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

Technical Accounting Knowledge

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

SLO 2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113) (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)

Students display financial accounting knowledge

SLO 3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210) (G: 2) (M: 17, 18, 19)

Students display knowledge about Managerial Accounting

SLO 4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310) (G: 2) (M: 20, 21, 22, 23)

Students display knowledge about accounting information systems

SLO 5: Taxation (ACCT 4510) (G: 2) (M: 24, 25, 26)

Students display knowledge about Taxation

SLO 6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610) (G: 2) (M: 27, 28, 29, 30, 31)

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Mean scores ranged from 59% to 94%. For 2010/2011, we had two primary objectives: (1) improve attendance and (2) increase the number of students who attend teaching assistant office hours. We did not have the success in these areas that we had hoped for. Attendance averaged around 75% as in most past semesters and the teaching assistants only had 221
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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Mean scores ranged from 53% to 84%. For 2010/2011, we had two primary objectives: (1) improve attendance and (2) increase the number of students who attend teaching assistant office hours. We did not have the success in these areas that we had expected. Attendance averaged around 75% as in most past semesters and the teaching assistants only had 221 student visits to their office hours. Given the 1,400 or so students taking ACCT 2101 in the MWF format during the 2010/2011 academic year, this number is much too low. The average number of students per week is just 15 which is exactly the same as in 2009/2010. Of the 221 student visits, 35% of them were from 5 students. We are just not reaching enough of our students. Spring 2011 was also impacted by missing two classes due to a snowstorm. We had to remove a few topics and juggle some of the remaining topics for that semester. Finally, one new item surfaced this year. The solutions manual has been listed for sale on Craig's List. This means that many students could be simply copying homework rather than putting effort into completing their assignments. All of these factors lead us to consider revising several key components of the course for 2011/2012.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Mean scores ranged from 54% to 82%. For 2010/2011, we had two primary objectives: (1) improve attendance and (2) increase the number of students who attend teaching assistant office hours. We did not have the success in these areas that we had expected. Attendance averaged around 75% as in most past semesters and the teaching assistants only had 221 student visits to their office hours. Given the 1,400 or so students taking ACCT 2101 in the MWF format during the 2010/2011 academic year, this number is much too low. The average number of students per week is just 15 which is exactly the same as in 2009/2010. Of the 221 student visits, 35% of them were from 5 students. We are just not reaching enough of our students. Spring 2011 was also impacted by missing two classes due to a snowstorm. We had to remove a few topics and juggle some of the remaining topics for that semester. Finally, one new item surfaced this year. The solutions manual has been listed for sale on Craig's List. This means that many students could be simply copying homework rather than putting effort into completing their assignments. All of these factors lead us to consider revising several key components of the course for 2011/2012.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Mean scores ranged from 54% to 99%.

M 5: Prepare financial statements (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)

Prepare the financial statements of a business with no complex transactions

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Mean scores ranged from 55% to 84%

M 6: Recognize Revenue (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)

Recognize revenue for a variety of business models

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 60% or more on exam questions

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Mean scores ranged from 66% to 82%

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data available

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: 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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean score of 70% or higher on a case assignment

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Recording Lease Contracts (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record the lease contracts of a business using professional accounting standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70% or higher

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Mean was 72% Students had difficulty with the material on the FASB's proposed standard on leases. Average score on exam questions was only 65%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: Record deferred tax assets and liabilities (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record the deferred tax assets and liabilities of a business using professional accounting standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70%

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Mean score was 75% Students had difficulty with loss carrybacks and carryforwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Record Pensions (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Pensions (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70%
Record the pension expense and liability of a business using professional accounting standards
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70% or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ran out of time to cover the material. Chapter was listed at the end of the syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 14: Record Shareholders Equity (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)**
Record the journal entries and prepare the shareholders equity section of a balance sheet
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70% or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score was 76% Students had difficulty with small dividends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: Advanced Statement of Cash Flows (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)**
Prepare an advanced level statement of cash flows with complex transactions
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean of 70%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ran out of time to cover the material. Chapter was listed at the end of the syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 16: Apply theory, standards and judgment (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)**
Apply financial accounting theory, professional standards and judgment to record business transactions
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)**
Mean score of 70% or higher on a case assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This measure was moved from ACCT 4112 to ACCT 4113. Mean score on case assignment was 80%. Facts of the case needed explanation in class. Students knowledge of the operations of a business was lacking. Also knowledge about where to find basic accounting and stock price information about a company was lacking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 17: 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 of 65% or more on exam questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean is 62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 18: 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 score of 73% or higher on exam questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean was 71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 19: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
Mean was 63%

M 20: Query Databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)
That students query databases to provide insights about business operations and performance
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For set 1, academic year 2011 least-squares means adjusted for student GPAs (73.6) were not significantly different than the mean for the prior year (73.5), 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), 2011 least-squares means adjusted for student GPAs (62.9) were statistically similar to the average for the prior year (61.3) and at the target level (62.2). Although students are meeting the learning objective, the Warranty Call Center case is showing its age. Therefore, I plan to replace it fall 2011 with a new case for implementing the learning objective. In the last year, employers and recruiters of accounting majors said their new hires, from GSU and elsewhere, need to be better skilled in preparing and using spreadsheets. To address this need, the new case will have two parts. Part one will be designed to impart improved spreadsheet skills including sound construction techniques. Part two will help students learn to select between spreadsheets and databases for specific analytical applications as it develops students querying skills. New targets will have to be set for the new case in FY2012.

M 21: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Academic year 2011 least-squares means adjusted for GPA (68.3) were not significantly different from the prior year mean (70.5), both of which are slightly below the target level (72.2). A new case, SuperSushi, was used to help students learn to prepare graphical documentation (flowchart and business process diagram). While it was not associated with improved performance for the learning objective, scores on its sub-parts were significant predictors of performance for the learning objective. This outcome indicates that constructing process diagrams, identifying errors in diagrams, and making inferences from diagrams are distinct tasks, each of which supports the learning objective for business processes. Even though they struggle to represent and use business process diagrams, they need experience obtaining information about business processes so they can document them. They need to be able to get such information from conversations because that is how they will obtain much information in practice.

M 22: 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 2010-2011 - 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). More guidance at first for tasks requiring critical thinking helps students perform better. Although students will need to learn to design databases for new situations, many of them would prefer to memorize information from a textbook rather than make sense of ambiguous situations.

M 23: 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 2010-2011 - 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. Students struggle with evaluating internal control due to several aspects: its unstructured nature, the cumulative nature of the required expertise, and its positioning at the end of the course. The cumulative aspect of the required expertise surprises many students. Some students tend to confuse processes and controls, which becomes apparent when they create graphical representations of business processes. They need practice distinguishing between them. Students also have difficulty identifying control weaknesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 24: Identify Tax issues (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)</td>
<td>Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns</td>
<td>Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 25: Select and Apply Tax Laws (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)</td>
<td>Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns</td>
<td>Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 26: Make Investment Decisions using Tax Law (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)</td>
<td>Make investment decisions requiring knowledge of the tax law and its effect</td>
<td>Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 27: Differentiate among the various types of auditing (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</td>
<td>Differentiate among the various types of auditing and the procedures applied on the financial statements audits and audits of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting</td>
<td>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>76.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 28: Evaluate the components of audit risk (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</td>
<td>Evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified</td>
<td>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 29: Apply the opinion formulation process (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</td>
<td>Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process</td>
<td>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>74.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 30: Understand evaluate the auditor’s responsibility (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</td>
<td>Understand and evaluate the auditor’s responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled</td>
<td>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean of 72.5% or higher on exam questions

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Mean was 85.48%

**M 31: 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 72.5% or higher on team project

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Mean 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

**ACCT 4210**

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.

### 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
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
**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.

**Excel Assignments**
Students do not practice problem solving sufficiently. We have added some homework MS Excel assignments to address this issue and concerns regarding students MS Excel skills.

**Excel Assignments**
Students do not practice problem solving sufficiently. We have added some homework MS Excel assignments to address this issue and concerns regarding students MS Excel skills.

**Excel Assignments**
Students do not practice problem solving sufficiently. We have added some homework MS Excel assignments to address this issue and concerns regarding students MS Excel skills.

**Explain case facts in class**
Continue to explain the facts of the case in class and guide students on where to find accounting and finance information about a company.

**Hand grade large problem**
One of the four areas targeted last year was still below the 60% correct target and will be reviewed for extra attention in the upcoming year (see highlighted rows). The full accounting cycle problem was a set of five MC questions in Spring 2001 so one error could throw off multiple questions. Prior semesters the large problem was hand graded with partial credit. The scores are not comparable. It is suggested that the large problem be handed graded due to the all-or-nothing nature of MC questions for large dependent computations. This course will be expanded to three credits, from two credits, and so the assessments going forward will add two new chapters with no history.
Hand grade large problem
One of the four areas targeted last year was still below the 60% correct target and will be reviewed for extra attention in the upcoming year (see highlighted rows). The full accounting cycle problem was a set of five MC questions in Spring 2001 so one error could throw off multiple questions. Prior semesters the large problem was hand graded with partial credit. The scores are not comparable. It is suggested that the large problem be handed graded due to the all-or-nothing nature of MC questions for large dependent computations. This course will be expanded to three credits, from two credits, and so the assessments going forward will add two new chapters with no history.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Recognize Revenue (ACCT 4111) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Taewoo Park

Hand grade large problem
One of the four areas targeted last year was still below the 60% correct target and will be reviewed for extra attention in the upcoming year (see highlighted rows). The full accounting cycle problem was a set of five MC questions in Spring 2001 so one error could throw off multiple questions. Prior semesters the large problem was hand graded with partial credit. The scores are not comparable. It is suggested that the large problem be handed graded due to the all-or-nothing nature of MC questions for large dependent computations. This course will be expanded to three credits, from two credits, and so the assessments going forward will add two new chapters with no history.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Prepare financial statements (ACCT 4111) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Taewoo Park

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: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluate Internal Control (ACCT 4310) | Outcome/Objective: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Borthick

Practice problem on loss carrybacks and carryforwards
Do a practice problem in class with loss carrybacks and loss carryforwards

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Record deferred tax assets and liabilities (ACCT 4113) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Proposed FASB standard
Develop detailed Powerpoint slides on the FASB's proposed standard on leases

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Recording Lease Contracts (ACCT 4113) | Outcome/Objective: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Refine Chris Notes
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: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
For academic year 2011/2012, we are making some radical changes to the course. Our goals will be the same as in 2010/2011, but our method of achieving those goals will be drastically different. First, we will teach the large section classes in a two day a week format rather than a three day a week format. This allows all students to see only one instructor for acct 2101 rather than an instructor and a teaching assistant. It also cuts down on the number of times students need to come to class. We will encourage students to come to class and participate with response pads by increasing their worth in the course to 15% of total course points by eliminating the homework grading component. Second, we will create an accounting lab that will be open approximately 35 hours per week. In the past, the teaching assistants have had Friday teaching commitments so were only able to hold 15 hours of office hours each week. We hope that this change from "TA office hours" to "accounting lab hours" will sound more inviting to our students and allow them to get help regardless of their schedule.

