effectively," were "quite true" or "true most of the time."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
On average, students rated their application of psychological theory very highly (M = 3.78, n = 31).

---

**Target for **O10: Career Planning and Development  
An average score of 3 or better for items probing the application of psychological theory. This score indicates that statements such as "My practicum experience has had a positive impact on my professional development" and "The supervision I received helped me develop a sense of professional identity, I gained a deeper understanding of the agency or the mental health field, both the positive and negative" were "quite true" or "true most of the time."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
On average, students rated the impact of the applied practicum on their professional development very highly (M=3.59, n = 31).

---

**M 9: PSYC4770 - Applied Practicum Survey (of supervisors) (O: 4, 5, 8)**  
Supervisors of students in PSYC4770, Applied Practicum, are asked to fill out a survey about their practicum students. Certain sets of questions pertain to specific learning outcomes. Our measurements of some of these outcomes are currently under development. It is our goal to have at least a 1:1 ratio of measurements to outcomes. In the interim, we are using responses to portions of the practica evaluations to measure outcomes toward the following goals: 2: Research Methods in Psychology (research practicum only) 4: Application of Psychological Principles (applied practicum only) 8: Sociocultural and International Awareness (both) 5: Values in Psychology (both) 9: Personal Development (both) 10: Career Planning and Development (both) A copy of the complete applied practicum survey of supervisors can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

---

**Target for **O4: Application of Psychological Principles  
Supervisors rate students with an average score of 4 or better for items probing the application of psychological principles. This range of scores indicates that the supervisor rated students' performance on "understanding an application of basic psychological theories to the clients being served" and "appropriate evaluation and analysis of situations pertaining to clients utilizing psychological concepts and principles" as "good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
On average, supervisors rated students' application of psychological principles very highly (M = 4.47, n = 30).

---

**Target for **O5: Values in Psychology  
Supervisors rate students with an average score of 4 or better for items probing students' ethical conduct during the practicum. This range of scores indicates that the supervisor rated students' "ethical conduct, (e.g. maintaining confidentiality)," as "good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
On average, supervisors rated students' ethical conduct in the applied practicum very highly (M = 4.84, n = 30).

---

**Target for **O8: Sociocultural and International Awareness
Supervisors rate students with an average score of 4 or better for items probing students' sociocultural and international awareness. This range of scores indicates that the supervisor rated students' "sensitivity to or respect for diverse populations" as "good" or "excellent."

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

**Introduce CTW Courses**

Two new Critical Thinking through Writing courses came online in the 2008-2009 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. In 2009, we began offering a PSYC4800 seminar called Neurobiology of Music. As a CTW course, students are encouraged to demonstrate critical thinking about this topic through a variety of written assignments. We continue to add different seminars under the PSYC4800 designation. This semester, 4 are available: Psychology of Consciousness; Play Learning and Cognitive Development; Psychology of War and Forensic Psychology.

**Established in Cycle: 2008-2009**

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Multiple sections of PSYC4800 are currently being offered (Fall, 2010). PSYC3530 is offered in Spring and Fall.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** Chris Goode, Kim Darnell, Chris Henrich

**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. Course: PSYC1101. Measure: We intend to add a list of terms with which students should be familiar at the end of PSYC1101. We will do a pretest and posttest. This is also a core university curriculum measure. 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

On average, supervisors rated students' sociocultural and international awareness very highly (M = 4.84, n = 30).
Implementation Description: We plan to implement new measures of learning outcomes over the next two years.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Goode, Kim Darnell, Sarah Cook, Rachelle Cohen.
Additional Resources: Two Graduate Student Assistants to help analyze data.

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).

Establish Peer Tutoring Centers for Writing and Statistics
We received an internal grant to fund graduate student tutors for writing and statistics. The funding period ended, but we continued the model as a volunteer, peer-based tutoring center, which is now housed in Kell Hall.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Peer Tutoring Center for Writing and Statistics - Undergraduate peers tutor students who need help with writing and statistics, primarily in our quantitative core (PSYC3510/3530).
Responsible Person/Group: Marika Lamoreaux, Liz Sheehan

---
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---

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the PhD program in the Department of Psychology is to educate graduate students in various areas of psychology and provide specific training in scholarship, research, clinical, and other skills, consistent with the expertise of the current faculty. Five programs are represented: Clinical Psychology, Community Psychology, 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, 7, 8, 12, 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, 11, 12, 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: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)**
Communicate and work in groups effectively.
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 4: Application (M: 4, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Apply psychological principles in professional activities.

**SLO 5: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.

**SLO 6: Personal Development (M: 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Show insight into one’s own and other’s behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.

**SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16)**

Acquire skills in accessing and disseminating information with the use of computer technology.

**SLO 8: Values in Psychology (M: 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology.
SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 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: 13, 14, 15, 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: MA Thesis Proposal GLOE (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
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% received a score of 2 or 3.

Target for O2: Research Methods
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% received a score of 2 or 3.

Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% received a score of 2 or 3.

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% received a score of 2 or 3.

Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% received a score of 2 or 3.

Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% received a score of 2 or 3.
### M 2: MA Thesis Defense GLOE (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Theory and Content</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students earned a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Research Methods</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students earned a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students earned a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5: Critical Thinking Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students earned a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7: Information and Technology Literacy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students earned a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 (&quot;Met Expectations&quot;) or 3 (&quot;Exceeded Expectations&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students earned a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: MA Thesis (Pass or Fail) (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Theory and Content</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2: Research Methods</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5: Critical Thinking Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Application

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

99% of students passed on first attempt.

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

99% of students passed on first attempt.

### Target for O8: Values in Psychology

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

99% of students passed on first attempt.

### M 5: General Exam GLOE (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

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

### Target for O2: Research Methods

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: PhD Dissertation Proposal GLOE (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**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98% received a score of 2 or 3. (Note: CLG, CLC, CLN, COR, and DEV had 100% with a score of 2 or 3; CGS had a score of 1 for three of the five scores (possibly one student in Theory and Content).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students had a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students had a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99% of students had a score of 2 or 3 (note: 100% of CLG, CLC, CLN, COR, and DEV had scores of 2 or 3; one of the five scores for CGS was a 1 (1 student)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of scores were 2 or 3.

**M 7: PhD Dissertation Defense GLOE (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**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**M 8: PhD Dissertation (Pass or Fail) (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% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 9</strong>: Performance in the ethics course (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8490: Scientific and professional ethics in psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Values in Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses knowledge of scientific and professional ethical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students earned a grade of A on a major ethics assignment that reflects the performance in ethics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 10</strong>: Performance in diversity courses (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8050 or Psyc 8060: Diversity issues in clinical practice and psychological research, or Issues of human diversity in psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for <strong>O9</strong>: Sociocultural and International Awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with issues of human diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a B or better on the assignment designed to assess expertise with diversity issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 11</strong>: Performance in statistics courses (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8410 and Psyc 8420: Psychological Research Statistics I, and Psychological Research Statistics II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Research Methods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% earn a grade of B or better on the selected assignments designated to assess expertise with data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of the students earned a B or better on the assigned designed to assess expertise with data analyses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 12</strong>: Performance in the history course (O: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8500: History of Psychology - written assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for <strong>O1</strong>: Theory and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of students earned a B or better on Exam I and 100% earned a B or better on the presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Target for **O2**: Research Methods** |
| At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology. |

| **Target for **O3**: Communication and Collaboration Skills** |
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology

**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% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O4: Application**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
At least 90% of students should meet or exceed expectations on a major assignment that assesses teaching expertise.

**M 14: 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**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O4: Application**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**Target for O10: Career Planning and Development**
At least 85% of GTAs should have good to excellent teaching evaluations (e.g., score on item 17 above 3.9, generally positive comments) per semester, as determined by the Director of Graduate Studies.

**M 15: Publications and presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**
Publications and presentations
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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

Target for **O2: Research Methods**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

Target for **O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

Target for **O4: Application**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

Target for **O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

Target for **O6: Personal Development**
Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**
50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

50% of our tenure-track faculty (15 of 30 faculty members) published at least 1 paper or chapter with one or more student co-authors (note: there were 40 student co-authored publications for these 15 faculty members). 83% of our tenure-track faculty (25 of 30 faculty members) presented at least 1 paper with student co-authors (note: there were 131 student co-authored presentations with these 25 faculty members).

**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**

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O4: Application**

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Target for O6: Personal Development**

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.
Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Target for O8: Values in Psychology
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Target for O10: Career Planning and Development
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding 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?

All Achievement Targets were met in last year’s Action Plan. Although the Graduate Program Committee (Chair’s of each of the Programs) is generally satisfied with training, it is believed that the Achievement Targets should be modified to more accurately identify problematic areas. Two primary changes will be made: 1) The Achievement Targets will be reviewed to determine whether they are sufficiently rigorous to allow for discrimination of training areas in need of improvement. 2) The Achievement Targets will be reviewed to determine whether they are appropriate indicators of areas of training. An additional measure will be developed that allows for graduate student and/or alumni feedback on training. For example, an anonymous survey might be conducted that assesses student satisfaction with their training across multiple domains (e.g., research, ethics, professionalism, technical expertise). Tracking of alumni professional positions will be conducted in order to provide another measure of long-term success of training.

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.

Currently, there is a disconnect between the Learning Outcome findings and the educational program. Other more proximal parameters (e.g., Annual evaluation, Student ratings and feedback, outside reviews, faculty meeting discussions) guide changes to the educational program. In addition, it is difficult to develop and measure outcomes for such a large department with diverse programs with diverse training goals. The Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether Learning Outcomes should be conducted at the program level or whether the current system might be modified to better inform graduate training across the whole department.
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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: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform (G: 1) (M: 1)**

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 2: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public service (G: 1) (M: 2)**

Students must be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in the public service.

**SLO 3: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students analyze the nature and function of the public service in the US, including the importance of public service in modern societies.

**SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)**

Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.

**SLO 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)**

Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

**SLO 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (G: 2) (M: 7)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers.

**SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)**

Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

**SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)**

Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.

**SLO 10: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (G: 3) (M: 10)**
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 11)</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 12: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 12)</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 13: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (G: 4) (M: 13)</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 14: Describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (G: 5) (M: 14)</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 15: Compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (G: 5) (M: 15)</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 U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (G: 6) (M: 16)</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 17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design (G: 6) (M: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand the advantages and disadvantages of various models of organizational structure and design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 18: Demonstrate ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts (G: 7) (M: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students able to demonstrate the ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 19: Evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees (G: 7) (M: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students able to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 20: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (G: 7) (M: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate ability to understand administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution avenues to resolve conflict and grievances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 21: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (G: 8) (M: 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students able to identify and evaluate the major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 22: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (G: 8) (M: 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students able to demonstrate how specific organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 23: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (G: 8) (M: 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate how to use organizational theories and related tools to solve practical management problems in a public and nonprofit agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Describe and analyze the key models of government and administrative reform (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: 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. 82% of students in PMAP 8111 at least partially meet this objective. 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

98.24% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 2: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public service (O: 2)**

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 O2: 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. 82% of students at least partially meet the objective. In an ethics memo and on the final exam students will be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in public service.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

98.25% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 at least partially demonstrated the objective.

**M 3: Describe the nature and function of the public sector (O: 3)**

On papers, policy memos, and 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 O3: Analyze 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 will at least partially meet this objective. On papers, policy memos, and the final exam students will describe the nature and function of the public sector.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All of the students met this objective.

**M 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (O: 4)**

Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams 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 O4: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8111 will at least partially meet this objective. Students complete problem sets, as well as, the midterm and final exams in order to measure their ability to apply basic concepts of measurements and data sets.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90.99% of the students met this objective.

**M 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 5)**

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 O5: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. Students do problem sets and complete a final paper to show evidence of skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis with SPSS.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

85.65% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 6: Demonstrate ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 6)**
The students’ final 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 O6: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students’ final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

95.84% of students at least partially met this objective.

**M 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)**

The students’ final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students’ final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

87.39% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 8)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131, Applied Research Methods and Statistics II, will at least partially meet this objective. 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

98.75% of students at least partially met this objective.

**M 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)**

Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables**

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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective. 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

97.77% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 10: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (O: 10)**

Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research.
Target for O10: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective. Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
97.77% of the students at least partially met this objective.

M 11: Demonstrated understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 11)

Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Target for O11: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
92.5% of students enrolled in the course at least partially met this objective.

M 12: Ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 12)

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm and final examinations and the final paper.

Target for O12: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm and final examinations and the final paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
88.75% of the students at least partially met this objective.

M 13: Demonstrated understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 13)

On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Target for O13: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
85% of the students at least partially met this objective.

M 14: Demonstrated ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (O: 14)

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.

Target for O14: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8161, Public Budgeting and Finance, will at least partially meet this objective.
M 18: Demonstrated ability to perform basic legal research, read judicial opinions, and negotiate contracts (O: 18)

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 O18: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8411, Law for Public & Nonprofit Managers will at least partially meet this objective. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

96.15% of students at least partially met this objective.

M 17: Demonstrated understanding of models of organizational structure and design (O: 17)

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 O17: 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. 82% of the students in PMAP 8171 will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

96.15% of the students at least partially met this objective.

M 16: Demonstrated ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (O: 16)

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 O16: 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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8171, Public Management Systems and Strategies, will at least partially meet this objective. On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

96.15% of the students at least partially met the objective.

M 15: Demonstrated ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (O: 15)

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 O15: 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. 82% of the students in PMAP 8161 will at least partially meet this objective. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

All of the students at least partially met this objective.
92.59% of the students at least partially met this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Evaluated the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees (O: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O19:</strong> Evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees</td>
</tr>
<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. 82% of the students enrolled in PMA 8411 will at least partially meet the objectives. The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.59% of the students met this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: Demonstrated understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (O: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the homework assignments and the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O20:</strong> Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution</td>
</tr>
<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. 82% of the students enrolled in PMA 8411 will at least partially meet this objective. On the homework assignments and the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.59% of the students at least partially met the objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: Demonstrated ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (O: 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O21:</strong> Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior</td>
</tr>
<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. 82% of the students enrolled in PMA 8431, Leadership and Organizational Behavior, will at least partially meet the objective. On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.45% of the students met this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Demonstrated how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (O: 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O22:</strong> Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations</td>
</tr>
<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. 82% of the students enrolled in PMA 8431, Leadership and Organizational Behavior, will at least partially meet the objective. On a midterm and final essay as well as a case study students demonstrate their ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.45% of the students met this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 23: Demonstrated how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (O: 23)

On the midterm essay, the final essay, and the case study 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 O23: 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. 82% of the students in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet this objective. On the midterm essay, the final essay, and the case study students demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

98.25% of the students met 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

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?

After meeting with Marti Singer and others to review last year's WEAVE report, the faculty considered the issue of having too many learning objectives/outcomes to evaluate. In this discussion a variety of options were considered such as a new approach to the process, a capstone course, etc. The decision was made to reduce the number of outcomes/objectives in the MPA degree. The method chosen to reduce the number of outcomes/objectives was by consolidating several. The suggestion was made to use Bloom's Taxonomy and identify objectives that were lower-order skills such as "Students will describe. . . ." If, for example, students in an introductory course were required to define or describe ethical issues related to public policy or management, and, later, in the curriculum the students were asked to apply ethical approaches to a particular issue or to analyze ethical issues in a policy or management case, then it could be presumed that the students had been able to absorb the definitions from earlier courses. Using this approach, the number of objectives in the MPA degree was reduced from 27 to 23. The faculty identified strengths and weaknesses of the assessment process used by the PMAP Department. Among its strengths, the approach involves virtually all the faculty members in the department. Anyone teaching a required core course must complete the responses to the request asking the faculty to assess how each student in a class demonstrated a mastery (or not) of each learning objective established for the course. These responses will continue to be collected for all course learning objectives for all required core courses. All full-time faculty now clearly understand the importance of their responses to the assessment process. A weakness of the approach is with Teaching Assistants and Part-time faculty members who do not fully understand how the assessment process works and why it is important. Staff time is used meeting with these instructors individually to brief them on the assessment process. This is a continuing process since new people are involved each semester. The faculty decided to continue the same approach next 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.

The WEAVE assessment process prompted the kind of discussion among faculty that the process was designed to do. Questions were asked about the learning objectives of each required core course in the MPA degree program, as well as how the objectives related to the needs of the program as a whole. The faculty felt that the MPA curriculum was accomplishing its mission. The major change that was agreed upon was to reduce the number of learning objectives that will be assessed.
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 discussion among faculty prompted by the WEAVE outcomes assessment process resulted in a reconsideration of the entire process used by the Department. There was a consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the present assessment process. The faculty agreed that a strength of the system was the large number of faculty members who are involved in the assessment process each year. A weakness identified by the group was the fact that new faculty and PTIs may not understand how the assessment process works or appreciate its importance to the Department. The faculty decided to continue the present system, but to require individual coaching with new faculty and Part-Time Instructors teaching in the core for the first time. The goal of this change is to help these persons better understand the assessment process used by the PMAP Department.

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 faculty felt good about the findings of the assessment process for the MPA program. No changes are being made in the curriculum of the MPA program in response to the assessment. However, having the WEAVE process in place is important for the external accreditation agency which oversees the MPA program. The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) changed it accreditation requirement in the fall 2009, and moved to an outcomes-based process of program review. The assessment findings for the MPA program will be an important part of the next NASPAA accreditation review.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The faculty did not see the need for substantive changes in the MPA curriculum as a result of the most recent assessment process.
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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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O4: Assess Public Health Conditions**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.
**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings**
100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 56/56 (100%) of graduating students enrolled in thesis/capstone successfully defended.

**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 IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**
45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation**
45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

**Target for O4: Assess Public Health Conditions**
45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**
45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

**Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health**
45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.
Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills

45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings

45% of IPH alumni (based on GSU university alumni survey response benchmark of 43%) will complete an alumni survey and 50% of respondents will report being employed in a public health setting.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Seventy-one out of 137 alumni (52% response rate) completed the alumni survey. Sixty-one respondents (86%) indicated agreement with the statement: the IPH graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. Forty-eight respondents (68%) reported that they currently working in a public health setting.

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students successfully passed the practicum course.

Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities
All students (100%) enrolled in the PH7960 must receive a "PASS" grade

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students successfully passed the practicum course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students (100%) enrolled in the PH960 must receive a &quot;PASS&quot; grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In SU09-SP10, Forty-four (100%) of students successfully passed the practicum course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Successful Completion of Core Courses (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each core course has course objectives that provide the foundation for the degree program objectives. A grade of &quot;B&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Less than 1 % (6/473) of all core grades awarded in SU09-SP10 were less than a "B".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Course Evaluations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In SU09-SP10, 79% (38/48) 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
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
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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: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate the variety of ways in which citizens can help to shape public policy.

SLO 2: Participate in public and community affairs (G: 1) (M: 2)
Through service learning students participate in public and community affairs. The students become active citizens of the community.

SLO 3: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy (G: 1) (M: 3)
As a CTW course, students develop writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy.

SLO 4: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students learn from leaders from all three sectors of society and how these leaders make changes within their organizational settings.

SLO 5: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students must demonstrate their understanding of important issues in leadership theory.

**SLO 6: Compare leadership theory and practice (G: 2) (M: 6)**
Students must demonstrate their ability to compare theoretical aspects of leadership with practical applications.

**SLO 7: Demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate (G: 3) (M: 7)**
Students must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society.

**SLO 8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (G: 3) (M: 8)**
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.

**SLO 9: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (G: 3) (M: 9)**
Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

**SLO 10: Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy (G: 4) (M: 10)**
Students demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze important questions in public policy.

**SLO 11: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 11)**
Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**SLO 12: Apply scientific method to policy issues (G: 5) (M: 12)**
Students must demonstrate their ability to apply the scientific method to policy issues.

**SLO 13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research (G: 5) (M: 13)**
Students must demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research.

**SLO 14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW) (G: 5) (M: 14)**
Students must demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.

**SLO 15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (G: 6) (M: 15)**
Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.

**SLO 16: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention (G: 6) (M: 16)**
Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Students demonstrate how citizens shape public policy (O: 1)**
Students demonstrate how citizens can help to shape public policy. This is demonstrated on the writing assignments for the course (weekly memos), the ULearn discussion board sessions, and final report.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Demonstrate how citizens can shape 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. 80% of students will at least partially meet the objective. This will be measured by weekly memos, ULearn discussion board sessions, and the final report.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
81.5% at least partially met the objective.

**M 2: Participate and report on public and community affairs through service learning (O: 2)**
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 O2: Participate in public and community affairs**
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. 80% of students will at least partially meet the objective. This will be measured by weekly memos, ULearn discussion board sessions, and the final report.
M 7: Demonstrate knowledge of main current policy issues (O: 7)

Students will demonstrate knowledge of main current policy issues. This will be measured by using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
81.45 at least partially met the objective.

M 3: Demonstrate writing skills appropriate to public policy (O: 3)

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 O3: Develop writing skills appropriate to 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. 80% of the students enrolled in the Citizenship course will at least partially meet the objective. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
81.45% of the students at least partially met the objective.

M 4: Students demonstrate how leaders from all sectors lead organizational change (O: 4)

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 O4: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their 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. 80% of students will at least partly meet this objective. On a midterm and final examination, students demonstrate their ability to understand how leaders from all three sectors lead change in their organizations.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
85.62% met this objective.

M 5: Students answer test questions on midterm and final exams on leadership theory (O: 5)

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 O5: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership

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. 80% of students will at least partially demonstrate this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
85.62% of the students met this objective.

M 6: Students compare theoretical approaches to practical applications of leadership (O: 6)

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 O6: Compare leadership theory and practice

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. 80% of the students enrolled in the Policy Leadership course will meet this objective. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
85.62% of the students met the objective.
Target for O7: demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate

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. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues, will meet this objective. Measure knowledge of main policy issues currently under debate using exams and classroom policy debates.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
85.4% of the student at least partially met this objective.

M 8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (O: 8)

Apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation as well as the examinations.

Target for O8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current 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. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82.02% met this objective.

M 9: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (O: 9)

Students will exhibit critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

Target for O9: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes

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. 80% of the students will at least partially meet the objective. Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
84.27% of the students at least partially met this objective.

M 10: Application of statistical techniques to analyze public issues (O: 10)

Students apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze public policy issues. This is measured by performance on examinations.

Target for O10: Apply introductory statistical techniques to 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. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues, will meet this objective. 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Only 70.16% of students at least partially met this objective.

M 11: Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 11)

Students develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS. This is demonstrated using examinations and class assignments.

Target for O11: Demonstrate skills using 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. 80% of students enrolled in PMAP 4041, Policy Data Analysis, will at least partially meet this objective. Students develop skills in using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS. This is demonstrated using examinations and class assignments.
examinations and class assignments.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Only 70.16% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 12: demonstrate ability to apply scientific method to policy issues (O: 12)**

Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O12: Apply 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. 80% of the students enrolled in PMAP 4051, Evaluating Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate their ability to apply scientific method to the evaluation of public policy issues. This is measured through examinations.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

85.71% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 13: Demonstrate ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research (O: 13)**

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O13: Demonstrate use of 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. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

85.71% of the students met this objective.

**M 14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research proposal as a CTW assignment (O: 14)**

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.

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

**Target for O14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW)**

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. 80% of the students will at least partially meet this objective. 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

85.71% of the students at least partially met this objective.

**M 15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (O: 15)**

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 O15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie 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. 80% of the students enrolled in PMAP 4061, Introduction to Policy Analysis, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90.56% of the students at least partially met this objective.
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 O16: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention**

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. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. 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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

92.45% of the students at least partially met 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 WEAPE 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 WEAPE 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 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 WEAPE 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 WEAPE 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.

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.

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.
**Improve MATH skills of students taking PMAP 4041**

The drop in the percentage of students who did not at least partially meet this objective from the 2008-09 academic year was steep. Last year, xx% at least partially met this objective, compared to only 70.16% who at least partially met this same objective this year. There is other evidence to support the observation that some PMAP students are weak in basic math skills. The rate of D, F, and W grades in the PMAP 4041 course (Policy Data Analysis) was 34% during the fall 2009 semester, compared to a 13% DFW rate for all the PMAP core courses. At present, students can take the upper division Policy Data Analysis course with only a grade of D in the lower division MATH courses 1101 or 1111. The two step Action Plan calls for changing the requirement to a minimum grade of C in either basis lower division MATH 1101 or 1111 course during the fall semester 2010. The second step of the Action Plan is to require all students to take and earn a minimum grade of C in MATH 1070, Elementary Statistics as a prerequisite for taking PMAP 4041. This prerequisite should improve the math skills of students taking PMAP 4041.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Measure:** Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis  
**Objective:** Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis

**Implementation Description:** Faculty will approve a change in lower division MATH requirements, so that students must have grades of C or higher in MATH 1101 or 1111. Students will also be required to make a grade of C or higher in MATH 1070, as a prerequisite for taking PMAP 4041.

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** PMAP faculty approval  
**Additional Resources:** N/A

---

**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?

After meeting with Marti Singer and others to review last year’s WEAVE report, the faculty considered the issue of having too many learning objectives/outcomes to evaluate. In this discussion a variety of options were considered such as a new approach to the process, a capstone course, etc. The decision was made to reduce the number of outcomes/objectives in the BS in Public Policy degree. The method chosen to reduce the number of outcomes/objectives was by consolidating several. The suggestion was made to use Bloom's Taxonomy and identify objectives that were lower-order skills such as “Students will describe...”. If, for example, students in an introductory course were required to define or describe ethical issues related to public policy or management, and, later, in the curriculum the students were asked to apply ethical approaches to a particular issue or to analyze ethical issues in a policy or management case, then it could be presumed that the students had been able to absorb the definitions from earlier courses. Using this approach, the number of objectives in the BS in Public Policy degree was reduced from 21 to 16. The faculty identified strengths and weaknesses of the assessment process used by the PMAP Department. Among its strengths, the approach involves virtually all the faculty members in the department. Anyone teaching a required core course must complete the responses to the request asking the faculty to assess how each student in a class demonstrated a mastery (or not) of each learning objective established for the course. These responses will continue to be collected for all course learning objectives for all required core courses. All full-time faculty now clearly understand the importance of their responses to the assessment process. A weakness of the approach is with Teaching Assistants and Part-time faculty members who do not fully understand how the assessment process works and why it is important. Staff time is used meeting with these instructors individually to brief them on the assessment process. This is a continuing process since new people are involved each semester. The faculty decided to continue the same approach next 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.

As a result of the assessment process, weaknesses were found in the math background of PMAP students who are taking the PMAP 4041, Policy Data Analysis course. Improvements are proposed in the Action Plan that will require minimum grades of C in basic MATH courses such as MATH 1101 or 1111. Also, MATH 1070 with a minimum grade of C will be required as a prerequisite for PMAP 4041. This should improve performance in the required Policy Data Analysis 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?

The faculty members of the PMAP Department reviewed the WEAVE data from last year, and came to the conclusion that they are satisfied with the process used to assess learning outcomes. As noted, there are strengths and weaknesses involved in the approach used. New faculty and PTIs will need individual coaching to understand how the assessment process works. The major operational improvement is a system to do this individual work with each person teaching a core course for the first time. This is a relatively new degree program, so the Department does not have much information from last year that is helpful to 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 findings from this year's assessment point to a problem with the math skills of our students. The steps proposed will be voted on by the faculty during the fall semester and implemented as soon as possible. Requiring a minimum grade of C or better in freshman-level math courses, and the additional requirement of Math 1070 (also with a minimum grade of C) should improve the skills of students entering the BS in PP core courses. The information from the assessment process was useful in building consensus for the approval of the proposed curriculum changes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The faculty does not anticipate that the curriculum changes proposed will improve student performance during the 2010-2011 academic year. These prerequisites must be in place in the new catalog in order for students to begin taking the new required MATH course and to meet the new minimum grade requirements. The following year will begin to see results, unless students can be advised to go ahead and meet the new requirements.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Public Policy PhD

Mission / Purpose
To combine the resources of two excellent schools of public policy to create a top doctoral program. To produce high-quality researchers capable of making contributions to the academic study of public policy and to the public policy process. To produce high-quality teachers, knowledgeable in the field and capable of conveying their knowledge to others.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of Theoretical Frameworks
Students will have an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.

G 2: Analytical methods of public policy
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy.

G 3: Field of Specialization
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.

G 4: Original Research in Public Policy
Students will apply their understanding of the theories and analytical methods of public policy to a particular sub-field specialization to produce original research.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Students apply analytical methods to public policy (M: 2)
Students demonstrate the ability to apply analytical methods to the study of public policy.

O/O 3: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field (M: 3)
Students demonstrate their understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.

O/O 4: Produce Original Public Policy Research (M: 4)
Students will produce original public policy research to demonstrate understanding of theories and analytical methods of the field.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Comprehensive Examination (O: 1)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical framework section of the public policy section of the core comprehensive examination.

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

Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory
The achievement target for the core portion of the comprehensive examination is 67% of students passing this portion of the exam.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

During the 2009-10 academic year, seven students attempted the core portion of the comprehensive examination. Six of these students (86%) passed the examination. The achievement target was met.

**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**

The achievement target for the core portion of the comprehensive examination is 67% of students passing this portion of the exam.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

During the 2009-10 academic year, seven students attempted the core portion of the comprehensive examination. Six of these students (86%) passed the examination. The achievement target was met.

**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 for the major field portion of the comprehensive examination is 67% of students passing this part of the exam.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

During the 2009-10 academic year, two students attempted the major field portion of the comprehensive examination. Both failed. The program failed to meet this portion of the achievement target.

**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**

All candidates will successfully propose and defend a dissertation proposal. By the end of the third year in the doctoral program, all students will present a conference paper and submit at least one manuscript for review as a journal article. All students will produce and successfully defend their doctoral dissertations.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 8 students produced and successfully defended their dissertation proposals. During the past year, 18 doctoral students produced 36 conference papers, and 12 students submitted 21 manuscripts for review as journal articles, book chapters, and conference proceedings. Of the 31 active students in the doctoral program who are in their second year or later, all but 2 have presented papers and submitted manuscripts. These 2 students are scheduled to do so during the next academic year. During the past year, 8 students produced and successfully 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 examination. 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

**Doctoral Program Committee developed 3-part action plan**

The Doctoral Program Committee developed a three-part Action Plan to improve students' performance on the major field portion of the comprehensive examinations. First, faculty members will update the reading list for students in each major field. Next, the Doctoral Program Committee will review admission criteria against performance on the comprehensive examinations. Perhaps some students were admitted in the past who should not have been. Finally, each major field advisor will conduct tutorial sessions for those students preparing for the examination. A special focus will be placed on the students who failed this year's field exams.
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.

ADMINISTRATIVE 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 Doctoral Program Committee developed a three-part Action Plan to improve students' performance on the major field portion of the comprehensive examinations. First, faculty members updated the reading list for students in each major field. Next, the Doctoral Program Committee reviewed admission criteria against performance on the comprehensive examinations. Perhaps some students were admitted in the past who should not have been. Finally, each major field advisor conducted tutorial sessions for those students preparing for the examination. A special focus was placed on the students who failed this year’s field exams. The students who failed the major field portion of the comprehensive examination participated in the tutorial sessions and have schedule a second attempt for the exam. Newer students taking the comprehensive examination will benefit from the revised reading list, higher admission standards, and tutorial session as needed.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
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 Doctoral Program Committee has functioned effectively to address past issues with the methods and statistics portion of the comprehensive examination. The Committee has now addressed the problems with the Major Field portion of the exam.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We anticipate a higher percentage of students who attempt the Major Field portion of the comprehensive examination will pass the exam. Since neither of the students who took the exam passed last year, we hope at least 75% will pass this year.
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
G 2: 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
G 3: Critical reflection skills 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
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Foundations of Reading and Writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric. Established in Cycle: 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - <strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: SBRR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - <strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Creates a Literate Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - <strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Range of Curricular Materials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - <strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Professional Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - <strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Variety of Assessment Tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010</strong> - <strong>Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

**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**

Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

**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 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

**Video Portfolio**

The MEd students currently submit video portfolios that are based on the IRA standards (2004). There are new standards (2010) that will be utilized in the future based on acceptance from the PSC.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2011

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

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 changes made in the MEd Reading Specialist assessment process is to have students submit a video portfolio (12-15 minutes in length) that demonstrates their knowledge and understandings of the following standards: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the history of reading research and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework. 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations 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. 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework. 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments 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. 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials 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. 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility. 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction. 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice 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.

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.

At this point, we do not anticipate any changes to the program in terms of curriculum or structure. The assessment data indicates that the students do well on the video portfolio and informal comments indicate they appreciate the video format.

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
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.
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
- 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)
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
- 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
- **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)
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
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.

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
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
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
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
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
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
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)

Strengthening Professional Standard
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, “students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility” has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTW Reflection 1</strong>: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTW Reflection 2</strong>: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTW Reflection 3</strong>: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTW Reflection 4</strong>: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTW Reflection 5</strong>: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since this program is new, there were no completers last year. Therefore, there were no assessment data for last year's assessment report. For the coming academic year, we plan to embed the assessments in the students' required courses. We believe that this change will make the assessment process more relevant and manageable. We hope that this way of assessing students will be more authentic and meaningful, leading to information that will inform both faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data from this year's report help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. As a faculty, we will continue to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements as we pilot an approach in which we will embed and align the portfolio standards into our course assignments. The findings of this year's assessment indicate that the program has prepared students to be successful through an online delivery system. This success may encourage the development of additional online programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Content Knowledge
Students will have knowledge of reading and ESOL.

G 2: Planning
Students will have pedagogical knowledge and skills to plan effective instruction.

G 3: P-12 Student Learning
Students will demonstrate the effectiveness of their teaching/instruction on P-12 student learning.

G 4: Clinical Practice
Students will demonstrate their pedagogical knowledge in their practice.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: ESOL STANDARD 1 (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to nature and acquisition of language.

SLO 2: ESOL STANDARD 2 (G: 1, 3) (M: 2)
Students understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups in creating effective learning environments.

SLO 3: ESOL STANDARD 3 (G: 1) (M: 3)
Candidates are knowledgeable of histories of ESL Teaching.

SLO 4: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 4 (G: 1) (M: 4)
Candidates have knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

SLO 5: ESOL STANDARD 5 (G: 1) (M: 5)
Students know, understand, and use the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups to construct learning environments that support ESOL students' cultural identities.

SLO 6: ESOL STANDARD 6 (G: 2, 3) (M: 6)
Students know, understand, and use standards-based practices and strategies related to planning, implementing, and managing ESL and content instruction, in terms of using effective classroom organizational approaches, resources, and teaching strategies for developing and integrating language skills.

SLO 7: ESOL STANDARD 7 (G: 4) (M: 7)
Students demonstrate a disposition indicating that teachers should support and advocate for ESOL students and their families and work collaboratively to improve the learning environment.

SLO 8: Reading Endorsement Standard 8 (G: 1) (M: 8)
Students are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness.

SLO 9: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 9 (G: 2, 3) (M: 9)
Students integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters reading.

SLO 10: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 10 (G: 1, 4) (M: 10)
Students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

SLO 11: ESOL STANDARD 11 (G: 1) (M: 11)
Students know, understand, and use the major concepts, theories, and research related to nature and acquisition of language to construct learning environments that support ESOL students' language and literacy development.
**SLO 12: ESOL STANDARD 12 (G: 2) (M: 12)**  
Students understand issues of assessment and use standards-based assessment measures with ESOL students (Assessment/instruction resulting in Literacy Gain – One on One ESOL Student).

**SLO 13: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 13 (G: 2) (M: 13)**  
Students use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2009-2010</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Portfolio Standard 1 (O: 1)</td>
<td>O1: ESOL STANDARD 1</td>
<td>100% of students will score a 3 or higher on this measure.</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of students scored a 3 or higher on this measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Portfolio Standard 2 (O: 2)</td>
<td>O2: ESOL STANDARD 2</td>
<td>100% of the students will score a 3 or higher on this measure.</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Portfolio Standard 3 (O: 3)</td>
<td>O3: ESOL STANDARD 3</td>
<td>100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Portfolio Standard 4 (O: 4)</td>
<td>O4: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 4</td>
<td>100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5: Portfolio Standard 5 (O: 5)</td>
<td>O5: ESOL STANDARD 5</td>
<td>100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.</td>
<td>Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6: Portfolio Standard 6 (O: 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students consistently demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and use of standards-based practices and strategies in planning,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 1: Portfolio Standard 1 (O: 1)**  
Integration of references to relevant theory/research is embedded throughout. Detailed explanation given with examples cited to support contentions. All issues or aspects of the question covered clearly  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: ESOL STANDARD 1**  
100% of students will score a 3 or higher on this measure.

**Findings 2009-2010** - **Target: Met**  
100% of students scored a 3 or higher on this measure.

**M 2: Portfolio Standard 2 (O: 2)**  
Integration of references to relevant theory/research is embedded throughout. Detailed explanation given with examples cited to support contentions. All issues or aspects of the question covered clearly  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2: ESOL STANDARD 2**  
100% of the students will score a 3 or higher on this measure.