Two day a week format and accounting lab

For academic year 2011/2012, we are making some radical changes to the course. Our goals will be the same as in 2010/2011, but our method of achieving those goals will be drastically different. First, we will teach the large section classes in a two day a week format rather than a three day a week format. This allows all students to see only one instructor for acct 2101 rather than an instructor and a teaching assistant. It also cuts down on the number of times students need to come to class. We will encourage students to come to class and participate with response pads by increasing their worth in the course to 15% of total course points by eliminating the homework grading component. Second, we will create an accounting lab that will be open approximately 35 hours per week. In the past, the teaching assistants have had Friday teaching commitments so were only able to hold 15 hours of office hours each week. We hope that this change from "TA office hours" to "accounting lab hours" will sound more inviting to our students and allow them to get help regardless of their schedule.

Two day a week format and accounting lab

For academic year 2011/2012, we are making some radical changes to the course. Our goals will be the same as in 2010/2011, but our method of achieving those goals will be drastically different. First, we will teach the large section classes in a two day a week format rather than a three day a week format. This allows all students to see only one instructor for acct 2101 rather than an instructor and a teaching assistant. It also cuts down on the number of times students need to come to class. We will encourage students to come to class and participate with response pads by increasing their worth in the course to 15% of total course points by eliminating the homework grading component. Second, we will create an accounting lab that will be open approximately 35 hours per week. In the past, the teaching assistants have had Friday teaching commitments so were only able to hold 15 hours of office hours each week. We hope that this change from "TA office hours" to "accounting lab hours" will sound more inviting to our students and allow them to get help regardless of their schedule.
each week. We hope that this change from “TA office hours” to “accounting lab hours” will sound more inviting to our students and allow them to get help regardless of their schedule.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
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: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Accountancy PhD**

_(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST)_

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Develop in graduates a high level of confidence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring (1) training in theory, (2) training in general research techniques as well as research techniques specific to a discipline, (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues, and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

---

**Goals**

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

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

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

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

**G 3: Research competence**

Students should be able to conduct original research individually.

**G 4: Placement**

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

**G 5: Teaching competency**

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

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Comprehensive exams (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Successful completion of comprehensive examinations as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.

**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.

**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.

**SLO 4: Research presentations (G: 2) (M: 4)**

Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.

**SLO 5: Dissertation defense (G: 3) (M: 5)**

Successful defense of the dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.

**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.

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

**SLO 9: Placement - teaching (G: 5) (M: 9)**

Students will place in institutions where the teaching skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Comprehensive exams (O: 1)**

Successful completion of comprehensive examinations as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive exams**

80% of students will pass comprehensive exams.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Of students taking the comprehensive exam in the past five years, 89% have passed.

**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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All current students have taken Critical Analysis seminar in each year of the first three years of their programs. Workshops are monitored and students beyond the first year are prodded for comments when necessary.

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

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

**Target for O3: Collaborative research activity**

Seventy-five percent of students will have a project with faculty member(s) by their third year in the program. Fifty percent will have a paper published or in the publication process by the end of their program.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Of the four students in their third year or beyond in 2010-2011, three have research projects with faculty members, which meets our target rate of 75%. Of the seven graduates in the past six years, four had co-authored papers published or in the publication process, for a rate of 57%. This meets our target of 50%.

**M 4: Research presentations (O: 4)**

Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Research presentations**

All students beyond the second year will have presented their research at internal workshops. 50% of graduating students will have presented a research paper at a research conference.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students beyond the second year have presented a least one research project internally. Of the students who have graduated in the past six years, five (71%) had presented a research paper externally at a research conference.

**M 5: Dissertation Defense (O: 5)**

Successful defense of the dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O5: Dissertation defense**

100% of students who attain ABD status will successfully defend their dissertations before a faculty committee; 75% on their first attempt.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of graduates in the past six years defended their dissertations on the first attempt. All ABD students are currently on track to propose and defend their dissertations.

**M 6: Initial placements - research (O: 6)**

Students will accept positions at research institutions, preferably at schools offering doctoral degrees in accounting.
**Target for O6: Initial placements - research**

At least 50% of graduating students will place at research institutions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Of the seven students who graduated in the past six years, four (57%) have placed at research-focused universities, which meets our target of at least 50%.

---

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

Successful completion of 9200, Seminar in University Teaching.

**Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other**

**Target for O7: Teaching - training**

100% of students will complete the seminar on teaching (9200) in their first year of the program.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students who entered the program in the past five years have completed the seminar in their first semester.

---

**M 8: Teaching - competency (O: 8)**

Students will develop their teaching competency by teaching and obtaining feedback via SEIPs.

**Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made**

**Target for O8: Teaching - competency**

All students will teach during their programs. 50% will teach an upper division course before graduating. All students will achieve a minimin average overall effectiveness rating of 4.0 in semesters beyond the first one that they teach. 60% of students will achieve overall effectiveness ratings of at least 4.2 before graduating.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

All students currently in the program have taught, which meets our target. All graduating students taught an upper-level course, which meets our target. Of the seven students who taught (beyond their first experience) during 2010-2011, two students did not attain an overall average effectiveness rating of 4.0, which does not meet our target. All students teaching beyond the second year have attained an average of 4.2 or above in at least one section, but only 33% are consistently at or above 4.2. These two outcomes together, indicate that we are only partially achieving this target.

---

**M 9: Placement - teaching (O: 9)**

Students will place in institutions where the teaching skills learned in the program will be used and developed further.

**Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas**

**Target for O9: Placement - teaching**

80% of graduates will place at institutions with AACSB accreditation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All graduates in the past six years have placed in AACSB accredited business schools, which meets our target.

---

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

#### Improve Teaching Effectiveness

International students tend to have the most challenge with SEIPs. All students, especially international students, are encouraged to observe the teaching of our most effective faculty and PhD students before they teach their first course. SEIPs are reviewed for each student. Any student who continually achieves ratings below 4.0 is required (rather than encouraged) to observe other faculty in the classroom as well as receive feedback from a faculty mentor. Students with average SEIPs below 4.2 are encouraged to observe other faculty and receive feedback from a faculty mentor.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Teaching - competency | Outcome/Objective: Teaching - competency

- **Implementation Description:** Beginning of the Fall 2010 semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2012
- **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

---

**Improve research collaborations**

We are meeting both our target of 50% published/submitted papers by graduation and 75% collaborative research projects for current third year and more senior students. We implemented the second year paper requirement for students admitted in 2006 in part to stimulate collaborative research. Students who have elected to pursue more of a teaching rather than research focus have tended to turn these projects into their dissertations rather than a separate, collaborative paper with faculty. Other students have been successful at using this requirement to build their research portfolios. We will continue to encourage and monitor collaborative research activity. Although we are meeting our targets, comparisons with peer and aspiration schools show that our students teach much more than students at these schools. Discussions with students indicate that teaching interferes with their ability to develop a competitive research portfolio. To address this, we are restructuring the stipends effective with students admitted in 2010 to shift the stipends toward RA and from TA.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Research with faculty
  - Outcome/Objective: Collaborative research activity

---

**pass rate on comprehensive exams**

We are meeting our target pass rate on comprehensive exams. No action is required at this time.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Comprehensive exams
  - Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive exams

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Actuarial Science BBA**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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.

**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.
### 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.

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

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

#### M 2: Selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2, 3)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in RMI 3750 Probability Theory and Simulation Analysis in Risk Management an understanding of the sources of uncertainty in a business application.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

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

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

#### M 3: Identified Exam Questions in AS 4230 (O: 3)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on identified exam questions in AS 4230 Theory of Interest and understanding of the basic concept of compound theory of interest and the term structure of interest rates.

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

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

#### M 4: Completion of first 2 professional actuarial exams (O: 4)
BBA-AS graduates will have passed the first two professional exams offered by the Society of Actuaries and the Casualty Actuarial Society: Exam P – Probability and Exam FM – Financial Economics.

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

**Target for O4: Completion of first two actuarial exams**
70% of our BBA-AS graduates will have taken and passed both Exam P – Probability and Exam FM – Financial Economics by the time they finish the program.

### 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.
Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2010-2011 Actuarial Science MAS

As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

**Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation**

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

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

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

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

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

**Target for O3: Concepts of Liability Risk Evaluation**

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

**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.

**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.

**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.

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

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

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

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

**Projected Completion Date**: 08/2012

**Responsible Person/Group**: Shaun Wang and MAS Assessment Group

**Additional Resources**: None
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
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
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
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Shaun Wang

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 African American Studies Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

Students will be able to make connections between the African American experience and larger events in the community and world.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Outcome: Three reviewers received a random sample of nine papers (one quarter) from the course. Of the nine papers reviewed 88% of the students scored a rating of 3 or above indicating that the paper reflected a careful reading and understanding of the material; focused on a careful critique of the material, as opposed to a restatement of what the author had stated.

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A panel of three reviewers assessed a random sample of nine student papers for appropriate punctuation, grammar, syntax, and formatting. Over 92% of the students papers received a rating of 3 or above indicating that a majority of the papers were clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax; were typed, containing no greater than 12 point font, double-spaced, no more than one-inch margins, and minimum three full pages of text; and included a reference page if sources other than those assigned were used.

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

Monitor current outcomes for trends
The instructor will monitor the current outcomes to assess if there are trends based on student demographics (e.g. major, minor, gender, age, etc).

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Enrollment data will be exported from class into SPSS for descriptive analysis.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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

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

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

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 over generalizes 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. Citations 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, grammatical or 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 use 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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

AAS 3975: Three reviewers assessed eleven randomly selected papers on the following criteria: Skillful collection of data required for research; exhibition of a careful reading and understanding of social science and humanities research; strong critique of ideas and theories and application to social, cultural, political and economic lives of African American people; and a reflection an understanding and application of interdisciplinary scholarship. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the students received ratings of 4 or higher on Analytic skills. AAS 4980: Three reviewers assessed four papers on the following criteria: Skillful collection of data required for research; exhibition of a careful reading and understanding of social science and humanities research; strong critique of ideas and theories and application to social, cultural, political and economic lives of African American people; and a reflection an understanding and application of interdisciplinary scholarship. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the students received ratings of 4 or higher on Analytic skills.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

AAS 3975: Three reviewers assessed eleven randomly selected papers for clear writing, appropriate punctuation, grammar, syntax, use of APA writing, appropriate citations and plagiarism. Over 96% of the papers received a 4 or higher from each reviewer. AAS 4980: Three reviewers assessed four papers for clear writing, appropriate punctuation, grammar, syntax, use of APA writing, appropriate citations and plagiarism. One hundred percent (100%) of the papers received a 4 or higher from each reviewer.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
### Target for O3: Demonstrate knowledge of field

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

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

AAS 3975: Three reviewers assessed eleven randomly selected papers on the following criteria: A clearly stated hypothesis; Reflected multiple levels of data acquisition (primary, secondary, etc); Demonstrated an understanding of a relationship between the lived experiences of African Americans and the Global African community; an applied application of data to understand the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the papers received a rating of four or higher by all reviewers. AAS 4980: Three reviewers assessed four papers on the following criteria: A clearly stated hypothesis; Reflected multiple levels of data acquisition (primary, secondary, etc); Demonstrated an understanding of a relationship between the lived experiences of African Americans and the Global African community; an applied application of data to understand the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the papers received a rating of four or higher by all reviewers.