**Findings 2009-2010** - **Target: Met**  
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 3: Portfolio Standard 3 (O: 3)**  
Students use their extensive knowledge of the research and evolution of the field of ESL to make instructional decisions and conduct their own classroom based research.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: ESOL STANDARD 3**  
100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010** - **Target: Met**  
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 4: Portfolio Standard 4 (O: 4)**  
Know a wide range of theories and how they relate to practices and materials in the reading and writing classroom. They can summarize empirical evidence related to these foundational theories. They can conduct and publish research (including teacher-research inquiries) and contribute to the development of the knowledge base in the area of reading.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O4: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 4**  
100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010** - **Target: Met**  
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 5: Portfolio Standard 5 (O: 5)**  
Students continually expand their knowledge of their students’ cultures and consistently integrate knowledge of cultural groups into their teaching. Students consistently provide in-class opportunities for students to make connections to their cultural backgrounds  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: ESOL STANDARD 5**  
100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010** - **Target: Met**  
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 6: Portfolio Standard 6 (O: 6)**  
Students consistently demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and use of standards-based practices and strategies in planning,
implementing, and managing ESL and content instruction for successfully developing and integrating language skills.

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

**Target for O6: ESOL STANDARD 6**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 7: Portfolio Standard 7 (O: 7)**

Students demonstrate sustained and consistent support and advocacy for ESOL students and their families. Candidates always work collaboratively to improve the learning environment.

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

**Target for O7: ESOL STANDARD 7**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 8: Portfolio Standard 8 (O: 8)**

Students are knowledgeable about all areas of phonemic awareness (ie. phoneme blending, isolation, segmentation, deletion and categorization) and demonstrate an ability to design instructional approaches that are engaging and varied and which are designed in light of the needs of students. Students recognize the importance of embedding phonemic awareness within a total reading program. Students demonstrate PA instruction that is engaging and varied

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

**M 9: Portfolio Standard 9 (O: 9)**

Students use a wide range of instructional practices, including technology-based practices, that promote reading. They can provide a critical rationale for their practices. Students use a wide range of print and nonprint materials and make appropriate use of new technology. Students design reading instruction to be multi-level to meet the needs of students at varying reading levels. Students design effective reading instruction for children from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds

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

**Target for O9: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 9**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 10: Portfolio Standard 10 (O: 10)**

Students identify specific questions related to knowledge, skills and/or dispositions related to his or her teaching of reading and writing. They plan specific strategies for finding answers to those questions. They carry out those plans and articulate the answers derived. Students participate in professional organizations and use professional resources related to reading and writing.

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

**Target for O10: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 10**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 11: Portfolio Standard 11 (O: 11)**

Students consistently apply their knowledge of nature and acquisition of language in language and literacy instruction and other language learning opportunities.

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

**Target for O11: ESOL STANDARD 11**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 12: Portfolio Standard 12 (O: 12)**

Student illustrates how assessment results were compared, contrasted, and analyzed to plan and revise effective instruction for the student within an assessment/instruction cycle. Meaningful interpretations and appropriate conclusions are determined based on a range of data collected. Analysis of student learning includes clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the literacy achievement of the target student.

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

**Target for O12: ESOL STANDARD 12**
100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**M 13: Portfolio Standard 13 (O: 13)**
Student illustrates how assessment results were compared, contrasted, and analyzed to plan and revise effective instruction for the student within an assessment/instruction cycle. Meaningful interpretations and appropriate conclusions are determined based on a range of data collected. Analysis of student learning includes clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the literacy achievement of the target student.

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

**Target for O13: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 13**
100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

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

**Embed**
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 |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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) |
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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.
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| Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard |
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Strengthening Professional Standard

Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility" has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Portfolio Standard 10 | Outcome/Objective: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 10

Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?

Since this program is new, there were no completers last year. Therefore, there were no assessment data for last year's assessment report. For the coming academic year, we plan to embed the assessments in the students' required courses. We believe that this change will make the assessment process more relevant and manageable. We hope that this way of assessing students will be more authentic and meaningful, leading to information that will inform both faculty and 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 data from this year's report help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. As a faculty, we will continue to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements as we pilot an approach in which we will embed and align the portfolio standards into our course assignments. The findings of this year's assessment indicate that the program has prepared students to be successful through an online delivery system. This success may encourage the development of additional online 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?
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?
Mission / Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. Degree with ESOL Concentration. The mission for the major in reading, language, and literacy program is to provide educators with a 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, or teaching English as a second language. Our purpose is to develop teachers as critical inquirers in multicultural, urban settings. 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 access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Become a Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge Expert
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become experts in Reading, Language, Literacy and the Early Literacy and/or ESOL subject disciplines.

G 2: Promote Student Language and Literacy Development
Students in the RLL MEd (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 RLL MEd (ESOL) program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become Members of Professional Communities
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

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 comprehensiion (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)
Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to culture, language teaching and learning.

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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading (O: 1)

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard. While the majority of our students met this standard, three failed to do so.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading**

One hundred percent (100%) will score at the Proficient or Advanced level on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Our targets were not realized for this standard as only 56% of our students (4) scored at the proficient level, 1 at the advanced level, while 42% or 3, scored at the basic level.

#### M 2: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL (O: 2)

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard. The majority of our students met this standard while 2 achieved passing.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**

100% of our candidates will achieve advance or proficient levels in this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

71.4% or 5 of our students achieved an advance (1) or proficient (4) on this standard with 2 students or 28.5% achieving a pass

#### M 3: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture (O: 3)

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard.

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture**

100% of our students will achieve an advance or proficient on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Only four or 57.14% of our students achieved an advanced (1) or proficient (3) on this standard while 3 students or 42.85% achieved a pass.

#### M 4: Achievement of Instructional Practices (O: 4)

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard.

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

**Target for O4: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development**

100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

71.4% of our students achieved an advanced (2) and proficient (5) on this standard while 28.57% or 2 students achieved a passing.
### M 5: Achievement of Reflective Action (O: 5)

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard. 

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

**Target for O5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners**

100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of our students attained an advanced (4 or 57.14%) or a proficient (3 or 42.85%) on this standard.

### M 6: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership (O: 6)

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard. 

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

**Target for O6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities**

100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

85.7% of our students achieved an advanced (3 or 42.85%) or proficient (3 or 42.85%) on this standard while 1 (or 14.28%) achieved a pass.

### 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
- **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
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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 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

Projected Completion Date: 07/2010

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.

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 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)

Goal partially met more monitoring will be done of weak students

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: More support from the onset of the program
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Achievement of Instructional Practices | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL faculty
Additional Resources: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**More support for weak students through close monitoring.**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Weak students will be monitored closely.
While the majority of our students met all the goals there was still a small number who lagged behind in meeting the highest standard possible. The action plan calls for closer monitoring and more support offered so that these students too might excel.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: There will be close tracking of students who appear to be lagging behind in submitting and completing coursework. Students who also do not achieve high standards in their course work will be given more support to complete submissions at a higher standard.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL faculty
Additional Resources: NA
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?

In lieu of our goal to push our students to higher standards, we instituted more feedback mechanisms which allowed students to achieve a higher standard. We have also given greater emphasis to issues of assessment. These changes were directly attributed to the scores students attained in their portfolio assessment. Over the coming year we continue to focus heavily on assessments but will institute more built-in class reporting mechanisms for the overall improvement of our portfolio scores. We will work harder with weaker 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.

We will continue to support the development of the portfolio through our coursework so that students are given more support in excelling on their portfolios. We will also work harder with our weaker students and build-in more reporting mechanisms for them. This year’s data has singed out the weak students who obtained “passes” in some areas. This signals more work with students who have the greatest 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?

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

---
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**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: Understands student development and learning (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td><strong>M 1: Portfolio (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio evaluations collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>via LiveText rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4: Can motivate and manage students for learning (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5: Understands and uses assessment for learning (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the learner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 6: Can effectively plan for instruction (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 7: Uses communication skills and technology (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 8: Practices professional reflection (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 10: Involves school and community in learning (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Graduate Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL candidates (n=14) demonstrated proficiency at understanding the foundations of language acquisition and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies</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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning</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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning</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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Can effectively plan for instruction</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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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.</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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) 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. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates demonstrated an "understanding of student development re: learning."

---

**Target for O3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - 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...
Findings 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100 % of the candidates were able to "effectively teacher diverse groups of learners."

Target for O10: Involves school and community in learning
75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of our candidates demonstrated proficiency at "involving school and community in learning."

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Increase Collaboration and Communication
The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
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
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW
on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

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 not made any particular change in the assessment process, but it seems that reordering of the courses to be taught allowed for greater uptake of key ESOL content. We will phase portfolio assessment into the courses throughout the program so that we will be able to see the progress of students learning in 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 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 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
2009-2010 Real Estate BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The BBA real estate major is designed for individuals entering careers in the real estate industry. It provides the student with the real estate knowledge and analytical skills necessary to support real property decisions in business environments as well as the requisite skills to effectively communicate them. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop 1) sufficient industry knowledge to support real estate decision making; 2) analytical skills leading to sound equity investment recommendations, value enhancing project funding strategies, effective project development plans; and 3) persuasive business communication skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: To develop creative decision-making skills (M: 2, 3, 4)
To develop creative decision-making skills associated with the real estate industry. 1) The student should be able to apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations. 2) The student should be familiar with available real estate financing products and be able to develop financing strategies for funding real estate projects. 3) The student should be able to use knowledge of real estate development to layout efficient project development plans.

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

SLO 2: To develop business communication skills (M: 1)
The student should be able to communicate real estate decisions and recommendations effectively.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Performance on writing assignments (O: 2)**
Performance on writing assignments in writing intensive designated course
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: To develop business communication skills**
75%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Average 79%. 84% of students achieved the target.

**M 2: Assignments in the real estate development course (O: 1)**
Performance on assignments in the real estate development course
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**
75%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Fall semester average 86%. 97% of students met the target. Spring semester average 88%. 100% of students met the target.

**M 3: Assignments in the finance and mortgage course (O: 1)**
Performance on assignments in the finance and mortgage banking course.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**
75%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Fall semester average 86%. 82% of students met the target. Spring semester average 85%. 84% of students met the target.

**M 4: Assignments in the real estate investment course (O: 1)**
Performance on assignments in the real estate investment course
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**
75%

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Fall semester average 82%. 84% of students met the target. Spring semester average 88%. 97% of students met 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

**Further exposition of learning outcomes**
The Department will identify the mission and general program goals. The Department will undertake a review to facilitate clarification of the locus of the learning outcomes and their articulation with the courses in which they are assessed. The use of percentage targets for learning outcomes measured achievement will be reviewed.

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
*Implementation Status:* In-Progress
*Priority:* High
**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?

No changes in this year. Changes planned in coming year related to on progress in pursuit of relevant issues in the Action 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.

No changes to program or curricular design arose from this year's assessment. Use of RE4700 as CTW course planned for implementation in coming session.
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8030 2.5 C2 8020 2.835

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8030 2.585 C2 8020 2.665 C3 8050 2.63

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8020 2.835 C2 8020 2.69 C3 8060 2.67

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8030 2.75 C2 8030 2.75 C3 8030 2.5

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8050 2.89 C2 8050 2.89 C3 8050 2.28

**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**

2.0

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8070 2.08 C2 8070 2.23
**M 8: Skills in the presentation of findings (O: 3)**

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**

2.0

---

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure C1 8090 2.5 C2 8090 2.5

---

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

**Continuation of new framework implementation plan**

Review achievement targets. At present target is expressed as an average. The Department will review whether this should be modified to encompass a minimum percentage of students attaining target. This was signaled in last year’s Action Plan but not fully pursued because for a number of courses last year was the first implementation of the new framework. Support instructors in interpreting and implementing new criteria. This continues to be an action point and is considered particularly relevant where instructors are new to teaching the course.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: During session

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Paul Gallimore/Department

**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?

No changes, since the initial modifications to the new framework were only implemented in this session. No changes planned in coming year, other than those that may arise from pursuit of the Action 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.

No changes to program or curricular design arose from this year’s assessment. The impact of the data is to confirm as appropriate the program outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Rehabilitation Counseling MS**

*As of 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Counseling and Psychological Services and the graduate rehabilitation program are committed to excellence in the vocational preparation of individuals in a wide variety of rehabilitation and health care settings. The department prepares students for careers in human service and physical and mental health settings such as governmental agencies, rehabilitation centers, non-profit community based residential and non-residential programs, educational institutions, and private for-profit businesses. The department also prepares professionals who will provide service in managed care, case management, vocational rehabilitation, and related areas. Graduates will also have knowledge and understanding of gender, cultural, ethnic, and physical issues as they relate to people with disabilities. In addition, graduates are expected to have a service and research mission to enhance and advance the field of rehabilitation and health care for people with disabilities. 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
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 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

### Strategic Plan Associations

6.3 Graduate Experience

**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.

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
3.31 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>90 % pass rate on first attempt is expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Only one student has failed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. CRC results report from the commission indicate about 95% pass rate (compared to ~80% nationwide).

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>90 % of students will pass the comprehensive exam and 85% will pass the CRC exam on the first attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Only one student was required to re-take the comprehensive exam. About 95% of students have passed the national CRC exam (whereas nationally about 80% pass).

**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**

Successfully complete the internship as judged by faculty and site supervisor.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Accomplished

**Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice**

One student was required to engage in remedial work in this area (successfully accomplished).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Based on recommendations from students, advisory board and employers, training in the DSM is now required.

**Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities**

All students will select an internship site that provides services to people with disabilities

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All students selected internship sites that provided services to people with disabilities.

**Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations**

Ethical conduct foundation will be accomplished through coursework associated with the introductory class (6050). All student will pass this class.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Accomplished

**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
Successfully complete the practicum and internship

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
All students successfully completed the class.

Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities
Successful completion by all students of helping skills, group and internship classes

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
One student was required to do remedial work, but successfully accomplished the goal.

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Evaluation will occur through site supervisors and faculty for the practicum/internship classes. Expect all students to successfully accomplish this goal.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Accomplished

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 engage in rehabilitation counseling with "clients" who receive services from community providers.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Accomplished through the Assessment of Rehabilitation Potential and practicum/internship classes.

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Students will obtain the foundation for this measure by taking a class relating to cultural and other diversity. Practice will be accomplished through role play in helping skills related classes and practicum/internship classes.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
Accomplished

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

Implementation Description: Initiate 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
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 05/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 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 (Eliade, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ 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, syncretism, 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 grammar/diction/usage, etc.) 3) Conducting Effective Research in Religious Studies (using libraries and on-line resources, evaluating scholarship, synthesizing, etc.)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of General Religious History (M: 2, 4)
Ability to extrapolate a general working knowledge of the great historical religious traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

SLO 3: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers (M: 2, 4)
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)
Ability to think critically and write persuasively within the academic study of religion.

O/O 9: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion (M: 3, 4)
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
## M 2: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Historical) (O: 1, 3)

Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final semester in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee (consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to historical content, i.e., knowledge of religious history, religion in its social and cultural contexts, comparative data, etc.

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 2.7 or higher. 81% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranked 2.7 or higher. 81% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

86% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranked 2.7 or higher. 57% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

86% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranked 2.7 or higher. 57% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of student rankings were 4.00 or higher. Mean student ranking was 5.00

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of student rankings were 4.00 or higher. Mean student ranking was 4.75

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of student rankings were 4.00 or higher. Mean student ranking was 5.00

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of student rankings were 4.00 or higher. Mean student ranking was 4.75

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

Comparative Religion
Reviewing curriculum to determine if sufficient comparative courses are offered within each cycle.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

Research in Religious Studies
Continued monitoring that majors have sufficient exposure to research methods in department's signature courses; continued integration of research component into CTW courses.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low

  Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (Numerical) | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion
  Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
  Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

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?

More direct alignment of exit-survey responses to specific 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.
**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: 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
94% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
94% of faculty evaluations ranked 3.3 or higher. No comments indicating significant problem with any of the relevant 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 this content.

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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
61% 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
78% 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

78% 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)

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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

67% 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.

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 4.88. No significant problems identified in this area.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

88% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 4.38. One student suggested that there was not sufficient theoretical and methodological diversity taught.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met

88% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 4.38. One student suggested a need for more theoretical and methodological diversity.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 4.88. No significant problems identified in this area.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met

100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 5.00. No significant problems identified in this area.

#### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 4.88. No significant problems identified in this area.

**Target for O7: Critical Thought and Expression**
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of student answers to relevant survey questions scored 4.0 or higher. Mean score of student answers to relevant questions totaled 4.88. No significant problems identified in this area.

---

## 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

### Theory and Method
Continue integrating theoretical and methodological components into graduate-only seminars, in addition to the required course in advance theory and method.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Theoretical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Theories of Religion
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond

### Theory and Method
Implementation of more theory-methodology oriented courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Historical Content Evaluation of M.A. Theses | Outcome/Objective: Research in Religious Studies
- Measure: Methodological Evaluation of M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Methodological Approaches to Religion
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Molly Bassett

### Thesis Timeline
Establish a prospectus/thesis timeline, with specific benchmarks, clarification of methodology, research plan, etc.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
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?

Adapting the process so exit-survey results match up better with specific 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.

More attention to integrating theoretical and methodological components to graduate-only seminars.

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 attention to offering graduate-only seminars, trying out various formats (team teaching, single weekly meetings, etc.).

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 pool is still a bit too small to generalize too confidently, i.e., it is difficult to tell if this year’s slight downward blip on theory/method is real, or mere “statistical noise,” which we will monitor carefully in the coming years.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Respiratory Therapy BS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Bachelor of Science Program in Respiratory Therapy major is designed for students entering the respiratory therapy profession. Our mission is to provide a rigorous and comprehensive undergraduate education in the science of respiratory care that results in graduates who have the knowledge and analytical skills necessary to deliver respiratory care to patients who have breathing or other cardiopulmonary disorders.

Goals
G 1: Division of Respiratory Therapy
Our goals for student learning include: 1. students become critical and ethical thinkers 2. students are knowledgable 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 Skills (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to: 1. communicate orally by presenting a patient case study to the faculty and their peers at least once while in the program which is logically organized and based on data found in medical records and/or oral interviews. This presentation will be graded by the faculty and 75% or higher score is needed for competency. 2. communicate in writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline through problem solving by addressing patient care plans in RT 3027. 75% or higher is needed for competency.

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: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy (M: 3, 4)**

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

**Target for O1: Communication Skills**

All students will achieve minimum grade of 90% on their assigned oral case presentation based on standard rubric used by the faculty.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

In Fall 2009, 13 students presented during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 69 (70 was highest grade on rubric) to 54. Average score = 63. Seven students out of 13 achieved 90% or higher. For Spring 2010, scores ranged from 85 to 99. 24 students out of 28 achieved 90% or higher on the case presentation.

**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 Skills**

Students will achieve a passing grade on a written assignment of a professional issue during RT 4075 based on approved rubric by CTW.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Thirty students completed RT 4085 in Spring 2010. Scores ranged from 50 to 100. 97% of students passed the professional issue assignment with 75% or higher.

**M 3: 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. Provided in web-based format. For this assessment, evidence will focus on one competency from the exam which on the test matrix is: Maintain Records and Communicate Information. This competency includes the following: record therapy and results using conventional terminology as required by the health care setting and/or regulatory agency; specify therapy administered which includes date, time, frequency of therapy, medication, and ventilatory data; note and interpret patient’s response to therapy, effects of therapy, adverse reactions, patient’s subjective and objective response to therapy; verify computations and note erroneous data, auscultatory findings, cough and sputum production and characteristics, vital signs, and pulse oximetry, heart rhythm, capnography readings.

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

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy**

90% of students will score 80% of higher on this competency.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

27/30 or 90% scored above 80% of this competency based on the CRT exam results.

**M 4: NBRC Written Registry Exam (O: 2)**

All students must successfully pass the National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC) Written Registry Exam to demonstrate cognitive mastery of advanced-level skills. Provided in web-based format. For this assessment, evidence will focus on one competency from the exam which on the test matrix is: Maintain Records and Communicate Information. This competency includes the following: record therapy and results using conventional terminology as required by the health care setting and/or regulatory agency; specify therapy administered which includes date, time, frequency of therapy, medication, and ventilatory data; note and interpret patient’s response to therapy, effects of therapy, adverse reactions, patient’s subjective and objective response to therapy; verify computations and note erroneous data, auscultatory findings, cough and sputum production and characteristics, vital signs, and pulse oximetry, heart rhythm, capnography readings.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy**
90% of students will score 80% or higher on the WRRT matrix item III.A.1 as determined by the National Board of Respiratory Care.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Four questions were on the WRRT Exam for this matrix item. Scores ranged from a low score of 1 to the highest score 4. Score of 3 was cut passing score. Ten students achieved score of 4, fourteen students achieved score of 3, seven students achieved score of 2, and one student received a score of 1. 75% students achieved target score.

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

**Capstone course**
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 Skills
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Instructor for RT 4085
- Additional Resources: GTA as a CTW assistant for office hours and other assistance for students.
- Budget Amount Requested: $2,000.00 (recurring)

**Case presentation**
Will continue to refine standards.
- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: All faculty participate. Program Director responsible.
- Additional Resources: No

**NBRC WRRT Exam**
Will continue to refine analysis of competency. Since this is the first time we have been this specific with an item on the exam matrix, will follow for another year to determine any trends.
- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

**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?

Changes made overall include the use of a more standardized rubric by all faculty. Students are aware of the rubric that is to be used for grading, so this has taken some of the subjectivity out of the grading process. Also, we have focused on one competency of the NBRC exams instead of the entire exam for possible improvements to the curriculum. These changes were made at the suggestion of the feedback received last year from the assessment review. We plan to continue to monitor what we have implemented for another 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.

At this time, we are not making any changes in the program or curriculum. We will be continuing with the changes implemented from last year.

---

Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section  
2009-2010 Respiratory Therapy MS
### 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: Critical and ethical thinkers**

Students will become critical and ethical thinkers.

**G 2: Knowledge of professional issues in respiratory care**

Students will become knowledgeable about the professional issues affecting the professional practice of respiratory care.

**G 3: Leadership and educational positions**

Students will become prepared for leadership positions in health care settings or for educational positions in academic institutions.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Communication in respiratory care (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 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
3. 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
3. 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**

1. Critical Thinking
2. 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**

All graduate students must complete oral presentation assignments in core master's curriculum.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In the past academic year, 4/4 master's level students completed assignments satisfactorily for advanced topics in respiratory care.

### 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 oral defense of thesis to thesis committee or directed study project to faculty members.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of the four graduates in the past year, one thesis defense and three juried projects were successfully presented.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking in the application of research**

At least 75% of graduate students will complete a thesis as opposed to a directed studies juried project.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

One completed thesis and two thesis projects in process during the last year.

### M 3: Understanding Health Policy in the US (O: 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 O3: Understanding Health Policy in the United States**

Master's students will complete the final exam in HHS 8000 which is a comprehensive assessment of Health Policy in the US with at least a score of 85% or higher.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Eleven graduates students were enrolled in HHS 8000 fall semester 2009. Scores ranged from 83 to 100.

## 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

**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

## 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?

Assessments are more refined due to an awareness on student outcomes. Expectations are higher for completed thesis work with an emphasis on communication and presentation of thesis outcome. Still need to develop rubric for thesis 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.

One additional statistical analysis course is being developed and will be taught for the first time in Spring 2011. This is added as part of the higher expectation being placed on thesis development and completion.

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

**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.

**G 2: Students will quantify and analyze stochastic risk exposures**  
Students will be able to quantify and analyze a variety of stochastic risk exposures.

**G 3: Students will determine value of assets and liabilities**  
Students will be able to determine the value of assets and liabilities and document various associated risks.

**G 4: Students will develop integrated risk management models**  
Students will be able to develop firm-wide integrated risk management models and identify and manage the limitations associated with the models.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Exams in MRM 8320 (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Selected student projects in ECON 8780 (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Selected student case work in RMI 8370 (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Selected projects in MRM 8620 (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: Exams in MRM 8320 | Outcome/Objective: Quantification and analysis of operational stochastic risk exposures
- **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: Quantification and analysis of operational stochastic risk exposures
  - 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.

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)

Georgia State University
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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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to the specified coursework in RMI 3750. A 2.0 average on all criteria was achieved and the target was met. Students demonstrated the ability to apply basic probability and statistics in a business risk analysis application, and to perform simple simulations, given a specification of standard probability distributions.

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
The MEASURE ONE RUBRIC was applied to the specified coursework in RMI 3750. A 2.0 average on all criteria was achieved and the target was met. Students demonstrated the ability to apply basic probability and statistics in a business risk analysis application, and to perform simple simulations, given a specification of standard probability distributions.

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
In RMI 4300, students will demonstrate comprehension of the risk management process by successfully identifying and prioritizing the hazard risks of a given business organization through the use of a risk mapping approach to risk assessment. Therefore, the learning outcomes assessment that relates to RMI 4300 is focused on the risk mapping exercises required in the course. An example of using risk mapping as a way to assess risk in a business setting can be found here in this report produced by a group of RMI 4300 students. For the current assessment period, the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC was applied to all risk mapping exercises. The target was met, as students, overall, demonstrated the ability to assess risk with a business operation. The following criteria met the target standard, with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3. No. 1 - Assess Property Risks of a Business Organization No. 2 - Assess Liability Risks of a Business Organization No. 3 - Assess Personnel Risks of a Business Organization No. 4 - Apply forecasting techniques to loss data to project the future impact of risks No. 5 - Apply cash flow analysis to risk financing options as an aid in decision-making

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

The MEASURE THREE RUBRIC was partially met with an average score above 2.0 but less than 3.0 for all of the criteria. However, for Criteria 3 too many (40%) scored a 1 on the 3 point scale. Our target was no more than 20%. No 1. Understanding the Risk management Process. 60 percent of students had a score of 2 and 40 percent of students had a score of 3. No 2. Applying Risk Management Process. 5 percent of the students had a score of 1 and 90 percent of students had a score of 2, and 5 percent of students had a score of 3. No 3. Making Strategic Recommendations. 40 percent of the students scored a 1, 40 percent of students scored a 2, and 20 percent of students scored a 3.

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

Assignments to include added focus on making recommendations and conclusions

RMI 4350 is a CTW course. Course assignments will be revised to focus more on providing the student with practice and feedback on making recommendations and conclusions.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350
- Outcome/Objective: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Martin Grace and Harold Weston

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The Mission of the Bachelors of Business Administration (BBA) program is to provide broad general education and the core business knowledge and skills to prepare both traditional and non-traditional students for entry-level position in public, private, and not-for-profit organizations and to stimulate in students a desire for life-long learning.

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.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 6: Ethics and Social Responsability (M: 8)**

Students will incorporate dimensions of ethics and social responsibility in their decision making. Ethics and social responsibility
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In Fall Semester 2008, 384 graduating senior students responded to this question, with 54% of the respondents indicating that they planned on pursuing either Masters or Doctoral level degrees. Another two percent indicated “other” post graduation “planned education” was in their future. Of those not indicating an interest in further education only 12% listed themselves as undecided (down from over 20% in the fall Semester of 2008). Only 30% of the students indicated that their plan was for no further education beyond their Bachelor’s degree. 2% of respondents left the question blank. In the Spring Semester 2010 graduating students were not surveyed as the RCB converts to a fully on-line system of testing and surveying graduating seniors.

**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. 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 demonstrates exemplary leadership skills.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

**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 demonstrates exemplary team behavior.

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made
M 6: Effective Analytical Skills (O: 4)

Students can 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 within 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.

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. 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. Measure 4 Effective Communication Skills: Oral Communication Skills Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i) Alignment of Material Presented with the Audience Student shows a weak ability to align the material with the audience in the presentation at hand. Student does not incorporate elements of oral presentation style and behavior in the presentation at hand.

Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) ii) Synthesis and Arrangement of the Content Presented Student shows a weak ability to synthesize and arrange the content in the presentation at hand.

Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) iii) Overall Effectiveness of Student's Oral Presentation Style and Behavior. Student incorporates elements of oral presentation style and behavior in the presentation at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student shows a weak ability to incorporate elements of oral presentation style and behavior in the presentation at hand.

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: Written Communication Skills Students can ... Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i) Alignment of Material Presented with the Audience Student shows a weak ability to align the material with the audience in the presentation at hand. Student does not incorporate elements of written presentation style in the document at hand.

Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) ii) Synthesis and Arrangement of the Content Presented Student shows a weak ability to synthesize and arrange the content in the document at hand.

Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) iii) Overall Effectiveness of Student's Written Presentation Style. Student incorporates elements of written presentation style in the document at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student shows a weak ability to incorporate elements of written presentation style in the document at hand.

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

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.

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 employ 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 shows 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 shows a weak ability to identify the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents the ability to identify the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student shows a weak ability to identify the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents the ability to identify the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student shows a weak ability to identify the problem at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents the ability to interpret data associated with the problem at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student shows a weak 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 a weak 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 an effective degree of accuracy. Student presents a weak ability to solve problems effectively.
use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to the problem at hand. Student shows very limited or no ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to the problem at hand.

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

**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.

**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

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**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.

**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.

**M 8: Ethics and Social Responsibility (O: 6)**

The students’ use of ethical and social responsibility considerations in the analysis and recommendations associated with a business problem will be assessed on the dimensions of the Ethics and Social Responsibility rubric.

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

**Target for O6: Ethics and Social Responsibility**

80% of students will be at or above the "B" level on the rubric scoring of the case analysis. Grading Rubric for Ethics and Social Responsibility Dimension of Citic Pacific case. A = 5 = Integrated, comprehensive, and dynamic analysis; one that is rationally supported and effective. B = 4 = Working toward "A," but incomplete, some inconsistencies or misunderstandings; analysis has gaps, could be more effective. C = 3 = Working toward "B," but with weaknesses in many areas, major inconsistencies, or failure to properly address items needed for assignment completion. D = 2 = Case Analysis turned in, little else; poor or no analysis of merit; lacking rationale or analysis; poor understanding of corporate governance mechanisms and little or no effective effort to remedy. F = 1 = Failure to do assignment at threshold level.

**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 in the material in 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 ethics 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)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Robinson College of Business MBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Analytical Decision Makers**
Graduates of the Robinson College of Business will be analytically skilled decision makers.

**G 2: Perspectives**
Graduates of the Robinson College of Business MBA Programs will incorporate, global, ethical and culturally diverse perspectives in their decision processes.

**G 3: Leadership**
Graduates of the Robinson College of Business MBA Programs will perform effectively as leaders.

**G 4: Teamwork**
Graduates of the Robinson College of Business MBA Programs will perform effectively as members of teams.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**
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

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions (G: 1) (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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Critical Success Factor Analysis (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE Measure 1 Students Can Analyze Relevant Questions: Critical Success Factor Analysis Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i) I 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. ii) 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 2009-2010 - 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 was consistent with last year when the same rubric was applied. The percentage of students with scores of 3 or 4 were in the low to mid 60s for all three, however, when averaged item i, the Ability to Identify Critical Success Factors had the highest average due to a bi-modal distribution of results which created a larger number of 4s and 2s than the more normally distributed items ii and iii.

**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 identify, and describe the opportunities for a firm's resources and capabilities in the light of the competitive environment Student has difficulty accurately identifying, and describing 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 all three sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

Students did not meet the goal of 805 scoring at 3 or 4 on item i with a total of 62.5%, however students did meet the goal on item ii with a total over 90% scoring 3 or 4. this compared favorable to last year where students had a comparable level of acceptable scores on item i but had only 56.3% of the students measured achieving a 3 or 4 on item ii.

**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 meets the goal of including all major functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative l Integration of global dimensions Student fully and effectively integrates all major global dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student includes multiple global dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative Student meets the goal of including all major global 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 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Results on the two retained dimensions of Measure 3 were encouraging when compared to the 08 – 09 cycle, although in both cases the goal of 80% of the students achieving a score of 3 or 4 was not reached. Only about 75% of students reached that goal on both items. In particular the Integration of Global Dimensions not only improved in the percentage meeting the minimum goal, but actually produced a left skewed distribution with about 50% of students scoring a 4, but with a tail that had about 12% of students producing “ineffective” answers.

**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.

**Law and Ethics**

**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 measures 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 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?

For the 2009-2010 cycle the number of measured goals and objectives were cut back to focus on a reasonable number of initiatives. The three remaining measures still contain a total of nine assessed sub-parts, but this is more reasonable than over 20 in the 2008-2009 cycle. We also revised the assignments that were used in assessment so that the learning outcomes that we sought to measure would be included. This was not always the case in the prior cycle. While the results were not any better in terms of meeting goals, they were more transparent. We were able to identify bi-modal outcomes on some items suggesting that some learning outcomes were not being taught to a threshold level for a significant percentage of students. In the 2010-2011 assessment cycle we will keep the same number of assessment measures and use the same rubrics so that we can begin to measure changes in teaching on student performance. Realistically it will be a few years before students matriculating through the program will reflect the changes 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.

Faculty members of both the threshold class in the program formats (MBA/PMBA 8000 and EMBA 8700) and those who teach in the capstone course of the formats (MBA/PMBA 8820 and EMBA 8710) met to discuss both the curriculum content and how it progressed on the programs learning outcomes from introduction onward. Changes were made in the cases selected for the capstone class and in the emphasis of concepts reviewed and enriched in that course. Future plans for new courses in the program that would allow further focus on the learning outcomes in the capstone class were also discussed. Specific implementation dates for the new course(s) will be determined in part by success in faculty hiring in the current AY.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Robinson College of Business PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

G 1: 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 course work, 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 8510. At the end of the semester, their performance is evaluated and they are assigned a grade of S or U.

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

**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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 School Counseling EdS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose overarching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents, to evaluate school counseling programs, and to coordinate the resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, program evaluation, advocacy and the curriculum of the school.

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)
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the tape presented.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the tape presented.

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 Satisfactory grade on the action research project.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the action research project.

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 earn a Satisfactory grade on the supervision session summary forms submitted.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the supervision session summary forms submitted.

M 4: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes (O: 4)
Students in CPS 8480 and CPS 8661 meet in small groups to analyze and critique each other's audio-taped supervision or counseling 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 O4: Participates in Learning Communities
At least 90% of the students will earn a Satisfactory grade on the feedback provided.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the feedback provided to peers regarding their supervision or counseling sessions.

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: Planned
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

Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty

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?

No changes have been made in the assessment process. The School Counseling faculty will examine the goals and objectives for the Education Specialist Program in School Counseling. If revisions are made in the goals and objectives, the methods for assessing them also will change. In addition, the rubrics used for assessment will be examined for possible changes.

**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 meeting the goals set by the School Counseling faculty for the Ed. S. program. This indicates that the data obtained from the assessment findings support continuing the current curriculum.

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 School Counseling program within the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University is dedicated to training professional school counselors who are prepared to use school data to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally appropriate school counseling programs that promote academic, vocational and personal/social success for all students. Our model for school counselor preparation is based on the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards for School Counseling Programs.

Goals

**G 1: Foundations of School Counseling**

Foundations of school counseling include the history and philosophy of the school counseling profession, professional roles and credentialing, current models of school counseling programs (ASCA National Model) and ethical and legal standards related to the profession.

**G 2: Counseling Interventions**

Counseling interventions include individual, small and large group and school-wide approaches to intervention.
### G 3: Social Justice, Diversity, Leadership and Advocacy

Diversity includes the cultural, ethical, economic, legal, and political issues surrounding community, environmental and institutional opportunities that enhance, as well as barriers that impede, the academic, career and personal/social development of all P-12 students. Diversity pertains to the effects of ability levels, stereotyping, family, socioeconomic status, gender and sexual identity and their effects on student achievement. Working as leaders, school counselors promote student success by closing existing achievement gaps, and influencing systemic changes for school reform. School counselors advocate for students' educational needs and work proactively to remove barriers to learning.

### G 4: Assessment

Assessment includes selecting appropriate assessment strategies that can be used to evaluate the academic, career and personal/social development of all P-12 students and analyzing assessment information to determine needs as well as the effectiveness of educational programs.

### G 5: Research and Evaluation

Research and evaluation includes knowing basic strategies for evaluating counseling outcomes and methods of using data to inform decision making and accountability. In addition it includes developing measurable outcomes for school counseling programs, activities, interventions and experiences.

### G 6: Academic Development

To promote academic development, school counselors work to close achievement gaps and use differentiated instructional strategies to teach counseling and guidance related material to promote the achievement of all students.

### G 7: Consultation and Collaboration

Consultation and collaboration includes empowering parents, guardians and families to act on behalf of their children, locating and coordinating community resources to improve student success, and working with teachers and other education professionals to create an environment that promotes academic, career, and personal/social development of all students.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Knowledge of Foundations of School Counseling (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: The Council for Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrates Skills in Counseling and Guidance (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrates Interpersonal Skills used in Counseling (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate interpersonal skills learned during CPS 6410 including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions, and closure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity (G: 3) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship (G: 3) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Knowledge of Indiv &amp; Group Approaches to Appraisal (G: 4) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### 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.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### 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.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### 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.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

### 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 exam.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a B or better on the comprehensive exam.

#### 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 the over-all area for individual counseling. At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the over-all area for small group counseling. Site supervisors will provide the ratings.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the over-all area for individual counseling and 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 Interpersonal Skills used in Counseling**
At least 90% of the students will earn a score above the cut-off score of 25.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students earned a score above the cut-off score of 25.

#### 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 80% of the students will earn a B or better on the multicultural experience/paper.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the multicultural experience/paper. 94% of the students earned an A on this assessment.