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium

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

  **Implementation Description:** May 2010
  **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee

  **Additional Resources:** Unsure

#### Analytic

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

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Written Assignment
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate logical reasoning

  **Implementation Description:** May 2010
  **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee

#### Communication skills

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

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Written Assignment
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate communication skills through writing

  **Implementation Description:** May 2010
  **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum committee

  **Additional Resources:** Unsure

#### 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)

#### Monitor trends
The instructor will monitor the current outcomes to assess if there are trends based on student demographics (e.g. major, minor, gender, age, etc).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Implementation Description:** Download class enrollment data into SPSS for descriptive analysis.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (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.

---

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Analytic (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to systematically analyze and critique empirical research.

---

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
AAS 6010: Based upon the aggregate ratings of the three reviewers, one hundred percent of the students scored between the 75th and 100th percentile on the analytic portion of the oral presentation.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Based on the aggregate scores of the three reviewers, 100% of the students scored between the 80th and 100th percentile on the communication portion of the research proposal.

---

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

**Mock Review**
The instructor will establish an external Mock Review process to determine student final research proposals scores increase

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Anthropology Assessment of Core

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Culture and its significance for humanity (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Students should understand the concept of culture in shaping human experience and the human condition. Culture is a universal characteristic of human groups, is inextricably linked to human biology and human adaptation, shapes environments and is dynamic and historical. Building on the conceptual foundations of anthropology and exploring examples of cultural manifestations in human groups across space and through time students should become able to distinguish and focus on the cultural bases of human behavior and experience. This objective is particularly significant for cross-cultural communication and competence, and is relevant to institutional goals regarding the global competency of students.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 2: Critique of the race concept (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Students should understand the multifaceted anthropological critique of the concept of race as used to explain human variation. Race is a major factor 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, historical 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
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Significance of Culture for Humanity (O: 1)**

Students respond to standardized in-class examination questions designed to assess this objective. Examples can be found in the attached document.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Culture and its significance for humanity**

Pooling data from multiple 1102 sections, 80% of students are expected to correctly identify the characteristics and role of culture for humanity.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Out of the 8 questions considered in this assessment, the lowest score was 89% and the highest was 100%, with an average of over 90% of students correctly identifying the characteristics, roles and manifestations of culture for humanity.

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

The faculty of the Department of Anthropology has been collaborating to standardize assessment of its learning outcomes/objectives. A shared repository of examination questions is being created for this purpose. Students in all sections are required to respond to several of these questions at in-class examinations. Questions used for this year's assessment can be found in the attached document.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Out of the 4 questions considered for this assessment, the lowest score was 81%, the highest was 96% and the remaining two were 85% correct.

---

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

**Monitor and encourage students**

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Critique of the race concept | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept
- **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
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

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

Stramlining assessment
The faculty will continue to collaborate on developing instruction modules and assessment questions to track student learning on the concept of culture.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In this cycle, the department modified its goals as well as measures and targets. Maintaining the focus on biocultural evolution in humans, we added outcomes with respect to the phenomenon of culture and its significance for humanity. For both outcomes, we measured success in relevant multiple-choice examination questions. These changes reflect the department's satisfaction with performance in previously established goals and subsequent shift of attention to additional topical areas. In the coming year we will revisit this cycle’s goals and outcomes, as well as measures and results, and proceed accordingly to amend existing ones or assess different parts of the program. The faculty teaching core courses will consider integrating assessment tools more broadly so as to generate additional data for the next cycle.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This assessment cycle has solidified our assessment practices. The data indicate a satisfactory degree of student learning associated with the areas under assessment. In the present cycle, this information is used to integrate and further inform teaching and evaluation in all core classes. It is hoped that this will generate more and more detailed data for the next cycle.
Students will demonstrate command of key anthropological concepts, issues and perspectives, and apply critical anthropological theory as well as key research methods pertinent to the field.

**G 3: Communication skills**
Students will communicate effectively and as appropriate to the field in speech and writing.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Holistic and comparative curriculum (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 3)**
To achieve the goals of a holistic and comparative curriculum, students apply key concepts, issues and methods relevant to each anthropological subfield by completing specialized projects in each of the three mandatory specialized survey courses for biological, cultural and archaeological anthropology. By graduation, students demonstrate their synthetic and cumulative understanding and analysis through their research and writing in the mandatory senior seminar course.

#### Institutional Priority Associations
- 1 Student retention
- 2 Student promotion and progression
- 3 Timely graduation

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

#### Strategic Plan Associations
- 1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 2: Content knowledge and application (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Under the premise that learning is best achieved through application, students identify, utilize and/or critique fundamental anthropological concepts, theory and methodology in cultural, biological, and archaeological anthropology, through conducting original research and evaluating current, peer-reviewed research in the field. Selected projects serve as gauges of student learning.

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

**SLO 3: Competence in oral and written communication (G: 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will interpret and produce communication in speech and writing appropriate to the discipline

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Archaeology - Garbology project (O: 2, 3)
Students apply fundamental archaeological concepts and methods by conducting a mini archaeological investigation of garbage. Students describe, classify and analyze material evidence, through which to reconstruct a profile of daily practice and its agents. Data collection and analysis culminates in a report in which students critically interpret the data to support or disprove their hypotheses. Evaluation is based on the quality of the content of the report (collection and analysis methods), the quality of the interpretation of findings (testing hypotheses through data), and the quality of writing in terms of organization and competent, academic English prose. See attached document for details.

**Target for O2: Content knowledge and application**
- 0 students will receive a score under 16, demonstrating satisfactory ability to apply fundamental archaeological concepts and methods - Average student scores will be 17 or above, demonstrating students’ superior use of methods, critical analysis and interpretation of material remains, to reconstruct lived experience

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Student average score was 17.5, while the score range was 17-19. One person received a score of 8 but this reflects a penalty for late submission and not the quality of the student's work.

**Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication**
Students communicate in clear, organized, grammatically correct prose

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students communicated their findings and analysis using a discipline appropriate combination of data presentation in tables, analysis and interpretive narrative. Writing was satisfactory to very satisfactory in all cases.

#### M 2: Cultural Anthropology - Mini Ethnography (O: 2, 3)
Students in ANTH 2020 - Introduction to Cultural Anthropology formulate and conduct a short, original ethnographic project in which they a. Demonstrate understanding of a. the concept of culture, b. cultural relativism and c. anthropological ethics by applying them to a short examination of an aspect of urban life b. Identify, design and conduct ethnographic data collection c. Produce an ethnographic narrative Student's work is evaluated using the following axes. The overall quality of the work is holistically evaluated in
terms of the following criteria. These axes are unequally weighted and presented here in an order of decreasing significance. A. Topic: The student identifies an appropriate topic and formulates a research question, contextualizing it in the culture concept B. Methodology: The student directs evidence and ethnographic details in the narrative, effectively addressing the initial topic or question D. Writing: The student writes in correct English prose. The narrative is clear, organized and grammatically correct. See attached document for details

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

**Target for O2: Content knowledge and application**
The maximum score for the assignment is 37.5 points, unequally weighted across the 4 axes. Criteria 1, 2 and 3 are most relevant for this objective. The achievement target for this exercise is that - 0 students will receive unsatisfactory scores (below 25) - The average scores will be between 30 and 37.5 reflecting Satisfactory or Superior performance.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
The breakdown in the 10-11 cycle was as follows: - 1 student did not return the assignment resulting in a score of 0 - 1 student turned in the assignment very late resulting in a significant penalty for a score of 15 - Beyond these two cases, all students scored 25 and above. 2 students scored between 25 and 30, while the other 47 students scored 33 and above. 36 of these scored 36+ points, demonstrating superior performance on all axes.

**Target for O3: Competence in oral and written communication**
Satisfactory or superior writing is required for scores over 35. The achievement target for this exercise is that - 0 students will receive unsatisfactory scores (below 25) - The average scores will be between 30 and 37.5 - Most students will score over 35 points, reflecting superior ability to construct an ethnographic narrative in proper English prose.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
- 2 students received a score under 25 though in both cases this had to do with problems completing the assignment on time. 1 student received a score of 25 though written communication was not the only problem. The student misunderstood the assignment - 41 students (81%) received a score over 35 demonstrating superior writing skills.

**M 3: CTW Senor Seminar (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Normal O The Senior Seminar is the capstone course for 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. The Senior Seminar is taught as a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course. The projects required the following: 1 - Identify theory and method in others’ work 2 - Produce a title and abstract for own research to be presented in the course 3 - Produce a CV and personal statement 4 - Produce a self-reflexive article 5 - Compose a mini-grant proposal 6 - Compile a teaching portfolio 7 - Deliver a conference-style presentation Evaluation was based on a CTW rubric developed by the department, and a WAC rubric. Please see attached documents for details.

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

**Target for O1: Holistic and comparative curriculum**
Students critically and reflexively analyze anthropological work.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Graduating students critically and analyzed peer-reviewed work of their choice.

**Target for O2: Content knowledge and application**
Students were expected to score on average below 2 on the CTW Anthropology rubric, and above 4 on the WAC rubric, for all assignments. Normal O

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
For each assignment, the average scores for students were between 1 and 2 on the Anthropology CTW rubric. For the WAC rubric, average scores were between 4 and 5 with no individual scores below 3

**Target for O3: Competence 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 CTW rubric and the WAC rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Students displayed competence in academic English prose, with their best work emerging in reflective and original research assignments, in both writing and oral presentation. Some issues with punctuation and proper citation format were present. A few students had problems tailoring their writing to the intended audience.

**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):**
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

Clarity objectives through discussion and examples

Most students' performance indicated that they successfully assimilated and applied the targeted concepts and methods. The two biggest challenges that require improvement however were a. to properly contextualize and formulate a research question out of the cultural topic students identified and b. to properly present data to support their conclusions. This will be addressed by a. explicitly discussing these issues in class and b. offering examples of proper use of evidence to support argumentation in an ethnographic context.

  Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Medium

Identifying intended audience

The instructor will focus on clarifying to the students the intended audience for each writing assignment.

  Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Medium

Relating theory to empirical evidence

The instructor has identified and will adopt a new text for the purpose of helping students identify and relate anthropological concepts and theory to both contemporary academic work and their own daily life and experience.

  Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Medium

Writing assistance

Students will be given access to the pamphlet-format grammar and style guide presenting the most common grammatical errors GSU students make. They will be encouraged to utilize the writing studio as well as to share drafts of their work with the instructor and/or the teaching assistant for review.

  Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: Low

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
Since the previous assessment cycle, the department has reconsidered its assessment tools and adopted measures that reflect our concern with theoretical and methodological application of knowledge through research projects in all subdisciplines. These changes were made to capture learning demonstrated by students through direct implementation of classroom knowledge. In the coming year we will revisit these projects and consider expanding their use and scope.

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

The assessment data from this cycle show strong learning outcomes and indicate a satisfactory structure and implementation for the program. The data indicate the usefulness of assessment based on projects that require the application of knowledge gained in the classroom. They will serve to inform a wider adoption of project-format assessments in the core academic nodes of the program.

---

**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, ethnography and 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 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 by producing 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.

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

**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.

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

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Synthesizing knowledge</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to continue in the program, all students at the third semester of graduate study at the Department of Anthropology will successfully synthesize, analyze and critically apply anthropological knowledge relevant to their graduate research through a comprehensive examination, which consists of a topical, a theoretical and a methodological segment. The comprehensive examination is evaluated by the faculty members forming the students’ committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the 2010-2011 cycle, 11 third semester graduate students passed their comprehensive examinations demonstrating a. Ability to synthesize and analyse 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 project. 8 students passed at the first attempt. 3 students were required to improve on a portion of the exam by rewriting, and successfully completed it on the second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Producing Original Research</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At graduation, all students will produce a satisfactory thesis, conduct revisions and successfully defend their thesis or practicum demonstrating competence in their subfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the 2010-2011 cycle, a total of 16 students reached their final semester in the program. 15 successfully completed their research projects, and defended their thesis of practicum, completing the study program. One student's work is still in review, and may be completed within the month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving comprehensive examination outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, and particularly faculty advisers are discussing mechanisms to enhance student assessment throughout the course of study, in order to further student success. A newly created professionalization seminar course will serve as a hands-on, practical forum in which students will be introduced to, discuss and share experiences regarding the rationale, requirements and strategies of the comprehensive examination process in the first two semesters of study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011 |
| **Implementation Status:** Planned |
| **Priority:** Medium |
| **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** |
| **Measure:** MA comprehensive exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Synthesizing knowledge |
| **Implementation Description:** The department’s new Professionalization seminar course will enhance student preparation for their comprehensive exams. |
| **Responsible Person/Group:** faculty |
| **Additional Resources:** no |
| **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:</strong> What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program has moved to more clearly define its goals and targets with respect to students demonstrating competence in the key areas of theoretical framing, research methodology and implementation/analysis of research. The Faculty has several conversations with respect to the assessment of student performance and resolved to more closely monitor students' progress throughout the degree program in order to address issues early and encourage continuously rising standards. |

| **ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain. |

The department is overall pleased with the results of this cycle’s assessment and has used these data to discuss strategies to coordinate student evaluation practices over the course of the program in order to encourage continuous improvement in student performance. This year’s assessment will contribute to this conversation, particularly with respect to instituting early alerts. |
**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Core areas of linguistics (M: 1)**
Students demonstrate understanding of the core areas within linguistic study: phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax.

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

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

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

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
73% of students achieved at least 70% in AL 3021 and 86.5 and 88% achieved at least 70% in AL 4011 and AL 4012, respectively.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
93% of students scored at least 70% on the final project 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

88% of students were judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all four relevant criteria on the rubric

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
86.5% of students in AL 4011 and 88% of students in AL 4012 scored at least 70% on the final examinations.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
88% of students in AL 3021 and 76% of students in AL 4161 were judged as competent or sophisticated in the area of "presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion"

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

Reweave current measures
In completing our assessment for the first year of our BA program, we realize that our measures are too gross to give us helpful information about improving our curriculum. Thus a committee will reassess the current measures and propose additional measures that can target specific outcomes more effectively.

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

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

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

Analysis of linguistic structure – revise measure
In the next cycle we will be adding a measure from data analysis problems for AL 3041.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Performance on language analysis problems | Outcome/Objective: Analysis of linguistic structure

Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair
For the next cycle we will add a new outcome related to inculcative competence and cultural discovery skills along with associated measures.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair

This is no longer a core outcome for our program and we will be eliminating this outcome in the next cycle.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

In AL 4161, where the achievement target was not met, we have revised preliminary writing assignments to better build towards the final paper. We will continue to monitor this outcome.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High

Currently we are using the final examinations for 3 courses to measure this outcome but in the future we will only use the final exam from AL 3021. We are exploring other ways of measuring this outcome and/or changing the achievement target.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

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.

**Mission / Purpose**

**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

**SLO 2: Teaching methodology (M: 3, 4, 5, 7)**
Applies the basic principles of ESL/EFL learning and teaching methodology

**SLO 3: Professional development (M: 1, 4, 8)**
Conducts and participates in professional development activities

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

**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

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

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
67% of graduating students made at least one conference presentation or wrote 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
96% of the students scored "good" or "excellent" on their use of technology in presentations.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
96% of the students scored "good" or "excellent" on the overall scores for their presentations.

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the students scored "good" or "excellent" on the overall scores for their presentations.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching performance for the outcome "teaching methodology".

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% 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".
Target for **O2: Teaching methodology**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "teaching methodology".

Target for **O3: Professional development**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "professional development".

Target for **O4: Technology**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

92% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "technology".

Target for **O5: Communication**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of graduating students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, five being highest for the outcome "communication".

Target for **O6: Connecting theory and practice**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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

Target for **O7: Cultural knowledge**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
92% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
88% 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)

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed the requirement.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed the requirement.

**M 8: Professional development activities (O: 3)**
Students are required to participate in two professional development (PD) activities each semester they are in the program. They document this experience by submitting a reflective essay about each PD activity to their advisor.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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

MA paper scholarship and theory/practice connections enhancement

The two faculty readers of each MA paper will be urged to give feedback specifically on scholarship and theory and practice connections on an early draft of the MA paper and work more closely with students who have difficulty in these areas. Additional drafts will be required if the student continues to struggle in these areas.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Master’s papers | Outcome/Objective: Connecting theory and practice
Implementation Description: The Director of Graduate Studies will send queries to graduate faculty each semester regarding the status of in-progress MA papers and will meet with faculty who wish to discuss further intervention needed for individual students.
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Changes were not made. In the coming year, the rubric for assessing the microteaching video, i.e., for evaluating teaching methodology, will be revisited and possibly revised. A rubric for assessing classroom-based experience will be proposed.

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

This past year’s assessment confirms that our new technology course elective is improving students’ technology use self-confidence, judging by students’ self-reports on the alumni survey and actual use of technology in presentations. For the MA paper, faculty readers will be urged to provide more direction and feedback on explicit linking of theory and practice in the students’ papers.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Applied Linguistics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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

SLO 2: Research methodology (M: 1, 3)
Graduates will be able to design studies on a range of topics in applied linguistics (e.g. second language acquisition, second language teaching, and English for academic purposes)

SLO 3: Familiarity with Applied Linguistics (M: 1, 2, 3)
Graduates of the program will be familiar with the current state of knowledge in applied linguistics, including the numerous questions that remain to be answered

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Professional development (O: 2, 3, 4)
Graduate students are expected to begin presenting regularly at conferences and to publish in scholarly journals.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O2: Research methodology**
At least 50% of graduate students in their second year or beyond will present at least one paper at a conference or publish a scholarly paper annually.

**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.

### 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

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Art Studio MFA
As of: 12/12/2010 04:10 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: Theoretical and critical thinking (M: 1, 3)**
Knowledge of art criticism and theory and facility in applying theory and critical thinking to visual analysis.

**SLO 2: Contemporary contextual knowledge (M: 1, 3)**
Informed of contemporary art and its relationship to the history of the discipline

**SLO 3: Advanced research skills (M: 1, 3)**
Ability to thoroughly investigate and critically analyze research results

**SLO 4: Professional practice (M: 1, 3)**
Professional presentation of studio work, polished representation of self on paper, fluency in discussing own work, demonstration of self-assessment skills.

### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Thesis Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Written paper detailing multiple aspects of studio practice.

**Target for O1: Theoretical and critical thinking**
With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 2, 3 Very Good = 1, 4 Excellent = 5.

**Target for O2: Contemporary contextual knowledge**
With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 1, 3 Very Good = 4, 4 Excellent = 3.

**Target for O3: Advanced research skills**
With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 0, 3 Very Good = 2, 4 Excellent = 6.

**Target for O4: Professional practice**
With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 0, 3 Very Good = 2, 4 Excellent = 6.

**M 3: MFA Solo Exhibition with Statement and Resume (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
A solo exhibition of work done in last two semesters of graduate study accompanied by an artist statement and resume.

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

**Target for O1: Theoretical and critical thinking**
With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 2, 3 Very Good = 1, 4 Excellent = 5.

**Target for O2: Contemporary contextual knowledge**
With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 1, 3 Very Good = 4, 4 Excellent = 3.
Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 1, 3 Very Good = 4, 4 Excellent = 3.

### Target for O3: Advanced research skills

With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 0, 3 Very Good = 2, 4 Excellent = 6.

### Target for O4: Professional practice

With possible scores of 1 = Poor, 2 = Average, 3 = Very Good, and 4 = Excellent, achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Of 8 students evaluated, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 0, 3 Very Good = 2, 4 Excellent = 6.

### 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:** Thesis Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Theoretical and critical thinking

**Implementation Description:** Ceramics and Sculpture faculty are in the process of refining the details of a 3-D program yet are moving forward by joining the two disciplines in one Directed Study course this semester. By Fall 2010 all details should be resolved and in full operation.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mark Burleson, Christina West, Ruth Stanford, George Beasley

#### Graduate Program Review

A Graduate Program review is scheduled for 2009 - 2010. A committee has been formed and will be chaired by Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine. Topics for consideration are: increasing cross disciplinary interaction and instruction among studio disciplines, expanding attendance and participation in graduate studio critiques to include faculty and students from all studio disciplines, reducing the isolation of graduate students in their respective studio areas and increasing their experience of other graduate students’ research activities, and devising program opportunities for graduate students to have greater exposure to practicing contemporary artists excelling in the field.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Thesis Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Theoretical and critical thinking

**Implementation Description:** The review of the Graduate Program will take place throughout this academic year with the intent of implementing any changes in Fall 2010.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Director Joe Peragine

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1:** Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

CTW is not required of MFA degree programs.

**CTW Reflection 2:** Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

CTW is not required of MFA degree programs.

**CTW Reflection 3:** Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

CTW is not required of MFA degree programs.

**CTW Reflection 4:** Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

CTW is not required of MFA degree programs.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
In spring 2011 the learning outcomes were revised by consolidating like outcomes. This sharpened the focus to four critical outcomes, making assessment results more pointed. It also assisted in streamlining the reporting.