**M 5: Site Supr. Eval. of MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrshp (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 on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating 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 2009-2010 - 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

96% 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 on the overall area rating for classroom guidance skills.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for classroom guidance skills.
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 80% of the students will earn a B or better on Quiz 1 and 2 combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89% of the students earned a B or better on Quiz 1 and 2 combined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 on the overall area rating for consultation and collaboration skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for consultation and collaboration skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: 09/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty

**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 School Counselor Intern Evaluation Form was revised. Specific assessments are now required for the effectiveness of the intern in using skills (i.e., individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance, and consultation) to promote students' school success in academic, career, and personal/social development. The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) developed a National Model that emphasizes promoting student success as an indicator of counselor effectiveness. In addition, many school systems now require school counselors to submit a report that outlines what they have done to improve student success. Requiring interns to consider student success in the activities they provide helps prepare them to be practicing school counselors. In addition, an over-all rating is required for each area assessed on this form. The School Counseling faculty added the over-all rating to give the interns a better understanding of their performance in a general area, such as small group counseling. The assessment process will become much more specific and comprehensive because of new requirements by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). CACREP (School Counseling) requires assessment of standards in the areas of Foundations of School Counseling, Counseling, Prevention and Interventions, Diversity and Advocacy, Assessment, Research and Evaluation, Academic Development, Collaboration and Consultation, and Leadership. Assessment in these areas will occur during practicum and internship as well as in core and school counseling specific classes that students are required to 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.

The assessments indicate that our students are performing effectively. We will continue to provide the instructions and experiences that we now provide. Changes were made in the objectives for the required courses because of changes in requirements by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP).
## 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: Understand Development of Wellness, 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 2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**  
Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic skills 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 3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**  
Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.

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 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

### 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will understand responsibilities related to professional, legal, and ethical duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Effectively utilizes technological applications (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and utilize information technology effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children’s mental health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priority Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</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
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Internship Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2: Faculty STARS Rating (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3: Practicum Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Supervisor Ratings (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 School Psychology PhD**

(As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The GSU school psychology PhD is an innovative program that seeks to develop and amplify the role of the school psychologist beyond their traditional roles and functions. Training is oriented toward developing students who are proficient practitioners and researchers. Students refine their knowledge and skills in assessment, prevention/intervention, and consultation. Students develop a cognate that reflects their particular interests and intended area of specialization. PhD school psychology students are also trained to be producers of research.

**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, ethical, and social responsibility in 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
2.23 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 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 subspecialty that strengthens their skills as psychologists.
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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Diversity Awareness & Sensitive Service Delivery (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

**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

**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

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Science Education MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST

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

**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: 4)
Unknown

O/O 9: Can plan and implement science curriculum (M: 5)
Teachers of science plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards. They begin with the end in mind and effectively incorporate contemporary practices and resources into their planning and teaching.

O/O 10: Unknown
Unknown

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
M 1: Unknown (O: 5)
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of 6 students attended and successfully completed the safety certification workshop. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 2: Unknown (O: 1)
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 3: Unknown (O: 4)
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of 6 teachers 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of 6 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 5: Unknown (O: 9)
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

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**

**Target for O4: Unknown**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 7: Portfolio element:Curriculum Exploration/Analysis (O: 6)
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.

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

**Target for O6: Unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 8: Student portfolio element: Lesson Plan (O: 6)**

Demonstration of content skills through a lesson plan. The Content knowledge section of the portfolio focuses on candidates’ understanding of the foundations of science (NSTA standard 1) through the development of a Socio-Scientific Issues Science (SSI) Unit that covers a science topic of social relevance. These units include all lesson plans, assessments, and resources for teaching the unit. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric and met expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 9: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (O: 2, 7)**

Teacher candidates develop an SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of students attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 10: Professional Growth Plan (O: 3)**

Teacher candidates will submit at least three documents/artifacts demonstrating professional growth activities/plan within the last two years. Teacher candidates will be given choices in terms selecting the artifacts such as becoming active members of NSTA/GSTA (National Science Teachers Association/ Georgia Science Teachers Association), in-service professional development workshops, presentations at conferences, and publications in scholarly journals etc. Teacher candidates will describe what they learnt from their experiences with the help of a reflection paper. They will describe the artifacts that document their professional growth. They will evaluate their own professional growth, list their ongoing goals and design a plan to meet these goals. The professional growth plan and the reflection paper will be graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 100% of 6 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

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
- Measure: Professional Growth Plan | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
- Measure: Unknown | Outcome/Objective: Can plan and implement science curriculum

**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

#### Communication between faculty and candidates
The program plan to improve communication between faculty and candidates to better support and guide candidates. The faculty will host a meeting with candidates at least once a semester in addition to various informal interactions and communication.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** The faculty will host a meeting with candidates at least once a semester in addition to various informal interactions and communication.

**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2011

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### CTW Reflection 1: Definition
How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

#### CTW Reflection 2: Achievements
What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

#### CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training
How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

#### CTW Reflection 4: Assignments
How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

#### CTW Reflection 5: Overall
Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

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?

No specific changes were made in the assessment process while specific emphasis was given to K-12 involvement through peer interactions and reflections based on our action plans. There is no plan to change our assessment process in the coming 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.

There will be no changes to the program. All the candidates met the expected outcomes and successfully completed the program. However, the program plan to focus on improving communication between faculty and candidates throughout 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
rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

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

**Target for O1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**

One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 66% (2/3) or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Fifty percent of the students scored 100% (3/3 Far Exceeds Expectation Level) on this target and 50% scored 66.66% (2/3 Meets Expectation Level) on this target. Data show that half of the students exceeded the expected level on this target.

**M 2: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 2)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Science Education Standards. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

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

**Target for O2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning Action Plan for Science**

One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 66% (2/3) or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Fifty percent of the students scored 100% (3/3 Far Exceeds Expectation Level) on this target and 50% scored 66.66% (2/3 Meets Expectation Level) on this target. Data show that 50% of the students exceeded the expected level on this target.

**M 3: Measure for Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) (O: 3)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Science Education Standards. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of curriculum, social context, safe and orderly environment, and professional practice. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

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

**Target for O3: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)**

One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 66% (2/3) or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Thirty-three percent of the students scored 100% (3/3 Far Exceeds Expectation Level), 33% scored 83.33% (2.5/3 Exceeds Expectation Level) on this target, and 33% scored 66.66% (2/3 Meets Expectation) on this target. Data show that 66% of the students exceeded the expected level on this target.

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

**Clinical Practice**

Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 33% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 33% scored at the exceeds level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Measure for Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Implementation Description:
Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.

Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.
Additional Resources: No additional resources needed.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Effects on P-12 Learning**

Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student Learning Action Plan for Science
**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.

**Additional Resources:** No additional resources needed.

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Planning - Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**

Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

**NA**

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

**NA**

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

**NA**

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

**NA**

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

**NA**

---

**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 process has changed in that students enrolled in the MEd. Online Program in Science Education must complete three assessment pieces. These assessment documents evaluate students in the areas of planning, clinical practice, and effects on P-12 learners. As students progress in the program, they receive feedback on their work, make revisions and submit a summative assessment document. The summative document, an electronic portfolio, must be completed by the last semester that the student is enrolled in the program. Changes were made in the program to improve performance of students and to provide continuous feedback to them. During the upcoming academic year, the new process for assessing the work of students will be evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the new process. Once the process has been investigated, appropriate changes will be 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.

The assessment process has changed. Students enrolled in the MEd. Online Program in science will continue to submit an exit portfolio. In addition to submitting the exit portfolio, students will document their knowledge of planning, clinical practice, and effects of their teaching on P-12 learners. Documents in the three areas will be submitted as class assignments which may or may not become a part of the exit portfolio. These changes were made to improve student performance and to enable them to successfully document their knowledge of the three areas to be assessed.

---

**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**
**2009-2010 Science Education--TEEMS MAT**
*As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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 the needs of a variety of their learners.

**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 the 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 understanding of 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 understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

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

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 preservice teachers plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community and curriculum goals.
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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understands student development re: learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
100% of students have passed this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: School and Community Involvement (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
100% of students have passed this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Pedagogical Content Knowledge (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
100% of students have passed this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Reflective Practice (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Practices professional reflection**  
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
100% of students have passed this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Instructional Variety (O: 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>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
100% of students have passed this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Effectively teaches diverse learners (O: 10)</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>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students have passed this standard.</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 Practicum
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:** Effectively teaches diverse learners | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

  **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

#### Related Action Plan(s):
Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses communication skills and technology

  **Implementation Description:** Faculty member teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas.

  **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MAT Science Ed Unit

#### Concern over issues in the community and its assessment
Even though the portfolio data indicates that this objective has been met, there was conflicting data coming from the observations. The issue seemed to be that if a supervisor did not see direct evidence of this objective in the lesson observed, the candidate was given a low score on the observation. In the portfolios, the candidates were able to show evidence in the artifacts they provided of meeting this objective. The point needs to be communicated to the supervisors that this objective needs to be assessed in the larger context of the whole practicum experience and not within the thin slice of a few observations.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** School and Community Involvement | **Outcome/Objective:** School and Community Involvement

  **Implementation Description:** Certainly, the supervisors and faculty need to continue to emphasize this area of teaching practice. However, it seems important that the supervisors need to be given some guidance in how to think about assessing this objective. This guidance will be communicated by science education faculty, particularly the program coordinator.

  **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

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 key change in the assessment process centered around the evaluation of the candidate's use of technology. There were issues with candidates being scored low on this rubric element simply as a result of the fact that the school they were in did not have sufficient resources in this area, not because the candidate was not capable of utilizing technology. Supervisors were made aware of the need to take into account the available resources when evaluating this component of the observation protocol. As a result, the candidates have been receiving more appropriate feedback on their use of technology relative to the school context in which they find themselves. The area of focus for this year is with regards to connections made within the curriculum to issues of local importance. Last year's data indicated discrepancies between the evaluations being given in the observation forms and the evidence being provided in the portfolio. The problem likely is that the supervisors are focusing their evaluations on what they see in the individual lessons they observe whereas the portfolio provides a broad overview of a candidate’s body of work. What will be helpful to overcome this disconnect is to have the candidates show the supervisor’s relevant examples of bringing local / community issues into their teaching during lessons for which the supervisor may not have been present.

**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 noted in the response to academic question 1, there will be more discussion with the candidates about ways to bring issues of local / community relevance into their practicum experiences and, more importantly, to make their supervisors aware of such integration of these topics in the cases where this integration might not be apparent in individual lessons. This concern will be addressed in all of the methods courses taken in the program. We have put in a proposal to convert the IT 7360 (Instructional Technology) course from a requirement to an elective (along with other electives such as an ESOL option and a Nature of Science course). The use of instructional technology has become embedded in all of the methods courses required of students in this program and so there is less of a need for a stand-alone course (particularly given that the state requirement for such a course has been removed). If individuals feel that this is an area of weakness, they are still able to take the IT 7360 course, but for those that feel more proficient in this area, they get to focus on specific examples of how to apply instructional technology to their discipline. This context-relevant integration of IT should help candidates in the program better understand the pedagogy of using IT and not just the mechanics.

**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 is the purpose of the CTW initiative for your unit, and what changes have been made to the initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What changes do you plan to make next year based on the findings?

N/A

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Responsible Person/Group:** All science education faculty can help in terms of communicating the significance of this objective to the candidates -- which they have been doing effectively. It will be a priority for the program coordinator to discuss the guidelines for assessing this objective with the supervisors.

**Additional Resources:** None
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
We changed the admissions process and deadlines for MS student applications. We eliminated the May 1st date being unable to fully review these files and interview students when off-contract in June. The twice a year applications now are aligned more closely with our doctoral degree deadline. We will start the APR planning year in fall 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.

We will not change the program delivery or curriculum offerings for the MS in Social Foundations. We will review our program during the APR planning year in fall of 2010.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Social Studies Education MEd**

*As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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: Social Studies M.Ed. goals**

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Social Studies program include their development as: 1) Leaders in their Social Studies communities; 2) Creators of democratic, socioconstructivist learning environments for diverse students using appropriate pedagogical content knowledge; and, 3) Scholars of educational theory and research as applied to curriculum and instruction, and social studies education.

### 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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Learning and Development (Standard 3) (O: 1)**

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for learning and development (Standard 3).

**Source of Evidence: Evaluations**

**Target for O1: Student Learning/Development**

85% of educators evaluated will meet standard for management and monitoring student learning/development.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

**M 2: Reflection (Standard 4) (O: 2)**

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for reflection (Standard 4).
### Target for O2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

85% of educators evaluated will meet standard for thinking systematically about her/his practice and learns from professional experience.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the exemplary level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

### M 3: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5) (O: 3)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for professional learning communities (Standard 5).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O3: Participates in professional learning communities**

85% of educators evaluated will meet standard for being a member of one or more learning communities.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

### M 4: Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1) (O: 4)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for commitment to student learning and development (Standard 1).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O4: Committed to student learning and development**

85% of educators evaluated will meet the standard for commitment to students and their learning and/or development.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

### M 5: Expertise to learning and development (O: 5)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for applying expertise to student learning and development (Standard 2).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O5: Can apply expertise for learning and development**

85% of educators evaluated will meet standard of being an expert in her/his field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning/development.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

---

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

### M.Ed. Collaboration

MSIT is in the process of combining the master's degree programs in the department with the Educational Leadership department to create an innovative master's degree program highlighting the social studies as well as urban teaching and leadership with a coaching and / or leadership endorsement.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ad Hoc Committee
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Recruitment

We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1) | Outcome/Objective: Committed to student learning and development
- Measure: Expertise to learning and development | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Learning and Development (Standard 3) | Outcome/Objective: Student Learning/Development
- Measure: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5) | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities
Revise Portfolio Assessment

We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1) | Outcome/Objective: Committed to student learning and development
- Measure: Expertise to learning and development | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Learning and Development (Standard 3) | Outcome/Objective: Student Learning/Development
- Measure: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5) | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities
- Measure: Reflection (Standard 4) | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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?

It was determined that no changes were necessary at the basic level of the assessment process for this program as it was newly revised last year and worked well for students and faculty. We will improve upon the process by collaborating with the Educational Leadership program to design an innovative degree program which will encompass the social studies into a department-wide masters 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.

We do not anticipate curriculum or coursework changes to the program in the upcoming year, although we are collaborating to create an innovative M.Ed. which is inclusive of the social studies as a separate concentration.

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?
**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**

**SLO 1: Content and Curriculum (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
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 (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)**
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 achievement data to improve instruction; identifies students' stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality; communicates with families regarding student progress through required school and district procedures.

**SLO 3: Learning Environments (G: 1, 3) (M: 3)**
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.

**SLO 6: Professionalism (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 6)**
The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locates 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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Content and Curriculum (O: 1)**
Students' knowledge of Content and Curriculum will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 1.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
### Target for O1: Content and Curriculum

100% of students would score at the level of Acceptable or Exceeds Expectations on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

A total of 100% of students scored at the level of acceptable or exceeds on this standard. There were 52 students that scored acceptable and 1 student that exceeded expectations. The mean was 2.02 with a standard deviation of 0.14.

### M2: Knowledge of Students (O: 2)

Students’ knowledge of Knowledge of Students will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 2.

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

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Students**

100% of students would score at the level of Acceptable or Exceeds Expectations on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

A total of 100% of students scored at the level of acceptable or exceeds on this standard. There were 52 students that scored acceptable and 1 student that exceeded expectations. The mean was 2.02 with a standard deviation of 0.14.

### M3: Learning Environments (O: 3)

Students’ knowledge of Learning Environments will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 3.

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

**Target for O3: Learning Environments**

100% of students will score at the level of Acceptable or Exceeds on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

There were 50 students that scored acceptable and 3 students that exceeded expectations. The mean was 2.06 with a standard deviation of 0.23.

### M4: Assessment

Students’ knowledge of Assessment will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 4.

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

### M5: Planning and Instruction

Students’ knowledge of Planning and Instruction will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 5.

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

### M6: Professionalism (O: 6)

Students’ knowledge of Professionalism will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 6.

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

**Target for O6: Professionalism**

100% of students will score at the level of acceptable or exceeds on this standard.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

There were 53 students that scored acceptable. The mean was 2.23 with a standard deviation of 0.42.

### 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

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

- **Measure:** Learning Environments
- **Outcome/Objective:** Learning Environments

**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)

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)

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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Content and Curriculum
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Content and Curriculum
- **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)

### Classroom Management
The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl McBride
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### CTW Reflection 1: Definition:
How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:
What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:
How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:
How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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 portfolio is used to assess student practicum experience and also serve as a professional tool to showcase various student created coursework, lesson plans, and other important professional materials. The portfolio assessment should be a document that serves as an effective professional tool that students can use to illustrate their work within the practicum and also share with prospective employers. After reviewing the portfolio assessment, it was determined that additional improvements in the overall portfolio assessment requirements were needed. In the upcoming academic year, comprehensive changes will be made to streamline the portfolio assessment requirements in order to provide students with a complete assessment tool that serves as an effective representation of their 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.
Initial teacher preparation student survey data indicated the need for more instruction on lesson planning and preparation. In response to the data, within program methods courses offered, students will receive instruction on effective lesson planning. Instructors will provide extensive instruction and practice for students using the Backward Design Lesson Plan model. Students will be required to submit their lesson plans for review and feedback. University supervisors will also be encouraged to emphasize lesson planning within their evaluation of students' teaching. Planning and preparation are the initial steps needed for effective instructional delivery, and focused instruction in these areas will help initial teacher preparation students master a critical component of teaching.
**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 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.

This academic year, we have modified our undergraduate curriculum to represent a competency based approach to teaching, learning, and student assessment. This process started with a full day faculty retreat in August, followed by regularly monthly meetings of small faculty work groups. Next academic year (2010-11), the assessment process will be totally revised to reflect this new approach. While the School adheres to this new method, the impetus was a major shift in the Educational Policy and Assessment Standards drafted by the accrediting body of social work - the Council on Social Work Education.

---

**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: Values Ethics
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, 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 |
| Target for O1: Written Communication: Soc Work | Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

95% will report that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.

| M 2: Outcome Survey Q2 (O: 5) | Confidence in understanding the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly. |
| Target for O5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics | Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

83% reported that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.

| 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 |
| Target for O3: Collaboration: Case Planning | Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% reported that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.

| M 4: Outcome Survey Q7 (O: 6) | Q7 Theory |
| Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related | Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

83% reported that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.

| M 5: Outcome Survey Q8 (O: 7) | Confident to analyze, formulate, and influence social policies. |
| Target for O7: Contemporary Issues: Legislative | Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

95% will report that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Outcome Survey Q9 (O: 8)</th>
<th>Confident to evaluate research studies, apply findings to practice, and evaluate one’s own practice interventions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met</strong> 66% reported that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O8: Research Skills: Evidence Base Practice | 95% will report that they were confident or very confident on this outcome. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Outcome Survey Q10 (O: 2)</th>
<th>Confident to use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met</strong> 66% reported that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O2: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice | 100% will report that they were confident or very confident on this outcome. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Outcome Survey Q12 (O: 4)</th>
<th>Confident to function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and seek necessary organizational change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong> 100% reported that they were confident or very confident on this outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O4: Collaboration: Social Agencies | 95% will report that they were confident or very confident on this outcome. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Theory Late Life (O: 6)</th>
<th>SW 3340 paper on Life Course Development:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met</strong> 71% received a B or higher on this assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related | 80% receive a B grade or higher on paper |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: ComTape (O: 2)</th>
<th>SW 3610 Final tape in Communication course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong> 85% received a B grade or higher on this assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O2: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice | 80% received a B grade or higher on the assignment |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Field Com (O: 2)</th>
<th>Sec5 – questions on communication (Q1 – 5) SW4340 Final Field Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong> 95% achieved this rating by their field internship supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O2: Oral Communication: Social Work Practice | 90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Field Write (O: 1)</th>
<th>Sec5 – questions on communications (Q6) SW4340 Final Field Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met</strong> 95% achieved this rating by their field internship supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target for O1: Written Communication: Soc Work | 80% receive a B grade or higher on this assignment |
90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90% achieved this rating by their field internship supervisor

**M 13: Case Plan (O: 3)**

SW 3720 Paperon client case plan
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Collaboration: Case Planning**

80% will achieve a B or higher on this assignment

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90% achieved a B or higher grade on this assignment

**M 14: Field Plan (O: 3)**

Sec5 – questions on case planning (Q8–12) SW 4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Collaboration: Case Planning**

90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

92% were rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**M 15: Soc Agency (O: 4)**

SW 4280 Paperon Community resource management
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Collaboration: Social Agencies**

80% of students will receive a B or higher on this outcome

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

88% of students received a B or higher on this assignment

**M 16: Field Agency (O: 4)**

Sec1 – questions on Community agencies (4–7) SW 4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O4: Collaboration: Social Agencies**

90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

93% were rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**M 17: Paper Values (O: 5)**

SW 3320 Paperthat includes values/ ethics in practice
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**

80% of students will receive a B or higher on this assignment

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

90% received B or higher on this assignment

**M 18: Field Values (O: 5)**

Sec3 – questions on ethics (1 – 8) SW 4340 Final Field Eval
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O5: Collaboration: Values and Ethics**

90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

95% were rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship

**M 19: Theory Early Life (O: 1)**

SW 3330 Final Paper on early life
**M 20: FieldTheory (O: 6)**

Sec4 – questions (1 – 5 A + B) SW4340 Final Field Eval  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  

**Target for O6: Contemporary Issues: Theory Related**  
90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship  

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
93% were rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship  

---

**M 21: PolicyPaper (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% will receive a B or higher on this assignment  

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**  
73% achieved a B or higher on this assignment  

---

**M 22: FieldPolicy (O: 7)**

Sec4 – policy, questions (7 A +B) SW4340 Final Field Eval  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  

**Target for O7: Contemporary Issues: Legislative**  
90% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship  

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**  
87% were rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship  

---

**M 23: ResearchFinal (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% will receive a B or higher on this assignment  

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**  
91% received a B or higher on this assignment  

---

**M 24: FieldResearch (O: 8)**

Sec 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% will be rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship  

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**  
87% were rated by field internship instructor as having consistent behavior on this objective during internship  

---

**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

**FieldResearch**

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** TheoryEarlyLife  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication: Soc Work

### TheoryEarlyLife

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:** TheoryEarlyLife  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written Communication: Soc Work

### TheoryField

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:** FieldTheory  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Contemporary Issues: Theory Related

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

### Field Policy

An additional assignment is planned for the field seminar to help students in integrating policy related content in their internship. In addition, policy-related topics will be discussed in greater depth within the seminar to help the students consider policy as related to their internship experiences.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Field Policy
| Outcome/Objective: Contemporary Issues: Legislative

Implementation Description: This assignment has helped students integrate policy within internship settings. In addition, students have been involved with the National Association of Social Workers Lobby Day which gives them an opportunity to see policy in action.

Responsible Person/Group: Instructors

Orientation
Orientation to major

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: The orientation process for majors is being refined. This will help students make decisions about sequencing courses and expectations about progression of programs of study. At this point, we have developed a new model that is a hybrid of individual and group formats. This seems to be working well.

Responsible Person/Group: BSW Program Committee

Policy

Policy has been divided into three sections (instead of the previous 2). This allows for a lower student:faculty ratio and hopefully, additional attention to content and questions from students.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Expend additional teaching resource to have 3 sections of policy.

Responsible Person/Group: Director

Additional Resources: Assignment of a faculty or hiring of an additional PTI

Research

Summer Course

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Continue to offer research methods in summer with expanded enrollment.

Responsible Person/Group: Director of School

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?

There continue to be discrepancies between average student scores by different sections of the same course. The degree program committee is undertaking an analysis of syllabi to be certain that comparable content is taught across sections.

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 some courses (e.g., Field education) there is little variability in scores. The faculty is reevaluating the way that students are evaluated in field internships to be sure that instruments are calibrated in a way to distinguish between different levels of student performance.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Social Work MSW
As of: 12/13/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Critical Thinking (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Community &amp; Organizational Communications (M: 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate professional written and oral modes of interaction and relationship between individuals, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Community Assessment &amp; Resource Development (M: 9, 10, 11, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to use theoretical and empirical content to determine challenges and assets within community settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Community &amp; Organizational Development (M: 13, 14, 15, 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to formulate, maintain, and strengthen relationships and partnerships that build healthy communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Leadership &amp; Management (M: 17, 18, 19, 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Research, Evaluation, and Technology (M: 21, 22, 23, 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to apply evaluative measures, technological processes, and the management of information to understand and facilitate health communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Outcome Survey Q1 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Outcome Survey Q2 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: SW 8100 Proposal (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final proposal for capstone student integrative project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: SW 8900 Critical Thinking Eval (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation by field instructor on student performance within the internship setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Outcome Survey Q3 (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate with diverse populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Outcome Survey Q4 (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in using differential communication strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: SW 8800 Presentation (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student group presentation on their community project with a community partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8: SW 8900 Communications Eval (O: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9: Outcome Survey Q5 (O: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10: Outcome Survey Q6 (O: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11: SW 7100 Com Assess Paper (O: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: SW 8900 Assessment Eval (O: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: Outcome Survey Q7 (O: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14: Outcome Survey Q8 (O: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15: SW 8100 Proposal (O: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 16: SW 8900 Development Eval (O: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17: Outcome Survey Q9 (O: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 18: Outcome Survey Q14 (O: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 19: SW 8900 Leadership Eval (O: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 20: SW 8300 Papers (O: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 21: Outcome Survey Q11 (O: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 22: Outcome Survey Q12 (O: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 23: SW 8200 Research Presentation (O: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 24: SW 8900 Leadership Eval (O: 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

SurveyAssessment
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

SurveyConfidence
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

SurveyFacilitation
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

SurveyInfluence
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

SurveyPolicy
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

SurveyResearch
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
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Outcome Survey Q12
  - Outcome/Objective: Research, Evaluation, and Technology

SurveyTechnology
This course is a candidate to be restructured as a hybrid course (50% on line). 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Outcome Survey Q11
  - Outcome/Objective: Research, Evaluation, and Technology
**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 SSW has worked to more closely standardize content across multiple sections. In addition, the faculty has started to integrate hybrid teaching format to allow students to complete programs of study in a more innovative way. This is supported by the Department of Education meta analysis of instructional technology as "state of the art" for adult learners.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2009-2010 Sociology Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST

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

---

**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)**
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 774 students from 8 sections of 1101 (433 students), and 6 sections of 1160 (341 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 97% of students in 1101 and 87% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 81% of students in 1101 and 95% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues" correctly, and 92% of students in both 1101 and 1160 answered questions correctly.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Sociology BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. 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

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Technology
6.2 Undergraduate Experience
SLO 3: Analysis of Social Problems (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 2, 4)
Faculty assessment of students' ability to: A. to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems B. analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 Contemporary Issues

SLO 4: Communication Skills (G: 5) (M: 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)
Faculty assessments of students' abilities to: A. articulate key sociological concepts and theories B. apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems C. 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: 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 or Paper (O: 1)
This measure is derived from professors' evaluations of students' papers. 139 students in four sections were evaluated. Professors judged 45% of their papers to be excellent (a score of 4); 36% to be very good (a score of 3); 17% to be good( a score of 2), and 2% to be poor (a score of 1). The median score is 4, which is above our target goal.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge
70 % of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in the paper.
Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
86% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

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. Forty-six students (in 2 sections) were assessed based on their course papers. Professors evaluated 65% of these papers as excellent (a score of 4) at demonstrating students' "acquisition of knowledge"; 20% were judged to be "very good" (a score of three) in this area; 6% were judged to be "good" (a score of 2) and 2% were judged to be poor (a score of 1). In terms of communication skills, professors assessed 72% of students' papers as excellent; 20% as very good; 6% as good, and 2% as poor. In terms of demonstrating "analytic skills," professors assessed 71% of students' papers as excellent; 18% as very good; 9% as good; and 2% as poor. Forty-three students (in 2 sections) were assessed based on their performance on final exams. Professors evaluated 12% of these exams as excellent (a score of 4) at demonstrating students' "acquisition of knowledge"; 21% were judged to be "very good" (a score of three) in this area; 42% were judged to be "good" (a score of 2) and 27% were judged to be poor (a score of 1). In terms of communication skills, professors assessed 12% of students' exams as excellent; 23% as very good; 40% as good, and 26% as poor. In terms of demonstrating "critical thinking," professors assessed 12% of students' exams as excellent; 21% as very good; 42% as good, and 25% as poor. In terms of demonstrating "analytic skills," professors assessed 12% of students' exams as excellent; 19% as very good; 47% as good; and 23% as poor.

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

Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
60% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
61% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

Target for O4: Communication Skills
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their communication skills.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
64% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
61% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

M 3: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance (O: 1, 2, 5)
Professors' evaluations of students' analytic skills and critical thinking skills in Statistics courses. Professors evaluate students on a 4-point scale. Ninety-seven students (in 3 sections) were evaluated. Professors judged 22% of students to be excellent (a score of four) in their demonstration of both analytic skills (appropriate computer skills) and critical thinking (able to analyze and interpret data). They assessed 25% of students as very good; 30% as good; and 22% as poor in these areas.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Data Collection and Data Analysis
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of data collection and data analysis.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
47% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met
47% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

M 4: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam (O: 1, 3)
This measure is based on professors' evaluations (using a 4-point scale) of students' demonstration of "acquisition of knowledge"; their ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems; and their ability to analyze contemporary, multicultural, global, or international issues, based on their performance on their final exams. The work of ninety-five students (in three sections) was assessed. In the area of "acquisition of knowledge," professors judged 15% of students' work to be excellent; 27% to be very good; 53% to be good, and 5% to be poor. In the first measure on analyzing contemporary problems, professors judged 16% of students' work to be excellent; 26% to be very good; 53% to be good; and 5% to be poor. In the second (global)
judged 16% of students' work to be excellent; 26% to be very good; 53% to be good; and 5% to be poor.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge**

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their acquisition of knowledge.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

42% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

**Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems**

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

42% of the students were rated as "excellent" or "very good."

**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 changed anything. I reported on some measures in more detail than I had in the past.

**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.

Since last year, all our sections of 3020 are now also CTW courses. The "impact on our educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings" are really so far, nil. We maintain a high level of excellence in our curriculum and in our teaching, and none of these data have changed that. We have not found that the data gathered in these required assessment exercises tell us anything we did not know. Our statistics are pretty consistent from year to year; students' median scores tend to be "very good" across the board (with some variation, depending on what instrument is used for assessment -- for instance, in the 3020 course, students assessed on final exams did not do as well as students assessed on their course papers this year).
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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**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student is able to analyze and interpret data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

**Target for O3: Research Reports**

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.
### Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O5: Data Analysis
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O6: New Research Questions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O7: Written Communication
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O8: Writing Conventions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O9: Concepts and Theories
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O10: Facts and Information
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O11: Use of Data Sources
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O12: Social Problems
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### Target for O13: Global Questions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" by their thesis chair on this item.

### M 3: Social Statistics Course (O: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11)
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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O2: Analytical Techniques
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O3: Research Reports
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O5: Data Analysis
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O6: New Research Questions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O7: Written Communication
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O8: Writing Conventions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

Target for O11: Use of Data Sources
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
82% were rated as "excellent" on this item by the course professor.

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. 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
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Sociology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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)**
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)**
The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

**SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 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)**
The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

**SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1)**
The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.

**SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1)**
The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

**SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)**
The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.

**SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)**
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)
The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)
The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.

SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)
The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

### 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O2: Analytical Techniques
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O3: Research Reports
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O5: Data Analysis
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O6: New Research Questions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O7: Written Communication
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

#### Target for O8: Writing Conventions
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."
### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- **Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**
  
  75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- **Target for O10: Facts and Information**
  
  75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- **Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**
  
  75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- **Target for O12: Social Problems**
  
  75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

### Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

- **Target for O13: Global Questions**
  
  75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  87.5% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" and 100% of doctoral students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

### M2: 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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

- **Target for O10: Facts and Information**
  
  50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

- **Target for O12: Social Problems**
  
  50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

- **Target for O13: Global Questions**
  
  50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

- **Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
  
  100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.
### 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 Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met

100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**

50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met

100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**

50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met

100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**

50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target:** Met

100% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

### 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 had added several assessments last year, and continued with most of those. Some at the PhD-level were a bit redundant, so we did not use them this year. But we did add an additional assessment at the MA-level this year. We will likely go back to using more of the additional assessments created last year for this year, to see if they lead to useful information.

**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 and this year we’ve met (and well exceeded) all of our assessment goals for the graduate program. Nevertheless, we continue to improve the program. This year we are taking on the task of revising our Doctoral exams.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to provide students majoring in modern languages the opportunity to improve their critical thinking skills and to better appreciate universal humanistic values, help them to acquire an international perspective and equip them to function as global citizens, and prepare them for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business, through the study of modern and classical languages, cultures and literatures.

### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge of Hispanic Literature**

Student will understand the particularities Hispanic literature.

**G 2: Outcomes for the current period**
Previous assessments could not be completed successfully due to several factors including personnel changes in the Department, the complexity of the program and the unsatisfactory design of the original rubrics. After consultation with GSUs Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to Literature course, a requirement for all majors in French, German and Spanish. The new rubric for this goal was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment. It includes 4 weighted criteria of a literary text: Focus on Topic (35%), Literary Lens Use (35%), Organization (15%) and Accuracy of Grammar and Spelling (15%).

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures (M: 1)**

The student shall demonstrate a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Paper (O: 6)**

In Spanish 3307 (Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts), students wrote a paper whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).

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

**Target for O6: Knowledge of Hispanic Literatures**

We hope that students will be able to achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature. However, because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions taken for each criteria and in each major, and a decision will be made whether to assess a larger number of goals.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

In the 2 courses of Spanish 3307 (Introduction to the Reading of Literary Texts) students majoring in Spanish achieved scores of 8.1 and 7.9.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

Previous assessments could not be completed successfully due to several factors including personnel changes in the Department, the complexity of the program and the unsatisfactory design of the original rubrics. After consultation with GSUs Director of Academic Assessment, it was decided to focus on a single goal, General Goal 6, for the current period. The assessment was made in the Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts course, a requirement for all majors in Spanish. The new rubric for this goal, which now includes 4 weighed criteria, was redesigned by departmental faculty skilled in the science of assessment.

**Challenges for Next Year**

Because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions will be taken accordingly At that point, the Department will make a decision regarding the goals to be evaluated in the future.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

In the 2 sections of Spanish 3307 (Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts), students completed a written assignment whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%). The minimum score for majors in Spanish was set at 8.0-8.4 in their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. In of the section, students majoring in Spanish achieved a score of 7.9; the objective is that they reach a score of at least 8.0-8.4 in their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. The ones in the other section achieved a score of 8.1. Although this score is within the minimum, we are confident that we can achieve an even higher score in this objective.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

Because Goal 6 assessment is new and in its first phase, it will not be possible to identify accurately important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength at this time. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2010-2011. The results of both years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions taken. At that point, the Department will make a decision regarding the goals to be evaluated in the future.
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the Spanish language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Spanish speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the literatures and cultures of Spanish speaking countries, and in linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Research and Data Collecting Skills
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 will present the results of their research in a 12-20 page paper. Candidates have a choice to write the project in either their target language or in English, under the direction of their graduate advisor. 3. M.A. General Examination: After completing all course work for the degree, candidates are required to pass a written and an oral General Examination based on a reading list. Candidates in the literature concentration must be prepared to discuss all the works listed in their chosen areas both individually and in relation to each other and to the period in which they are written. The written exam requires candidates to choose three fields from Spanish reading list. 4. Oral Exam: For the oral examination Spanish candidates are responsible for one additional area of their choice from the reading list, one additional area based on course work taken in culture or literature, and the three areas covered in the written exam. This examination is scheduled 7 to 10 days following successful completion of the written exam. It lasts a minimum of one hour and is conducted by an M.A. Committee. Indirect Assessment: Student evaluations, annual reports, and teaching portfolios are evaluated by the Department’s executive committee.

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

Mentor
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
2009-2010 Speech BA
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 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.

Goals
G 1: oral communication
Students will be able to present quality information.

G 2: critical thinking
Students will be able to use critical thinking skills to assess information, relate theoretical concepts to practical experiences and to develop original research ideas about human communication.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: oral communication (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate the ability to: 1. Choose and narrow 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.

SLO 2: leadership skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 4, 5)
Students will possess communication competencies necessary for effective leadership.

SLO 3: processes, theories and research (G: 2) (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.

SLO 4: critical skills (G: 2) (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 gave a technical speech presentation.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: oral communication
Students will score 70% or better on the technical speech presentation.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 140 points (140/200 = 70%) or better on the technical speech presentation.
M 2: oral presentation (O: 1)

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students in Spch 3250 will present speeches.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: oral communication

70% of the students will score at least 70% or higher on the Competent Communicator Scale rubric.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

This was not assessed in this cycle.

M 3: research paper (O: 3, 4)

Students in the three major courses (Spch 3750, 4550 and 3050) write a research paper.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O3: processes, theories and research

Students will score 70% or higher on the writing rubric for the research paper.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

Scores on research papers from several advanced courses were collected for this measure. In Intercultural Communication (Spch 3750), 90% of all students earned 31/40 (70%) or higher. In Communication Styles (Spch 4550), 100% of students earned 175/250 (70%) or higher. In Communication Research Methods (Spch 3050), 100% of students earned 17.5/25 (70%) or higher. Writing rubric data was not collected in addition to these scores.