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

The weaker scores were in theoretical and critical thinking. Studio graduates are required to take Contemporary Art and Theory and Criticism, though the semester that they take these courses is not specified. More often than not, graduates are taking these courses toward the end of their degree program rather than at the beginning. Earlier involvement in these classes has the potential to improve the theoretical and critical thinking results.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Scheduling the graduate studio classes in all disciplines on the same days and times has allowed for greater interdisciplinary opportunities, such joint critiques with students and faculty from different disciplines, shared visiting and guest artists and scholars, and discussions based on assigned readings and critical writings.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Theoretical and critical thinking needs improvement across the MFA studio program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Graduate faculty student advisement needs to stress the importance of taking Contemporary Art and Theory and Criticism courses within the first year of study. This may involve working the the art historians and their ability to add more sections of these classes in order to accommodate graduate student demand. By having this exposure earlier in the program, we anticipate students demonstrating a higher level of critical thinking and theoretical knowledge by the end of the degree program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Art and Design Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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) (M: 1, 2)

“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).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M 1: Critical thinking in multiple choice exam (O: 1)

One exam from AH 1700 was assessed. The exam had 75 multiple choice questions, of which 19 were identified by AH faculty as CT questions. The average correct responses to the CT questions were measured, and compared to the overall test average.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Critical thinking in core**

Target is 75%. 88 students took the exam. The test mean was 77%. The mean for the CT questions was 77%.
A standardized exam for AH 1700 was used to measure CT in the core. The mean of the CT scores surpassed the target of 75% and reflected the overall test mean.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Critical thinking in core**

A mean of 75% or better on CT questions on multiple choice exams.

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

**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  
*Priority:* Low  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
  - Measure: Critical thinking in multiple choice exam  
  - Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking in core  
*Responsible Person/Group:* AH faculty

---

**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: Learning Environment (M: 1)**

Student is able to clearly describe expectations for student behavior and design and carry out a plan for rewards and consequences. Student is highly organized and manages materials, equipment, and the labeling and storage of student work effectively. Student demonstrates the ability to communicate effectively both verbally and in writing, with colleagues, students, and other stakeholders regarding expectations.

**SLO 2: Instruction (M: 1)**

Student is able to plan and assess developmental appropriate lessons for Pre-K through 12 students, including those in need of accommodation. Student demonstrates competency in a variety of art mediums, and has broad knowledge of the history and criticism of art, informed by cultural understandings. Students use appropriate vocabulary and is able to discuss and write about artworks and art processes from an informed perspective and communicate information about art to students through a variety of pedagogical strategies. Student is reflective about their teaching practice and revises strategies based on assessments of student learning.

**SLO 3: Instructional Resources (M: 1)**

Student can create and utilize teaching tools such as slide presentations, demonstrations, displays, critiques, and performance-based assessments to communicate and document expectations, objectives, procedures, outcomes and progress to learners. Student is able to utilize technology effectively in preparing and presenting lessons to students, and in empowering students to utilize technology in their own creative endeavors. Student responds critically to readings and organizes final portfolio to highlight their
SLO 4: Professionalism (M: 1)
Student has demonstrated and understanding of the professional role of the teacher through appropriate, positive dispositions, including ethical conduct and responsiveness to diverse student needs. Student has articulated a thoughtful teaching philosophy and understands the importance of advocacy and participation in professional development opportunities.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Student Teaching Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
The student teaching portfolio is the capstone assessment and consists of measures for content knowledge, lesson planning, classroom management, instructional strategies, classroom and student behavior management, assessment skills, and professional attributes.

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

Target for O1: Learning Environment
Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aiming for an average score of: 4.5

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Number of students evaluated: 27 Number of students who achieve the goal: 27 Aim for an average score: 4.5 Average score this academic year: 4.6

Target for O2: Instruction
Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aiming for an average score of: 4.5

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Number of students evaluated: 27 Number of students who achieve the goal: 27 Aim for an average score: 4.5 Average score this academic year: 4.6

Target for O3: Instructional Resources
Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aiming for an average score of: 4.5

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Number of students evaluated: 27 Number of students who achieve the goal: 27 Aim for an average score: 4.5 Average score this academic year: 4.7

Target for O4: Professionalism
Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aiming for an average score of: 4.5

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Number of students evaluated: 27 Number of students who achieve the goal: 27 Aim for an average score: 4.5 Average score this academic year: 4.6

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

Increase student field experience hours
We have not been collecting data in this particular format long enough to have established a practical baseline but we are hopeful that this streamlined reporting will assist us in determining whether our students are consistently reaching our goals and will inform our efforts to improve the program as needed. Strengths: Implementing new criteria for this report helped the program to consolidate and solidify the relationship between various data sources and their use in program evaluation. Our review this year was more thorough than previous years thanks to this process. Because students in art education are evaluated at the beginning, middle, and endpoint of their certification program, streamlining the data collected should enable us to better track improvement over time. Areas for Improvement: Faculty in art education recognize the need to increase student field-experience hours prior to student teaching, to allow more hands-on experience for students, and allow faculty more insights into student “readiness.” We are currently developing expanded field experience opportunities in courses prior to student teaching. Faculty also recognize the overwhelming burden of reporting and accountability make it essential to streamline data collection to assist in analysis which will then inform program evaluation and revision. Plans are in place to revise the Summative Evaluation form and other rubrics and upload them into Livetext.
to centralize the collection of information needed for accountability purposes.

**Maintain condensed objective achievement**

We have not been collecting data in this particular format long enough to have established a practical baseline but we are hopeful that this streamlined reporting will assist us in determining whether our students are consistently reaching our goals and will inform our efforts to improve the program as needed. Strengths: Implementing new criteria for this report helped the program to consolidate and solidify the relationship between various data sources and their use in program evaluation. Our review this year was more thorough than previous years thanks to this process. Because students in art education are evaluated at the beginning, middle, and endpoint of their certification program, streamlining the data collected should enable us to better track improvement over time. Areas for Improvement: Faculty in art education recognize the need to increase student field-experience hours prior to student teaching, to allow more hands-on experience for students, and allow faculty more insights into student “readiness.” We are currently developing expanded field experience opportunities in courses prior to student teaching. Faculty also recognize the overwhelming burden of reporting and accountability make it essential to streamline data collection to assist in analysis which will then inform program evaluation and revision. Plans are in place to revise the Summative Evaluation form and other rubrics and upload them into Livetext to centralize the collection of information needed for accountability purposes.

**Revise Summative Evaluation form for Livetext upload**

We have not been collecting data in this particular format long enough to have established a practical baseline but we are hopeful that this streamlined reporting will assist us in determining whether our students are consistently reaching our goals and will inform our efforts to improve the program as needed. Strengths: Implementing new criteria for this report helped the program to consolidate and solidify the relationship between various data sources and their use in program evaluation. Our review this year was more thorough than previous years thanks to this process. Because students in art education are evaluated at the beginning, middle, and endpoint of their certification program, streamlining the data collected should enable us to better track improvement over time. Areas for Improvement: Faculty in art education recognize the need to increase student field-experience hours prior to student teaching, to allow more hands-on experience for students, and allow faculty more insights into student “readiness.” We are currently developing expanded field experience opportunities in courses prior to student teaching. Faculty also recognize the overwhelming burden of reporting and accountability make it essential to streamline data collection to assist in analysis which will then inform program evaluation and revision. Plans are in place to revise the Summative Evaluation form and other rubrics and upload them into Livetext to centralize the collection of information needed for accountability purposes.

**Streamlining of data collection**

We have not been collecting data in this particular format long enough to have established a practical baseline but we are hopeful that this streamlined reporting will assist us in determining whether our students are consistently reaching our goals and will inform our efforts to improve the program as needed. Strengths: Implementing new criteria for this report helped the program to consolidate and solidify the relationship between various data sources and their use in program evaluation. Our review this year was more thorough than previous years thanks to this process. Because students in art education are evaluated at the beginning, middle, and endpoint of their certification program, streamlining the data collected should enable us to better track improvement over time. Areas for Improvement: Faculty in art education recognize the need to increase student field-experience hours prior to student teaching, to allow more hands-on experience for students, and allow faculty more insights into student “readiness.” We are currently developing expanded field experience opportunities in courses prior to student teaching. Faculty also recognize the overwhelming burden of reporting and accountability make it essential to streamline data collection to assist in analysis which will then inform program evaluation and revision. Plans are in place to revise the Summative Evaluation form and other rubrics and upload them into Livetext to centralize the collection of information needed for accountability purposes.
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

CTW data analysis is completed by Art Education CTW Ambassador Melanie Davenport.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

CTW data analysis is completed by Art Education CTW Ambassador Melanie Davenport.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

CTW data analysis is completed by Art Education CTW Ambassador Melanie Davenport.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Learning outcomes were reduced in number and made more generalized to coincide with the primary aims of the program. These outcomes will be assessed in the coming semester and then a determination will be made regarding any needed changes. Otherwise no changes are planned.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

Students are functioning at a high level and meeting, if not exceeding, learning outcome expectations for the program. Results reinforce the recent course sequence changes to the curriculum, which allows students to go through the program as a cohort.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

The previous number of learning outcomes was greater than needed and redundant in nature. By consolidating the outcomes to four, the focus on the mission of the program was sharpened. Students are now operating as a cohort, making the scheduling of classes more streamlined.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

If learning outcome assessment results for 2011 - 12 indicate that all students are meeting or exceeding the goals, it seems appropriate to consider raising the standards of performance.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

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

No current changes for improvement are scheduled for the coming year. If all students score as high as they have this past year, faculty may consider higher standards for their assessments.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Art Education MAEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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: Research skills in gathering evidence (M: 1)

Thesis evaluation: Ability to gather evidence to support thesis statement

SLO 2: Research skills in critically analyzing evidence (M: 1)

Thesis evaluation: ability to provide a critical analysis of research material as evidence in support of thesis statement
### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

### SLO 3: Written Communication Skills (M: 1)

Thesis evaluation: effective and persuasive writing in support of thesis statement

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3)**

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

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Research skills in gathering evidence**

Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Number of students evaluated: 5 Number of students who achieved the goal: 5 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0 Average score for this goal for this academic year: 4.6

**Target for O2: Research skills in critically analyzing evidence**

Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Number of students evaluated: 5 Number of students who achieved the goal: 5 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0 Average score for this goal for this academic year: 4.5

**Target for O3: Written Communication Skills**

Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Number of students evaluated: 5 Number of students who achieved the goal: 5 Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3 Aim for average score: 4.0 Average score for this goal for this academic year: 4.6

### 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
Develop extended support network
Although all of those evaluated above met our expectations for completion of the Master’s degree, this evaluation includes students who were admitted into the MAE prior to the development of the new cohort program. We will be interested to see how ratings for the cohort groups compare to those for students who made their way through the program individually, without that extended support network and a more structured curriculum. Based upon comparative data with next year’s completers, we will re-evaluate the cohort program to ensure that it is serving the needs of our students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Research skills in critically analyzing evidence
Implementation Description: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012

Greater structure in curriculum
Although all of those evaluated above met our expectations for completion of the Master’s degree, this evaluation includes students who were admitted into the MAE prior to the development of the new cohort program. We will be interested to see how ratings for the cohort groups compare to those for students who made their way through the program individually, without that extended support network and a more structured curriculum. Based upon comparative data with next year’s completers, we will re-evaluate the cohort program to ensure that it is serving the needs of our students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication Skills
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

New cohort formation evaluation
Although all of those evaluated above met our expectations for completion of the Master’s degree, this evaluation includes students who were admitted into the MAE prior to the development of the new cohort program. We will be interested to see how ratings for the cohort groups compare to those for students who made their way through the program individually, without that extended support network and a more structured curriculum. Based upon comparative data with next year’s completers, we will re-evaluate the cohort program to ensure that it is serving the needs of our students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Research skills in gathering evidence
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
CTW assessment is not required of Art Education MAED degree program.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
CTW assessment is not required of Art Education MAED degree program.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
CTW assessment is not required of Art Education MAED degree program.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
CTW assessment is not required of Art Education MAED degree program.
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.

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

**Target for O1: Knowledge of content**
Evaluation based on analysis of performance in 1000-level art history survey classes, and a review of the content-based sections
of tests submitted with the graduation portfolio. Students evaluated: xx, Students achieving goal: xx, Minimum score for successful
completion of goal: 3, Aim for an average score of: 4.5, Average score for this goal this academic year: xx

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Students evaluated: 17, Students achieving goal: 14, Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3, Aim for an average score
of: 4.5, Average score for this goal this academic year: 3.76

**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: xx

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Number of students evaluated: 17, Number achieving goal: 13, 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: 3.65

**Target for O3: Research skills**
Evaluation based on review of any research-based exam questions and the writing project submitted with the graduation portfolio.
Number of students evaluated: xx, Number of students achieving goal: xx, Minimum score for successful completion of goal: 3, Aim
for average score: 4.5, Average score for this goal for this academic year: xx
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 Neddia Ahmed, the new library instructor in the fine arts area. We plan to take more advantage of this opportunity in the future, with the expectation that it will further improve our students' research skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking skills
| Knowledge of content | Research skills | Written communication skills
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 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 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.

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

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking skills

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.

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

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.

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

AH 3000 and Fine Arts Library Liaison
The outcome score for Objective 3, Research Skills, is marginally higher than the previous year's score (2009/10 was 3.75, 2010/11 is 3.76) but is still lower than we would like to see. The change is the smallest of all the objectives (.01 points, which is less than 1% of the total). Like objective 2, the small upward shift we are reporting this year may or may not be statistically significant. The meagerness of the improvement may be the result of the relative difficulties involved in teaching research skills in the Humanities to undergraduates. Art History, as a research field, is intensely interdisciplinary and requires that students be able to read languages other than English, be able to read, process, and critique high-level scholarly articles and books in multiple fields (e.g. history, religious studies, women studies, anthropology, sociology, etc), and be able to make multiple types of arguments (e.g. rhetorical, visual, contextual) each of which has its own methodological and historiographical complications. As part of our continuing effort to improve our students’ Critical Thinking Skills, we have added a required undergraduate methodology course (AH 3000) and have been working with the Fine Arts Library Liaison, Nedda Ahmed, to provide students with more access to research materials and instruction. It is still too early to know what effect these measures will have. The Art History area’s action plan for this objective is unchanged -- we are working toward 100% student achievement and an average score of 4.5.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Research skills

Implementation Description: By continuing to provide students with more access to research materials and instruction, we anticipate improved scores for 2011-12

Responsible Person/Group: John Decker, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, Glenn Gunhouse, Kimberly Cleveland, Susan Richmond
Instituted CTW courses AH 3000 and AH 4990 and increased critical writing submission

The outcome score for Objective 4, Written Communication Skills, climbed slightly from the previous academic year (2009/10 was 3.58, 2010/11 is 3.62). Like each of the preceding objectives, the change was relatively small (.04 points, which is 1.2% of the total). Once again, it is uncertain whether or not this change is significant. While the increase is encouraging, we are still disappointed given our focus in recent years on improving our students' writing. We have instituted CTW courses (AH 3000 and AH 4990) and hope to see greater improvement. These courses have been available only for a short time and it is still too early to measure any effect they may have on student performance. That said, however, the Art History area has taken steps to emphasize the importance of writing. Specifically, the capstone class (AH 4990) requires students to submit a great deal of written documentation for assessment including 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. The last of these, the art history experience paper, is an attempt to gather “pseudo-exit interview” information, which we plan to use to help us identify potential areas for improvement. The emphasis on written work is part of our overall strategy to make writing the central feature of how we educate our students. Art History area’s action plan for this objective is unchanged – we are working toward 100% student achievement and an average score of 4.5.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Graduation portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Written communication skills

Implementation Description: Instituted CTW courses AH 3000 and AH 4990, which have been available only a short time. Addition of art history experience exit paper.

Responsible Person/Group: John Decker, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, Glenn Gunhouse, Kimberly Cleveland, Susan Richmond

Maintain baseline with continued insistence on rigorous course work

The outcome score for Objective 1, Knowledge of Content, is marginally lower than the previous year’s score (2009/10 was 3.85 and 2010/11 is 3.76). To some degree, this small drop (.09 points, which is only 3% of the total) may be attributable to the Art History area’s continued insistence on more rigor in its course work. For Art History, Knowledge of Content includes the ability to identify information like artist, title, and date with 100% accuracy as well as knowledge of Art Historical terms. In early classes (such as the surveys) student often struggle with learning how to memorize and report this information. As the Art History area increases its expectations regarding student performance, it places more weight on this foundational information and demands higher performance from students, especially majors. The drop in performance in this objective, however, is slight (3%) and also may be a normal yearly fluctuation. We have not been collecting data long enough to have established a practical baseline and cannot determine whether or not such a small numerical movement is statistically significant. The Art History area’s action plan for this objective is unchanged – we are working toward 100% student achievement and an average score of 4.5.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Graduation portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of content

Implementation Description: Maintain current standards for ability to identify information with 100% accuracy

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012

Responsible Person/Group: John Decker, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, Glenn Gunhouse, Kimberly Cleveland, Susan Richmond

Maintain goals to improve critical thinking skills

The outcome score for Objective 2, Critical Thinking Skills, is higher than that of the previous academic year (2009/10 was 3.58 and 2010/11 is 3.65). Like the score for objective 1, above, the change is relatively small (.07 points, which is only 2% of the total). This upward shift may be, to some extent, the result of the area’s emphasis on critical thinking in each of its 3000 and 4000-level courses. The capstone course (AH 4990) may also be contributing to the rise in performance. The capstone requires a graduation portfolio that is a representative sample of each student’s work. The ability to look over a clearer cross section of our students’ works provides us with a more realistic view of their critical thinking skills. While the change is positive, it too may or may not be statistically significant – we lack sufficient longitudinal data to perform in-depth analysis. The Art History area’s action plan for this objective is unchanged – we are working toward 100% student achievement and an average score of 4.5.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Graduation portfolio
- Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking skills

Implementation Description: Unchanged from previous year

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012

Responsible Person/Group: John Decker, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, Glenn Gunhouse, Kimberly Cleveland, Susan Richmond

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

CTW is reported by Art History Ambassador Susan Richmond.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

CTW is reported by Art History Ambassador Susan Richmond.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

CTW is reported by Art History Ambassador Susan Richmond.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your
CTW is reported by Art History Ambassador Susan Richmond.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our review this year was more thorough than previous years thanks to the information derived from the capstone portfolio. In particular, the portfolio requires students to submit a paper from the beginning of their Art History studies and one from the end. This “book-ending” approach provides us with a much better grasp of each student’s improvement, or lack thereof, across time.

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

In the future, we would like to see all undergraduate majors take at least one seminar class. For this, we would need to make 4900-level classes “undergraduate seminars,” with a lower cap on class size to ensure greater one-on-one instruction. Such a seminar would better prepare our students for the rigors of graduate school and would offer them an opportunity to perform more focused research and writing.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Students are in need of an advanced level seminar course that concentrates of critical writing and allow for more one to one instruction.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

We need to develop more robust 3000-level courses, which will provide students with intermediary critical thinking and writing skills. These courses would be a firm foundation and would better prepare students to perform at higher levels in the 4000-level courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Strengths: Our review this year was more thorough than previous years thank to the information derived from the capstone portfolio. In particular, the portfolio requires students to submit a paper from the beginning of their Art History studies and one from the end. This “book-ending” approach provides us with a much better grasp of each student’s improvement, or lack thereof, across time.

Areas for Improvement: In the future, we would like to see all undergraduate majors take at least one seminar class. For this, we would need to make 4900-level classes “undergraduate seminars,” with a lower cap on class size to ensure greater one-on-one instruction. Such a seminar would better prepare our students for the rigors of graduate school and would offer them an opportunity to perform more focused research and writing. We also will need to develop more robust 3000-level courses, which will provide students with intermediary critical thinking and writing skills. These courses would be a firm foundation and would better prepare students to perform at higher levels in the 4000-level courses. These changes may be possible as the Art History area works toward having its BA program recognized as a self-standing major (rather than a concentration).

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

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence) (M: 1, 2)**


**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
**SLO 2: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence) (M: 3)**
The ability to gather relevant art historical evidence

- **Student Learning Outcome:** Yes
- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Active Through:** 2007-2008
- **Entry Status:** Final
- **Last Updated By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
- **Established By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
- **Relevant Associations:** National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Review of thesis (O: 1)**
Review of thesis

- **Source of Evidence:** Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- **Active Through:** 2007-2008
- **Entry Status:** Final
- **Last Updated By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
- **Established By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008

**Target for O1: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence)**
We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Number of students evaluated for this goal: 5
Number of those students who achieved the goal: 5
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: 4.6

**M 2: Review of thesis (O: 1)**
Evaluation based on review of the thesis.

- **Source of Evidence:** Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- **Active Through:** 2007-2008
- **Entry Status:** Final
- **Last Updated By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
- **Established By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008

**Target for O1: Research Skills (Gathering of Evidence)**
We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Number of students evaluated for this goal: 5
Number of those students who achieved the goal: 5
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: 4.7

**M 3: Thesis (O: 2, 3)**
Review of thesis

- **Source of Evidence:** Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
- **Active Through:** 2007-2008
- **Entry Status:** Final
- **Last Updated By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008
- **Established By:** Migration Tool on 10/13/2008

**Target for O2: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence)**
We are aiming for an average score of: 4.5

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Number of students evaluated for this goal: 5
Number of those students who achieved the goal: 5
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: 4.3