M 4: observation (O: 2, 3, 4)

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students in Spch 4400 will give an oral presentation of their research.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: leadership skills

70% of the students will score at least 70% or higher on the rubric for oral presentation of research

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

This was not assessed in this cycle.

M 5: group research project (O: 2, 3, 4)

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students participated in a group research assignment.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: leadership skills

This was not measured this year.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

N/A

Target for O3: processes, theories and research

This was not measured this year.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met

N/A

Target for O4: critical skills

70% of the students score at least 17 out of 25 points on the group research project performance.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met

89% of the students scored 17 points or higher on the group research project performance.

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
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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: research paper | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories and research

Implementation Description: Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

revise 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: research paper | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories and research

Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

revised curriculum/assessment
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: research paper | Outcome/Objective: critical skills

Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty
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: research paper | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories and research  
- Implementation Description: Early Fall 2009  
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
- Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: observation | Outcome/Objective: processes, theories and research  
- Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009  
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
- Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

**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 2009  
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
- Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

**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

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: group research project | Outcome/Objective: leadership skills  
- Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009  
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
- Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: group research project | Outcome/Objective: leadership skills  
- Implementation Description: Early Fall Semester 2009  
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009  
- Responsible Person/Group: Speech faculty
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
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.

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Sports Administration MS
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Sports Administration degree seeks to prepare graduates with professional skills and knowledge for careers in the $600-plus billion dollar sports business industry through an exceptional program inspired by excellence, vision, scholarship, leadership, and entrepreneurship. This program is one of only 34 approved masters programs in the country (out of 240-plus 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. (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate knowledge of theoretical and practical fundamentals of sport business management.
Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management; Sport Marketing Association.

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

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 3: Is familiar with legal aspects of sport business (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Students will be familiar with the legal concepts in those areas that they are most likely to encounter in the sport business industry workplace.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM); Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 4: Sport Marketing (M: 4)**

Demonstrate an understanding and application of sport marketing to sport business.

**SLO 5: Understands Administration of Sport and Management and Leadership Theory (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 3)**

Develop an understanding of management functions and leadership aspects in sport business.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management; Sport Marketing Association; COSMA

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
3 Collaboration
4 Critical Thinking

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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

**Standard Associations**

2 Outcomes of administrative support services (3.3.1.2)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

6.3 Graduate Experience

**SLO 7: Has work experience in the sport business industry (M: 2, 4)**

Student will perform work in a sport business setting. Work will be conducted with an approved sport business, supervised by an in-office agency representative, and monitored by a faculty member through weekly reports.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM); Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

**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
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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Can develop financial plans and forecasts for sport business (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Student will be able to develop financial planning techniques applicable to the sport business industry. This includes creating budgets and forecasting revenues and expenses.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM); Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

**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**

6.3 Graduate Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Socio-cultural Aspects of Sport (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students study the role and significance of sports in contemporary society, issues of a cultural nature, aspects of the human experience in sport, such as gender, race, sexual orientation, age, and disability issues; and the effects of and relationships with various factors, such as the media, violence, religion, and commercialization, on the sporting world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: , (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/O 9: xcontent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Major Projects (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. On any major project in a course, 80% of students will score a passing grade (80% or higher).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Papers (O: 1, 2, 3, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. In courses that require a presentation, 80% of students will meet or exceed a passing score of 80% as evaluated by the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A culminating all-essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content. The exams are evaluated by program faculty; each section is scored with a 0-10 scale. The student must average a 7.0 on all evaluated parts of the exam to pass. In a comprehensive examination, 90% of students will score a passing mark; exams are scored by specific professors based on subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 areas of prevention, management, evaluation, and rehabilitation of athletic injuries. The program also includes a research project in which findings will be presented at a graduate student symposium prior to graduation. 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**

G 1: Demonstrates effective Sports Medicine Administration
Students through daily participation, demonstrate administrative functions in a variety of athletic settings. Measured through evaluations given every semester on a 1-5 scale.
**G 2: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**
Students will demonstrate both practical and cognitive knowledge of therapeutic modalities.

**G 3: Understands importance of professional Development and service to the profession**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional development, responsibilities, and its importance to their continued growth in their chosen field.

**G 4: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation**
Students demonstrate knowledge in orthopedic assessment and injury rehabilitation.

**G 5: Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice**
Students will learn how to obtain, synthesize, and conduct research.

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1</th>
<th>Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice (M: 1, 3, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current research methods, including evidenced based practice, and are able to read and interpret current research in their field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2</th>
<th>Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students develop advanced proficiency in the acute care and management of activity related injury and illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3</th>
<th>Demonstrates effective Sports Medicine Administration (Draft/In Progress)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students through daily participation, demonstrate administrative functions in a variety of athletic settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4</th>
<th>Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate both practical and cognitive knowledge of therapeutic modalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5</th>
<th>Understands importance of professional development and service to the profession (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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</th>
<th>Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation (M: 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge in orthopedic assessment and injury rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Professional Presentations (O: 1, 5)**
To gain full understanding of professional issues, students must present a minimum of twice annually in a peer setting on a relevant professional issue. All

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice
Students will present twice a semester utilizing evidence based research and will be graded on presentation.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All 25 students successfully presented twice a semester providing relevant research.

**M 2: Acute Care Certifications (O: 2)**
Students will obtain either AHA or Red Cross Professional CPR certification and Red Cross Emergency Responder Certification

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2:** Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care
Certification cards for Emergency Response, First Aid and NATA BOC certifications

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of the students received their Emergency respose, first aid and NATA BOC certification

**M 3: Thesis or Research Project (O: 1)**
Students must complete a thesis or research project prior to graduation

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice
Completion of satisfactory research project

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
100% of all students completed an acceptable research project. There is room for improvement in the area of additional data
M 4: Clinical Site Evaluation (O: 4)
Site evaluations are performed twice yearly.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**
All students evaluations are 3/5 or higher or a meeting and intervention is scheduled

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students passed modalities with a B or above and passed the practical application exam with an 88% or higher.

M 6: Case Study (O: 1)
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

**Target for O1: Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice**
All students complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.

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

**Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation**
All students pass the sports medicine portion of the comprehensive exam with a 3.5 or better on two case studies.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All students taking the comps passed with a 3.5 or better. One student ran out of time and was given an additional oral exam.

**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.

**Evidence based research project**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Thesis or Research Project | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Shelley Linens

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Challenges for Next Year**
Creating a research timeline in order to prepare students for research symposium which will be help prior to graduation. Recreating the final comprehensive exam to be more practical for a certified athletic trainer with an advanced degree.

**Publications and Presentations**
All students will present their research findings at a graduate student symposium prior to graduation. All students will at least submit an abstract to either a local, regional, or national conference.
### Mission / Purpose

Recognizing that physical activity is vital for all people, the Department of Kinesiology and Health at Georgia State University seeks to: 1. Discover new knowledge and advance the understanding of the role of physical activity in attaining optimal health and well-being, 2. Educate members of society and prepare future professionals, and 3. Promote healthy lifestyles through life-long activity and learning. The Ph.D. major in Kinesiology is designed to prepare students for research and teaching careers at colleges and universities and for health, physiological performance, rehabilitative science, and related fields. Three concentration areas, Biomechanics, Exercise Physiology, and Physical Rehabilitative Science are available within this program.

### 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**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
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
4.3 Technology
6.3 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**
1 Written Communication
2 Oral Communication
4 Critical Thinking
6 Quantitative Skills
7 Technology

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
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

**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
1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Critical Thinking
4. Collaboration
5. Quantitative Skills
6. Technology

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3. Educational support systems that foster student access and success
4. Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
5. Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

### Strategic Plan Associations
1. Faculty
2. Technology
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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Priority Associations
1. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

### Strategic Plan Associations
1. Faculty
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>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Comprehensive exams and dissertation (O: 1)**

Students pass comprehensive exams and write dissertations that contribute to the body of research literature in the exercise physiology and biomechanics fields

- **Source of Evidence:** Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

- **Target for O1:** Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
  - 95% of students will successfully complete this requirement

  **Findings 2009-2010** - **Target:** Met

  100% of graduating doctoral students earned jobs as either university professors or post-doctoral fellows

**M 2: Research presentations (O: 1, 2)**

Students must present papers at professional conferences before they are allowed to sit for comprehensive exams

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

- **Target for O1:** Prepare for careers as professors and researchers
  - 100% of students complete this requirement

  **Findings 2009-2010** - **Target:** Met
All of the doctoral candidates/graduates presented research papers at professional conferences.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All doctoral candidates/graduates presented research papers at professional conferences.

**M 3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)**

Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**

100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

All doctoral students (n=5) that have taken statistics and research design method courses in 2009-2010 have passed the 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 skills in areas of specialization within their respective fields

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Seven out of eleven doctoral students have completed their cognate. The other four students are, for the most part, in their first two years of their degree programs.

**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 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Seven out of eleven students have completed seminars addressing grant writing/management and/or have written grant proposals. The other four students are at early stages of their academic program. Three of the doctoral students had their proposals funded.

**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 2009-2010 - 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 have developed a policy involving the annual review of doctoral students. This meeting is held in the spring semester and each doctoral student is required to submit a current curriculum vitae, progress report on course work and residency requirements, with special attention to research/scholarship projects. This meeting essentially addresses all aspects of the learning outcomes 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
- Understanding of research
- Measure: Seminar and professional development | Outcome/Objective: Grant writing and management

Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kinesiology faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
The development of critical thinking skills has always been a key component in our Kinesiology program. Our goal is to enhance critical thinking skills via involvement of students in research projects throughout their entire program of study.

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?
Annual review of doctoral student meeting in the spring semester. This meeting insures that students are making adequate progress in their program of study as well as address issues related to 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.

Other than administrative changes in program structure, little change will be made in the Kinesiology program based on assessment data. Key assessment measures indicate that the program is very successful in placing doctoral students in academic/research positions.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2009-2010 Taxation MTX
As of: 12/12/2016 03:58 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Taxation (M.Tx.) program offers a variety of courses that provide students with opportunities to develop research, technical and communication skills that tax professionals need to excel in their careers.

Goals

G 1: Tax Research
Students will be competent tax law researchers.

G 2: Technical Tax Knowledge for Practice
Students will be knowledgeable in the technical areas of tax law for professional practice.

G 3: Strong Communications Skills
Students will be effective communicators both in written communications and in oral presentations and will be able to document their research conclusions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: To develop ability to conduct tax research (M: 1, 2, 3)
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; and (3) The student should be able to correctly evaluate primary tax authority. The assessment method for this learning objective is performance on projects in Tax Research (Tx 8030).

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
2. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

**SLO 2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge sufficient to practice at a professional level. (M: 4, 5)**

Assessment is done by measuring performance on exams in key areas of practice involving entity taxation.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate professional communications skills. (M: 6)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to correctly and effectively document and cite research conclusions in writing and in oral presentations.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Identifying Tax Issues (O: 1)

Students complete self-tests on an electronic self-assessment website developed by Georgia State University. The assessments consist of four self-tests related to questions of fact and law and identifying issues in various areas of tax law. Assessment takes place in TX 8030.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**

Target Average score of 70 on questions of Identifying Issues.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Spring 2010: 71.90 Summer 2010: 72.26

#### M 2: Locating Tax Authority (O: 1)

Students perform online exercises designed to improve ability to effectively and efficiently locate tax authority using electronic resources. Assessment involves a series of self-tests to locate authority using different search techniques and different research databases on an electronic self-assessment website developed by Georgia State University. Assessment takes place in TX 8030.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**

Average score of 70 on Locating Authority self-tests.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Not Met**

Spring 2010: 59.94 Summer 2010: 59.56

#### M 3: Evaluating Tax Authority (O: 1)

Students complete self-tests on an electronic self-assessment website developed by Georgia State University. The assessments consist of questions related to evaluating tax authority located during research and to properly reconciling conflicting authorities. Assessment takes place in TX 8030.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**

Average score of 70 on Evaluating Authority self-tests.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Spring 2010: 74.41 Summer 2010: 74.89

#### M 4: Knowledge of Corporate Tax Law (O: 2)

Performance is measured by class average on multiple examinations covering detailed elements of forming, operating, and liquidating a corporation.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge sufficient to practice at a professional level.**

Final class average score of 80.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

Fall 2009: 84 Spring 2010: 82

#### M 5: Knowledge of Partnership Taxation (O: 2)

Performance is measured by class average on several exams which test the rules for creating a partnership entity, determining outside basis of partners, and applying the distribution rules to determine proper tax treatment.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge sufficient to practice at a professional level.**

Class final average of 80.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
M 6: Demonstrate professional written communications skills (O: 3)

Students are assessed by their overall average in the Business Communications course, BCOM.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Demonstrate professional communications skills.

Class average of 85.

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: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.

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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student 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.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

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 objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

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 objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

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 objective.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

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 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.
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development
- Measure: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning
- Measure: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development
- Measure: M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect | Outcome/Objective: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience
- Measure: M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: O5: Participates in Learning Communities

Implementation Description: Once the curriculum review process is completed, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Faculty and Department Chair
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?
N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
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
We have continued to update our assessment system using the LiveText portfolio system. Most concentrations are using LiveText for student exit portfolios. 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.

**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. 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 continued 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). Some Ed.S. concentrations have increased in enrollment, but the completer rate has remained low. Thus, the Ed.S. is being de-activated in 2010-2011.

**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?

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Once the curriculum review process is complete, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.

**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 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. However, for the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Once the curriculum review process is complete, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

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

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education. Once the curriculum review process is complete, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.
### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: O1: Research Competence (M: 1)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**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.

**O/O 7: O7: Teaching and Professional Development (M: 7)**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**O/O 8: O8: Technology as Tool for Inquiry (M: 8)**
The Ph.D. candidate understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

### 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated research competence in at least one paradigm. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning 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 achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated the creation of new knowledge and scholarship in their disciplines or majors. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an extended knowledge base in the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an extended knowledge base in a cognate area associated with the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated a developing professional identity through their contributions to the community of scholars in their field. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated leadership through teaching and professional developing in the major discipline of inquiry. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.
as a tool for inquiry for teaching and learning. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 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
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Department Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** At the end of each semester, faculty will submit to the department chair the following: (1) name of Ph.D. graduate, (2) graduate’s new position title, and (3) graduate’s new institutional affiliation. This information will be compiled by the chair and submitted in the department annual report each year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Faculty and Department Chair
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Assignments:** How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?**

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?

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. In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%). In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year). We will continue to document our students' job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**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 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. In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%). In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year). We will continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**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?

In 2009-2010, we developed a new department policy on Doctoral Student Mentoring to help guide both students and faculty in this important mentoring process. We plan to continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**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 indicate that our students are performing well in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program. In 2009-2010, we developed a new department policy on Doctoral Student Mentoring to help guide both students and faculty in this important mentoring process. We plan to continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We plan to continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

---
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**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 interdisiplinary field of urban policy studies (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of contributions of the social sciences to the interdisiplinary 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

**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

**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

**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.
M 5: Describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society (O: 5)
Student 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 by quizzes, in-class exercises, and examinations.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

M 16: Demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy (O: 16)
Students demonstrate 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

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

It is the mission of the Master of Science in Urban Policy Studies (MS/UPS) degree program of the Andrew School Young School of Policy Studies to prepare graduates for leadership roles in urban policy organizations and to provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to understand the urban policy environment and specialized policy areas within this context. In 2007, the faculty voted to also discontinue this degree program, replacing the emphasis on Urban Policy with a new emphasis on Public Policy, effective fall 2009.

**Goals**

**G 1: Understand politics and policy**
Students will understand the scope of policy studies with an emphasis upon politics and policy.

**G 2: Understand urban policy planning**
Students will understand the scope, purpose and practice of planning and how it is informed by demographic analysis.

**G 3: Understand urban political economy**
Students will understand the conceptual base for and development of public-private partnerships.

**G 4: Understand basics of research methods and statistics**
Students will understand the basic methods and statistics for applied research in the public and nonprofit sectors.

**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**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate ability to categorize policies (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to categorize policies in different ways.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Students will demonstrate how different actors are likely to influence policies.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate ability to use major sources of literature for urban policy research (G: 1) (M: 3)**
Students will demonstrate their ability to access and utilize the major sources of literature for urban policy research.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate understanding of different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 4)**
Students will demonstrate their understanding of different models of policy-making.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate understanding of history of urban planning (G: 2) (M: 5)**
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.

**SLO 6: Demonstrate ability to understand and apply important issues and techniques of planning practice (G: 2) (M: 6)**
Students demonstrate understanding of important issues and be able to apply techniques of planning practices in a variety of contexts.

**SLO 7: Demonstrate appropriate application of several models of planning processes (G: 2) (M: 7)**
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.

**SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of fundamental political processes and institutions (G: 3) (M: 8)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions at the local level.
**SLO 9: Demonstrate ability to define and identify market failures (G: 3) (M: 9)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to define and identify market failures.

**SLO 10: Demonstrate ability to identify and analyze methods of collective action (G: 3) (M: 10)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to identify the issues associated with collective action and to analyze the methods used to achieve it.

**SLO 11: Demonstrate understanding of theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth (G: 3) (M: 11)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth.

**SLO 12: Demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 4) (M: 12)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.

**SLO 13: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 13)**
Students will demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**SLO 14: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results (G: 4) (M: 14)**
Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.

**SLO 15: Demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers (G: 4) (M: 15)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public managers.

**SLO 16: Demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 5) (M: 16)**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.

**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

**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  

**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  

**M 4: Demonstrate their understanding of different models of policy-making (O: 4)**  
Students will demonstrate their understanding of different models of policy-making. This is assessed using the final examination and the second homework assignment.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 5: Demonstrate an understanding of the history of urban planning (O: 5)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 6: Demonstrate understanding of important issues and be able to apply techniques of planning practices (O: 6)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 7: Demonstrate their ability to apply several models of planning processes (O: 7)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 8: Demonstrate an understanding of the workings of fundamental political processes and institutions (O: 8)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 9: Demonstrate the ability to define and identify market failures (O: 9)**  
Students will demonstrate the ability to define and identify market failures. This is measured on the midterm examination.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 10: Demonstrate the ability to identify the issues associated with collective action and to analyze the methods used to achieve it (O: 10)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 11: Demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical explanations and solutions concerning urban growth (O: 11)**  
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.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**M 12: Demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (O: 12)**  
Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets. This is measured using problem sets and the first exam.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**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  

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques (O: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (O: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Demonstrate their ability to describe basic tools of government intervention in the economy (O: 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: Demonstrate understanding of the context of local governance (O: 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: Demonstrate ability to differentiate among the roles of different types of local government (O: 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Demonstrate an understanding of the principal actors in local governance (O: 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: Demonstrate ability to describe some contemporary problems of local governance (O: 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |
G 1: Urban Teacher Leadership M.S.
1. Students will perform as change agents in urban schools. 2. Students will employ critical perspectives in education. 3. Students will design, develop and implement action research in their classrooms and schools.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Students will perform as change agents in schools. (M: 1)
Students will effectively perform as change agents by positively impacting the culture of the school by facilitating effective dialogue among colleagues, administrators and community members challenging old paradigms of teaching and learning and creating new plans of action. These students will actively participate in creating a school climate conducive to change through a process of redefining roles and relationships, rethinking goals, developing excellence through planning, inquiry and collaboration. They will also engage in the politics of creating excellence in urban schools so that children from diverse groups will be academically successful. These students will also complete a leadership project which institutes change in their schools or school communities.

Relevant Associations: In standards for Programs in Educational Leadership, Standard 1.0 states that candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who develop a vision for learning for a school that promotes the success of all students. Candidates base this vision on relevant knowledge and theories including but not limited to an understanding of learning goals in a pluralistic society, the diverse learners and learners' needs, schools as interactive social and cultural systems, and social and organizational change. The National Board of Professional Teaching standards' core propositions state that teachers are members of learning communities and that they work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development and that teachers also work collaboratively with parents and engage them productively in the work of the school.

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

Institutional Priority Associations
1. Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.1 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
2.2 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
2.3 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
4.5 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
3. Interdisciplinary Programs
6. 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. Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2. Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
3. Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
4. Effective utilization of resources
4.5 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

Strategic Plan Associations
2. Faculty
3. Interdisciplinary Programs
6. 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.
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
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

Georgia State University
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(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 3: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives
Students should develop a basic understanding of broad feminist/womanist interdisciplinary perspectives.

G 2: Develop writing skills
Demonstrates the ability to analyze concepts through writing clear, concise, well-argued and well-organized papers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Critical Reading Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
Demonstrates critical reading skills through the ability to grasp the main point(s) and supporting arguments of an academic or narrative text.

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: Thesis Development (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
Shows the ability to develop a clear and coherent thesis that directs the entire paper or exam response.
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

SLO 4: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)
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

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 3: Writing skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)
Demonstrates appropriate writing skills through the ability to develop sufficient evidence, organize the material carefully, and utilize appropriate grammatical conventions for clear and concise writing.

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: Reading Response papers (O: 1, 2, 3)
Critical responses will enable you to expand upon your general reading of a text and delve deeper to more fully develop your own interpretive and critical voice. While you will demonstrate your understanding of the reading in your critical response, you will do so by crafting an argument about some element of the article or book. In other words, each critical response paper will have a thesis statement that you prove using evidence from the reading itself. Critical response papers should be typed and double-spaced, and should be 2-3 pages in length. In order to get a more nuanced measurement, we collected a set of reading responses from both the beginning and end of 2 classes (random selection, choosing specific students with both papers) in order to see what sorts of progress are made throughout the class.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Critical Reading Skills
On the first set of papers from early on in the semester, we expect that students will have about 1/2 with a score of at least 3, and 1/3 with a score of 2 or higher. On the second set of papers from later in the semester, we hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
One the first set of papers, 81% of students scored at least a 3, while 50% scored at least a 2. These numbers were higher than we expected. On the second set of papers, 100% scored at least a 3, and 75% scored at least a 2. These numbers, while also being higher than we expected and exceeding our target levels, also demonstrate considerable improvement throughout the semester, which we are pleased to see.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met
One the first set of papers, 81% of students scored at least a 3, while 50% scored at least a 2. These numbers were higher than we expected. On the second set of papers, 100% scored at least a 3, and 75% scored at least a 2. These numbers, while also being higher than we expected and exceeding our target levels, also demonstrate considerable improvement throughout the semester, which we are pleased to see.

Target for O2: Thesis Development
On the first set of papers from early on in the semester, we expect that students will have about 1/2 with a score of at least 3, and 1/3 with a score of 2 or higher. On the second set of papers from later in the semester, we hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met
On the first set of papers, 56% scored at least a 3, and 19% scored at least a 2. On the second set of papers, 100% scored at least a 3, and 56% scored at least a 2. Although these numbers do not always meet the target, they show a great deal of
improvement, both in terms of meeting basic standards and in terms of developing advanced writing skills.

**Target for O3: Writing skills**

We measured writing skills here with 2 elements on a rubric -- the first involves evidence, organization, and development, and the second involves writing skills on the level of the sentence, such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation. On the first set of papers from early on in the semester, we expect that students will have about 1/2 with a score of at least 3, and 1/3 with a score of 2 or higher. On the second set of papers from later in the semester, we hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

On the first aspect in the first batch, 88% scored at least a 3, and 44% scored at least a 2. On the second aspect in the first batch, 94% scored at least a 3, and 56% scored at least a 2. Here, students met expectations on all levels of writing skills. Once again, we would note that, while there is definite improvement, general writing skills seem to be the areas where students are less able to improve dramatically during the course of the semester. In other words, they tend to be more static in their skills.

**M 2: Analysis Papers (O: 2, 3, 4)**

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 O2: Thesis Development**

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

We found that 88% of the students scored at least a 3, but only 38% scored a 2 or higher. Students are therefore doing well in terms of average performance, but not in terms of superior thesis development.

**Target for O3: Writing skills**

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2. In terms of writing skills, we have combined 2 measures from the rubric: one involves evidence, development, and organization, and the second involves writing on the level of the sentence, including syntax, grammar, and punctuation.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

In terms of the first aspect (evidence, development, organization), 88% of students scored at least a 3, but only 13% of students scored a 2 or higher. In terms of the second aspect (writing on the level of the sentence), 100% scored at least a 3, but only 25% scored a 2 or higher. Once again, we can notice that students are doing fine when it comes to basic skill levels, but they are underperforming when it comes to above-average skill levels.

**Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives**

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

We found that 100% of students scored at least a 3, and 63% scored a 2 or higher. These numbers do meet our target goals and suggest that, as in the past, students are doing better at understanding theoretical concepts and utilizing them than they are at improving their writing skills.

**M 3: Final Exams (O: 3, 4)**

Students will respond to 4 out of 6 questions in 1 1/2 - 2 pages each. Each answer should address all portions of the question thoroughly, demonstrating familiarity with the material, the ability to utilize concepts to make arguments, and appropriate writing conventions.

**Target for O3: Writing skills**

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

In terms of writing skills, we used 2 aspects of the rubric to measure the finding: the first involved how well the students argued in their answers, and the second involved their basic writing skills on the level of the sentence. In terms of the first aspect (argument), 100% of the students achieved at least a 3, and 88% achieved a 2 or higher. Since these numbers exceed our target, it demonstrates that students tend to be more successful in writing exams than papers.

**Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives**

We hope that 3/4 of the students score at least a 3 (on a scale from 1-5, where 1 is excellent and 5 is unacceptable), with 1/2 the students scoring at least a 2.

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Here, we found that 100% of students scored at least a 2, far exceeding our expectations and demonstrating that this skill, the skill of understanding and utilizing feminist/womanist interdisciplinary perspectives, is very successfully communicated in the classroom. These high scores also provide credence to the notion that students perform better on exams than they do on formal papers.

### 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:** Finished
- **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

#### Rework targets
Since the only target that was not met involved the baseline papers, I think the important thing here is to focus on the improvement, rather than having targets for the baselines themselves, as we don't actually have any control over students abilities when they join our classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Reading Response papers | **Outcome/Objective:** Thesis Development
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**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?

Last year, in response to the committee's evaluation of the previous year's report, we added measures in order to increase the variety of the materials we assessed. For instance, we added reading responses to the analysis papers and exams that we had already been using. This addition allowed us to also evaluate ungraded shorter papers; we collected a sample of papers written early in the semester and those written by the same students later in the semester in order to compare the results and see if our instructional techniques were resulting in improvements in writing and reading skills. We are still working on increasing our data collection of personal narrative papers, in particular, to see if increasing the kinds of writing samples will allow us to improve our assessment. So far, while we have learned much about how writing and knowledge-acquisition are happening within the classroom, we are also realizing that the problems we have identified are persistent across all types of writing; to wit, students are doing really well at learning content, but they are still having trouble formulating clear and coherent theses, organizing and developing their papers, and providing sufficient evidence to support their claims in their writing. We also added an additional item to be measured -- increasing critical reading skills. While we believe that critical thinking and writing are inherently connected (hence the CTW initiative), we also felt that the importance of reading and critical reading skills can be left out of this focus. We realized that to measure what our students are learning more carefully, it would be helpful to also evaluate their critical reading skills. In particular, we measured these through the reading response papers and final exams, because these measures show clearly how well students are reading for main points and supporting arguments. In both these measures, students did quite well in terms of critical reading. This material demonstrates that what we should focus on is translating these reading skills into writing skills; in other words, students are improving in terms of how well they read, but we could still work on improving their ability to take these ideas somewhere in terms of formulating their own ideas and supporting them carefully and clearly. Also, one of our action items from last year was to develop writing instructional materials. As such, I have collated the departmental handouts on writing into a single instructional handout, which we began to use last year. Since these are so new, I am not sure how effective they are, though they are showing signs of being mildly effective. I think it is good for us, as teachers, to be clear about our expectations; therefore, I think it is useful to continue to work on these instructional materials, even if it is unclear how often students utilize them to improve their writing.
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 continuing to try to figure out what we can do to improve students ability to organize and develop their points in terms of writing. We are still working on implementing intensive writing instruction in the classroom. Many teachers are also increasing the amount of ungraded short response papers to try to further improve students' writing skills.
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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: 3)
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: 3)
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: 2, 3)**
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, 2, 3)**
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, 2, 3)**
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

**SLO 6: Critical thinking through writing skills (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**
This outcome measures general writing skills, syntax, grammar, punctuation; it focuses on the clear and coherent expression of ideas.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Final Exam (O: 4, 5, 6)**
In this final exam, students should demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives. Furthermore, we scored sample exams on their ability to develop and argue their responses, as well as their ability to express ideas clearly and coherently.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 1/2 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
We found that all students received at least a 2 on this measure, exceeding our target goal.
**Target for O5: Application of skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 1/2 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 1/2 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Target for O6: Critical thinking through writing skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
We found that all students not only exceeded our expectations here, but there was a high percentage of students who scored a "1" -- the highest score -- for this measure. We are happy that are students are writing well in the major.

**M 2: Creative Project (O: 3, 4, 5)**
The basic idea is for you to further develop an idea from class that you want to in a creative fashion. Presenting the creative project is an important point of the project; be sure you can talk about why you chose what you did in a way that makes sense in terms of the class. 1) Be sure to consult with me about your individual topic! 2) You may use any variety of artistic or creative means to present the project; however, be sure you can communicate clearly their relevance to the class. 3) I am not qualified to grade you on artistic merit; therefore the grade will focus mainly on organization and contribution to the ideas of the class. 4) Be sure to include an analysis of the complexity of these ideas. It should be approximately 5-7 pages. 5) Be sure that your analysis is focused and coherent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Organization**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
We found that all students achieved a 3 on the project, but only half received a 2. Even though these are creative projects, we should work on encouraging students to take the writing seriously here.

**Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All of our students received at least a 2 on this measure, exceeding our target goal.

**Target for O5: Application of skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
All of our students received at least a 2 on this measure, exceeding our targets.

**M 3: Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
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. We are including in this measure not only final seminar papers, but senior research papers as well. The senior research papers have similar requirements, although the standards are higher since they involve a semester long project.

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

**Target for O1: Research Questions**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
We found that all of our students received at least a 3 on this measure, and 86% received a 2 or higher.

**Target for O2: Evidence**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
We found that all our students received at least a 3 on this measure, and 71% received a 2 or higher, so we came in slightly under our target goal. Just as in the assessment of the core classes, evidence tends to be something that students have...
Target for **O3: Organization**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**
We found that all our students received at least a 3 on this measure, but only 71% received a 2 or higher, coming in slightly under our target. Not too surprisingly, we found that many of the same students who have difficulty with evidence also have difficulty with organization, suggesting that we continue to focus on writing skills in these classes.

---

Target for **O4: Theoretical Perspectives**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
We found that all of our students received at least a 2 on this finding, with over half receiving a 1. Once gain, we find that students succeed most clearly on this aspect of the assessment reports -- demonstrating theoretical perspectives on feminist/womanist knowledge.

---

Target for **O5: Application of skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
Once again, we found that all students received at least a 2 on this measure. Not surprisingly, students who do well on the demonstration of theoretical perspectives measure also do well on the application of skills measure.

---

Target for **O6: Critical thinking through writing skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**
We found that all our students received at least a 2 on this measure, exceeding our expectations. It is somewhat surprising, given that students demonstrated more weakness in providing evidence and organization; however, it does show that the focus on writing at the level of the sentence is rightfully separated from the macro-level writing skills.

---

**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: Fall 2007
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 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 added a measure to our data collection: creative projects. Through adding an additional measure, we are hoping to be able to measure students' learning across a wider variety of formats. In our assessment of these projects, we found that students' scores tended to mirror those of other writing samples in that they did much better in terms of demonstrating their knowledge of feminist/womanist perspectives and utilizing the skills learned than in some of the more "writerly" categories. We also added an additional rubric, critical thinking through writing, to our assessment of students' final papers. We found that students did better on this piece than they did on the evidence and organization pieces, suggesting that it is important to separate out writing on the level of the sentence from the macro-level issues about writing papers. One important point to note here is that on the senior research papers, which comprise a CTW class, students are required to have a revision component. Students, in this class, performed much higher on these aspects of writing than students have done previously. Given the sample size, though, it is difficult to know how much of the improvement is due to our intervention and how much is due to the fact that these students already had strong skills. Moreover, there was a higher percentage of students who received incompletes, and so they had two semesters to do this work, which also probably helps, though I do want to point out that one reason for the incompletes involved IRBs. Given that students are still having trouble with certain major writing skills, such as evidence and organization, we are planning to develop more instructional materials, similar to those we have used in the core classes. We are hopeful that these review sheets will aid students in strengthening their writing 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.

Even though students performance is consistently higher on exams than papers, I do not think that means that we should do away with the papers. Rather, I think it is important that we focus on improving students' performance on the papers. In general, students did better on these skills last year than they have in the past, which suggests that our changes to the program are helping to improve student performance. We came very close this past year to meeting our goals. Therefore, I think that we need to do more of what we are doing -- improving and focusing substantially on writing instruction in the classroom, including critical reading skills with the writing skills that we are teaching, and, when possible due to time constraints, focusing on revision as an important part of the writing process.
### G 1: Research Question
Students will learn how to formulate innovative and feasible research questions that will lead to their thesis research, and contribute to the field of women’s studies.

### G 2: Theoretical Frameworks
Students will demonstrate their understanding of, and ability to synthesize, a range of feminist theories and to employ feminist theoretical frameworks in their theses.

### G 3: Critical Thinking
Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills through effective writing.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 6: Research Questions (G: 1)
Students will demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist and/or womanist research.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - Written Communication
  - Critical Thinking

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 6.3 Graduate Experience

#### SLO 7: Research Questions (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist and/or womanist research.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - Written Communication
  - Critical Thinking

#### SLO 8: Evaluating Arguments (G: 3) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their ability to evaluate the claims, arguments, and chain of reasoning present in texts.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - Written Communication
  - Critical Thinking

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### SLO 9: Organization (G: 3) (M: 1)
Students will structure their papers and thesis proposals in a clear and coherent fashion.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - Written Communication
  - Critical Thinking

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### SLO 10: Overall Grammar (G: 3) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate proficiency in overall writing and grammar skills, including syntax, punctuation, and citation.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - Written Communication
  - Critical Thinking

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

#### SLO 11: Theoretical Frameworks (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of key feminist and/or womanist theoretical perspectives and apply them in their own work.

- **General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
  - Written Communication
  - Critical Thinking

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M1: thesis proposal (O: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

Students write a thesis proposal introducing their thesis topic and research question, charting the field of inquiry in a literature review, and detailing the methods they will use in their project. They complete the first draft of this thesis proposal in the spring semester of a required first year class, the Women’s Studies proseminar. We expect that they will be able to articulate a clear and innovative research question, and that their thesis proposal will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of key feminist and/or womanist frameworks in their literature review as they chart out the related fields to their research topic. We also expect that they will demonstrate critical thinking skills through their writing, organize the proposal coherently, and utilize correct grammar.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

We found that 80% of our students met this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Evaluating Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

We found that 100% of our students met this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

We found that 2/3 of our students achieved this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Overall Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Partially Met**

We found that 80% of our students achieved this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Theoretical Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2009-2010 - Target: Met**

We found that 100% of our students achieved this target.

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

**early intervention**

We have found that some of our students come in to the program with poor grammar skills, but it is not until they begin to write their thesis proposal or later that they finally seek out support from outside sources, like the Writing Studio.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: thesis proposal
- Outcome/Objective: Overall Grammar

**Implementation Description:** We will identify students who have particular problems with grammar in the first year, and preferably the first semester of the program, and refer them to the Writing Studio in the first semester.

**Responsible Person/Group:** core faculty in Women’s Studies

**Additional Resources:** none

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**increased focus in proseminar on RQ**

Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar spent a lot of time on the literature review and on writing abstracts, but not as much time on defining a research question.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: thesis proposal
- Outcome/Objective: Research Questions
more focus on writing skills

Last year we implemented a major change in our program in order to respond to many of the problems our students had been having progressing through the program in a timely manner. We added a required proseminar course in which they receive training and support about how to put together a thesis proposal. The proseminar focused more on the basics of putting a proposal together than on the mechanics of writing.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: thesis proposal
- Outcome/Objective: Organization

Implementation Description: The proseminar will incorporate more peer review with more focus on writing skills and organization. Core classes will also provide more feedback on writing skills and organization.

Responsible Person/Group: instructor for proseminar and WSI core faculty
Additional Resources: none
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? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The major change we have implemented in our degree program is to introduce a new required course, a Women's Studies proseminar, which is designed to help students gain training and skills to help them progress toward the MA degree in a more timely manner. We found that students had been getting stuck after comprehensive exams, without knowing how to get through the process of writing and defending a thesis proposal and, ultimately, a thesis. As a result, they now write the first draft of their thesis proposal over the course of their first year, and have something on which to build when they return in their second year. This major change in the program has stimulated a change in the assessment process (in addition to the fact that there was a change in grad directors since last year, which also provoked a change in the assessment process). Because the proseminar closely follows each cohort, we now use data from the proseminar to assess our program. After writing this year's report, it seems that I did not have enough measures. Last year, the proseminar had both first and second year students in it (since it was our first time running the course). As a result, we could assess the program across the two different cohorts, but we couldn't really assess different aspects of it. Also, this year we only have first year students in the proseminar, so next year's data would only measure findings related to first year students. In the coming academic year, I will include some other measure in order to assess the program in terms of students who are farther along.

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 came back stronger than I expected. They seem to support the idea that the proseminar has made a big impact on our students abilities. We will continue to fortify the proseminar, then, and try to make it even better.