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

**Instituted Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH8010)**
The 2010/11 outcomes for Art History graduate students are significantly better than the previous year. The 2009/10 outcomes reflected the work of two graduates, one a high achiever and the other a low achiever. The sample size for this year’s analysis is larger and is more reflective of the quality of graduate students graduating from the Art History program. Scores for objectives 1 and 2 exceeded our stated targets; the score for objective 3 came close to meeting our desired level. One potential reason for the rise in outcomes may be that each of the students assessed benefited from the institution of Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH 8010). This course introduced students to graduate-level methodology and provided them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research. We plan to continue offering this class (currently we are only able to offer it every other year because of the College’s minimum enrollment requirement). In keeping with our recent NASAD review, we also began offering graduate only seminars. Previously, our graduate students have taken mixed classes and this may have negatively impacted their performances. We are hopeful that the combination of AH 8010 and graduate only seminars will have continued positive effects on our students.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Continue AH 8010 course
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** John Decker, Susan Richmond, Melinda Hartwig, Maria Gindhart, Glen Gunnhouse, Kimberly Cleveland
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
CTW is not part of the Art History MA program, only undergraduate programs.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
CTW is not part of the Art History MA program, only undergraduate programs.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
CTW is not part of the Art History MA program, only undergraduate programs.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
CTW is not part of the Art History MA program, only undergraduate programs.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The learning outcomes were re-assessed in an effort to consolidate like outcomes and streamline reporting. In doing so, this process clarified our priorities for the graduates in Art History. Thus far, this has been effective and no changes are needed for the coming academic year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The rise in outcomes may be that each of the students assessed benefited from the institution of Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH 8010). This course introduced students to graduate-level methodology and provided them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research. This change will continue next year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
Our NASAD review in 2010 resulted in the requirement for more graduate only seminars. Previously, our graduate students have taken mixed classes and this may have negatively impacted the performances we measured in 2009-10. We are now offering graduate only seminars along with our Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH 8010) course every other year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
The 2010/11 outcomes for Art History graduate students are significantly better than the previous year. The 2009/10 outcomes reflected the work of two graduates, one a high achiever and the other a low achiever. The sample size for this year’s analysis is larger and is more reflective of the quality of graduate students graduating from the Art History program. Scores for objectives 1 and 2 exceeded our stated targets; the score for objective 3 came close to meeting our desired level. One potential reason for the rise in outcomes may be that each of the students assessed benefited from the institution of Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH 8010). This course introduced students to graduate-level methodology and provided them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research. We plan to continue offering this class (currently we are only able to offer it every other year because of the College's minimum enrollment requirement). In keeping with our recent NASAD review, we also began offering graduate only seminars. Previously, our graduate students have taken mixed classes and this may have negatively impacted their performances. We are hopeful that the combination of AH 8010 and graduate only seminars will have continued positive effects on our students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Art Studio BFA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Technical skills (M: 1, 2)
In their studio work, students demonstrate control of their medium, creative use of formal elements such as shape, line, form, texture, color, and competent use of relevant technologies.

**SLO 2: Conceptual Skills (M: 1, 2)**
Students demonstrate conceptual and critical thinking skills in their approach to their studio work. They have the ability to investigate and research their individual ideas with a focus on content. Conceptual skills are manifested in the level of sophistication in their studio work as well as in the quality of their participation in critical discussions and the critique process.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 3: Historical and contemporary knowledge (M: 1, 2)**
Students demonstrate a knowledge of the historical development of their medium and the critical contemporary issues attached to it. This includes familiarity with movements and trends of the past that have shaped the medium and an awareness of contemporary artists and contemporary critical discourse in their field.

**SLO 4: Professional preparation (M: 1, 2)**
Students acquire refined professional skills in the presentation and exhibition of their studio work. They demonstrate the ability to represent themselves on paper, which includes writing cogent and effective artist statements, compiling a polished resume and preparing a professional packet for the submission of their work for exhibition consideration.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Gateway (Foundations) Portfolio and Statement (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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

**Target for O1: Technical skills**
Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Poor), 2 (Average), 3 (Very Good), 4 (Excellent).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 45 students evaluated, the results were: Poor 1 = 4, Average 2 = 12, Very Good 3 = 20, Excellent 4 = 9

**Target for O2: Conceptual Skills**
Minimum target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Poor), 2 (Average), 3 (Very Good), 4 (Excellent).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 45 students evaluated, the results were: Poor 1 = 1, Average 2 = 14, Very Good 3 = 20, Excellent 4 = 10

**Target for O3: Historical and contemporary knowledge**
Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Poor), 2 (Average), 3 (Very Good), 4 (Excellent).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 45 students evaluated, the results were: Poor 7 = 1, Average 2 = 16, Very Good 3 = 17, Excellent 4 = 8

**Target for O4: Professional preparation**
Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Poor), 2 (Average), 3 (Very Good), 4 (Excellent).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 45 students evaluated, the results were: Poor 1 = 1, Average 2 = 16, Very Good 3 = 17, Excellent 4 = 11

**M 2: Final Portfolio, Artist's Statement, Resume and BFA Senior Exhibition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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 ones 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: Technical skills**
Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in four categories: Technical skills, conceptual skills, historical and contemporary knowledge and professional preparation. Possible scores are: Poor 1, Average 2, Very Good 3, Excellent 4. Target for technical skills is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Of 56 students assessed, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 5, 3 Very Good = 18, 4 Excellent = 32
### Target for O2: Conceptual Skills

Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in four categories: Technical skills, conceptual skills, historical and contemporary knowledge and professional preparation. Possible scores are: Poor 1, Average 2, Very Good 3, Excellent 4. Target score for conceptual skills is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Of 56 students assessed, the results were: 1 Poor = 0, 2 Average = 5, 3 Very Good = 20, 4 Excellent = 31.

### Target for O3: Historical and contemporary knowledge

Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in four categories: Technical skills, conceptual skills, historical and contemporary knowledge and professional preparation. Possible scores are: Poor 1, Average 2, Very Good 3, Excellent 4. Target score for historical and contemporary knowledge is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Of 56 students assessed, the results were: 1 Poor = 1, 2 Average = 3, 3 Very Good = 25, 4 Excellent = 27.

### Target for O4: Professional preparation

Final Portfolio Reviews and Assessments are conducted by Faculty committee within each discipline. Student generated portfolios of studio work are evaluated in four categories: Technical skills, conceptual skills, historical and contemporary knowledge and professional preparation. Possible scores are: Poor 1, Average 2, Very Good 3, Excellent 4. Target score for professional preparation is 3.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Of 56 students assessed, the results were: 1 Poor = 2, 2 Average = 3, 3 Very Good = 17, 4 Excellent = 34.

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

**CTW ART 3910 and CTW 4950 Portfolio II in all 7 studio disciplines**

In fall 2009 the School, BFA majors will be required to take the new gateway CTW course ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemporary Art as they begin the foundation level studio courses in Area G. They will also be required to take the newly designated CTW 4950 Portfolio II course as the capstone course for the major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Fall semester 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All Studio faculty in 7 discipline areas of Photography, Textiles, Interior Design, Graphic Design, Sculpture, Drawing/Painting/Printmaking, Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>As demand for our CTW gateway course ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemporary Art increases after 2010, additional faculty may be needed to cover this demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>We hope to improve in the next year by specifically highlighting this deficiency with studio faculty with express directives aimed at improvement (e.g., clear, concise, and direct verbal and written presentation of work that is less esoteric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

CTW for Art Studio BFA is completed by Ambassador Craig Drennan.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

CTW for Art Studio BFA is completed by Ambassador Craig Drennan.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

CTW for Art Studio BFA is completed by Ambassador Craig Drennan.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?**

CTW for Art Studio BFA is completed by Ambassador Craig Drennan.
**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The learning outcomes for the gateway course and capstone course were changed by reducing the high numbers of outcomes that varied from the gateway to the capstone to four identical outcomes for both courses. This allows for a clear understanding of where and to what degree growth and learning occurred from the onset of the degree program to its conclusion.

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

Since we implemented the new learning outcomes just this past spring, we need to accumulate another semester’s worth of data in order to make an informed judgement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

We were finding with different learning outcomes for the gateway and capstone courses that it was difficult to determine where actual growth and development occurred and where we needed to take action. With consistent measures for both, we will obtain very clear indicators of our students strengths and weaknesses and can then address them accordingly.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

We learned that it was difficult to determine where growth occurred because of the varying measures employed for the introductory level students and the senior level students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We anticipate receiving much more informative data that will assist in addressing areas for improvement in our BFA program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Astronomy PhD**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Coming Soon

**Goals**

**G 1:** Coming Soon

Coming Soon

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

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

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

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

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

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

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

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

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

M 1: Qualifying Exam 2 (O: 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 As part of the M.S. program, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. Each Ph.D. student takes a second qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on graduate level astronomy and astrophysics, followed by an oral exam with a committee of four faculty members. Students are advised on their degree progress, and for Ph.D. students, on their preparedness for independent research. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are available in the Qualifying Exam 2 Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Seven students were rated by the exam committee after completing Qualifying Exam 2. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.

M 2: Research Advisor Evaluation (O: 1, 4, 6)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their Ph.D. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student’s progress in collaboration and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student’s successful dissertation defense. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are the first section of the advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Four students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 5.0 out of 5.0.

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Four students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.8 out of 5.0.

Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Four students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 4.9 out of 5.0.

M 3: Committee Evaluation of Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, written communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections
of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Eighteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.6 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Eighteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Eighteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Eighteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.7 out of 5.0.

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

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, oral communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Nineteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Nineteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Nineteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.7 out of 5.0.

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Nineteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**

The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the Ph.D. students in astronomy. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in the PhD in Astronomy program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. 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:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Committee Evaluation of Dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills  
- **Measure:** Motivations and Implications of Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking  
- **Measure:** Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills  
- **Measure:** Motivations and Implications of Research | **Outcome/Objective:** Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking  
- **Measure:** Qualifying Exam 2 | **Outcome/Objective:** Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills  
- **Measure:** Research Advisor Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Collaboration in Scientific Research  
| **Outcome/Objective:** Scientific & Research Technology | **Outcome/Objective:** 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:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 changed its assessment process since last year's assessment. Although data was collected last year, no report was submitted for the Astronomy PhD. Also, the number of students completing the Astronomy PhD each year is small.

Therefore the report for this cycle contains data collected from July 2009 to June 2011.

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

The assessment findings indicate a very high level of achievement for the students in the program. No significant changes are planned for the coming year based on this assessment.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2010-2011 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification**  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**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 and assess instruction.
Can Effectively plan for and assess instruction.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
Relevant Associations: Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

**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

**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

**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.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
With an N of 22, 86% of students scored a 3 or above on the EXC 7190 teaching sequence rubric. The range was 2-4. The mean score was 3.35.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
With an N of 22, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the P-12 rubric. The range was 3.5-3.95. The mean score was 3.64.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
With an N of 22, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the performance evaluation rubric. The range was 3.4-3.9. The mean score was 3.66.
**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

With an N of 22, 100 scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The range was 3-4. The mean score was 3.63.

**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 three measures and was at 86% for the other measure; target for all was 90%. The faculty have indicated that the student’s performance on these measures is adequate since they were within 4% 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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plan</td>
<td>Effectively plan and assess instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012

**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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Sequence</td>
<td>Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:** 11/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** BLD Coordinator and faculty

**Revise rubric**

After discussion, the BLD faculty decided to use the same rubric for the P-12 change project across programs.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil change project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012

**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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil change project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** BLD Coordinator and course instructor

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST*

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

Through a focus on teacher education as an area of excellence and research, the BLD Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing special educators who can make decisions that enable them to provide high quality instruction and support services consistent with the diverse needs and abilities of individuals with disabilities and their families. Because there is a critical shortage of teachers for students with mild disabilities in Georgia, the members of the BLD Faculty are committed to attracting and retaining highly qualified students who will become new special education teachers. The members of the BLD Faculty recognize that the personnel we prepare must have the flexibility to adapt to the changing role of the special educator, the changing patterns regarding how special education services are delivered, and the changing social and economic context in which individuals with disabilities will live. The growing availability of technology tools, improvements in field-based learning experiences, implementation of research-supported practices in special education, a focus on effective communication, and working collaboratively with other special educators, general educators, parents, and support personnel all have bearing on the enhancement of student learning. The BLD Master's program is a graduate program 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.

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.

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.

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

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
With an N of 9, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3.6-4. The mean score was 3.79.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
With an N of 9, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3-4. The mean score was 3.22.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Biology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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

G1: 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: 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: 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)
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
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, 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 22: Dilution Scheme problem solving BIO3890 (O: 1, 4, 5)
Course: BIOL 3890 Assessment: Final Exam Question (complex dilutions) Data: Students are taught to calculate dilution schemes for use in enumeration of bacteria. The following question requires the students take the learned principles and formula and apply them in a new situation (Bloom's level 3). Given the following serial dilution, what is the colony count of the original sample if 0.1 ml of the final dilution yields 185 organisms? 1:10 2:10 1:100 1:100 (Final Dilution) Outcome: Greater than 75% of the students were able to completely answer the question and demonstrate the mechanics of how they got there.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

Action Plan Biology Fall 2009
One issue in our curricula that was identified from assessment data collection was the discontinuity of topics covered in the same courses. We realized that in Cell & Molecular Biology, for example, instructors varied more from topic to topic than expected. This is a problem since our courses constitute components of a building, continuous degree program. Our dept. is holding subcommittee meetings with instructors to teach the same courses to form a concrete consensus on what topics must be covered in major courses. This will standardize the degree program so that students receive similar material in the same courses regardless of the instructor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frank Cruz, Therese Poole

Curriculum Assessment
At a recent faculty retreat it was realized that the Biology Department has grown large enough to re-examine the content overlap and gaps between required courses. The first step will be to form an Assessment Committee. The committee will decide how to best assess the curricula in consideration of our departmental goals (which are also being clarified).

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Goals

G 1: To provide opportunities to pursue graduate studies in biology for the 21st century

The accumulation of information in biology and related fields is increasing geometrically. In addition, ethical and problematic issues associated with environmental health, public health and individual health confront each of us everyday. Our goal is to train biologists to meet these challenges. We provide our students with a curriculum that emphasizes training in scientific literacy and critical thinking. We also provide them with opportunities to participate in internships and contribute to research efforts that explore a variety of scientific frontiers.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Student Learning Outcomes, Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings and Action Plans (G: 1)

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 in part 1 of the rubric. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: not met. A random sample of 12 non-thesis M.S. graduates were evaluated using the rubric and 58% (7/12 scored 4 or 5) achieved the target score. M 2: Thesis Report 1) Students prepare a thesis proposal, that is reviewed by a committee of at least three faculty members. Upon approval of the proposal, students register for Biol 8999 and undertake their thesis research. 2) Students complete the thesis and present an oral defense before the 3-member faculty committee and a general audience consisting of interested faculty and students. Achievement Target: 80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met. Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met. Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five proposals were approved. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met. Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six proposals were approved. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met. Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track. O 2: Scientific Inquiry. Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Related Measures: M 1: The non-thesis Report Students in the non-thesis track are asked to demonstrate the ability to analyze relevant data from the literature and/or from the student's laboratory. Students are evaluated on their ability to formulate logical arguments supporting interpretations of the data and describe the limit of our understanding about the chosen topic. Achievement Target: 65% of students achieve a score of 4 or higher on a 5-point scale in part 2 of the rubric. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: met. A random sample of 12 non-thesis M. S. graduates were evaluated using the rubric. 42% (10 of 12 (83%) scored 4 or 5). M 2: Thesis Report 1) Students prepare a thesis proposal, that is reviewed by a committee of at least three faculty members. Upon approval of the proposal, students undertake their thesis research. 2) Students complete the thesis and present an oral defense before the 3-member faculty committee and a general audience consisting of interested faculty and students. Achievement Target: 80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met. Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09. All three proposals were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met. Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five proposals were approved. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met. Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six proposals were approved. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met. Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track. O 3: Critical Thinking. Students will be able to critically assess the findings they have presented and formulate a reasonable hypothesis for future experiences. Related Measures: M 1: Non-thesis Report Students are asked to critique data sets and generate a speculative but testable hypothesis with alternative outcomes. It is expected that this section of the report be accompanied by an appropriate experimental design for testing the hypothesis. Achievement Target: 60% of students are expected to achieve a score of 4 or higher on a 5-point scale in part 3 of the rubric. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: not met. A random sample of 12 non-thesis M.S. graduates were evaluated using the rubric. 50% (6 of 12) scored 4 or 5. M 2: Thesis Report 1) Students prepare a thesis proposal, that is reviewed by a committee of at least three faculty members. Upon approval of the proposal, students undertake their thesis research. 2) Students complete the thesis and present an oral defense before the 3-member faculty committee and a general audience consisting of interested faculty and students. Achievement Target: 80% of those who submit a thesis proposal are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met. Three students submitted a thesis proposal between Su08 and Sp09.
All three proposals were approved. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Five students submitted a thesis proposal between Su07 and Sp08. All five proposals were approved. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Six students submitted a thesis proposal between Su06 and Sp07. All six proposals were approved. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met Three students submitted thesis proposals during the 2005-2006 academic year. After revision, 100% of the students were approved to continue on the thesis track.

O/O: Scientific Inquiry

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their MS degree between Su2008 and Sp2009. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 24 months, the median time was 22 months. Three M.S. degrees were awarded to biology doctoral students as non-terminal degrees. Of the 58 students enrolled only as M.S. students, 53 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 23.9 months, while the median was 22 months. Of the 58 students awarded a degree, 46 (79%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: three M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree.] Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 2.8 years, while the median time was 2.3 years. Of the 70 students awarded a degree, 46 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: this year, M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 9 current Ph.D. students who opted to complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. Thus, of the 61 MS recipients who were enrolled only as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree in 3 years or less.] Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years. Related Action Plans:

O/O: Scientific Inquiry

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their MS degree between Su2008 and Sp2009. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 24 months, the median time was 22 months. Three M.S. degrees were awarded to biology doctoral students as non-terminal degrees. Of the 58 students enrolled only as M.S. students, 53 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 23.9 months, while the median was 22 months. Of the 58 students awarded a degree, 46 (79%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: three M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree.] Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 2.8 years, while the median time was 2.3 years. Of the 70 students awarded a degree, 46 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: this year, M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 9 current Ph.D. students who opted to complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. Thus, of the 61 MS recipients who were enrolled only as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree in 3 years or less.] Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years. Related Action Plans:

O/O: Scientific Inquiry

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their MS degree between Su2008 and Sp2009. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 24 months, the median time was 22 months. Three M.S. degrees were awarded to biology doctoral students as non-terminal degrees. Of the 58 students enrolled only as M.S. students, 53 (91%) completed the program in 3 years or less.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 23.9 months, while the median was 22 months. Of the 58 students awarded a degree, 46 (79%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: three M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree.] Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 70 students completed their MS degree between Su2007 and Sp2008. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 2.8 years, while the median time was 2.3 years. Of the 70 students awarded a degree, 46 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. [Note: this year, M.S. degrees were offered to biology doctoral students as a non-terminal degree. Of the 9 current Ph.D. students who opted to complete the non-thesis M.S. requirements, 8 had already been in their doctoral program for more than 3 years. Thus, of the 61 MS recipients who were enrolled only as M.S. students throughout their entire graduate program, 45 (74%) obtained their degree in 3 years or less.] Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 64 students completed their MS degree between Su2006 and Sp2007. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 3.0 years, while the median time was 2.34 years. Of the 64 students awarded a degree, 42 (66%) completed the program in 3 years or less. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met 61 students completed their M.S. degree during the 2005-2006 year. Of these, 69% completed their degree within three years. The average time to completion of degree was 2.74 years, and the median time was 2.33 years. Related Action Plans:
Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Scientific Content (M: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate the ability to 1) form hypotheses, design experiments, collect data, and evaluate results; 2) comprehend the current scientific literature; 3) place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and 4) develop an understanding of the impact of these discoveries on science and society.

Related Measures: M 1: Ph.D. Qualifying Examination Students must prepare, submit, and orally defend an NIH-style research proposal. The examination process follows a specific timeline. 1) Students must submit a pre-proposal in which they state the nature of the problem, present their hypothesis, and briefly describe their experimental design. The pre-proposal is evaluated by a 3-member faculty committee who either grant their approval or make suggestions. 2) After the pre-proposal or a revised pre-proposal has been approved, students have two months to complete the full proposal. During this time period, they receive mentoring from their Committee in the form of 1-2 meetings in which they present their progress on developing the proposal and receive suggestions from the Committee. 3) Students submit their completed proposals and orally defend them before their Committees. The Committee then makes one of the following assessments of student performance: a) Pass (satisfactory performance on both the written and oral parts of the examination); b) Qualified Pass (satisfactory performance on the written proposal, but deficiencies noted in the oral defense); c) Conditional Pass (certain parts of the written proposal must be revised); or Fail (unsatisfactory performance on both the proposal and the oral defense). Students who fail the examination two times are subject to expulsion from the Ph.D. program. Achievement Target: 75% of students are expected to receive a Pass on their first attempt, and 90% are expected to receive a Pass, Qualified Pass, or Decision Pending. Of those who receive a Qualified Pass or a Conditional Pass, 80% are expected to meet the conditions stipulated by their Committee 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 Qualifying Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are retaking the examination during the Fa08 semester, and the fourth has left the program.

Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2006-2007 academic year. Of these 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. Two who received a conditional pass 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. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5 years. 15 of the 17 students (88%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 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 department during the 2005-2006 academic year. Of these, 5 (45%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less. O 2: Scientific Communication Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats. Related Measures: M 2: 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 Qualifying Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are retaking the examination during the Fa08 semester, and the fourth has left the program. 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 associated with the Doctoral Examination Format. 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. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these, 7 (64%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these, 15 (94%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. The two students who received the Decision Pending 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 18 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 associated with the Doctoral Examination Format. 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.

Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program. Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5.6 years. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5.6 years. 15 of the 17 students (88%) 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 Inquiry (M: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. [Preview Formatting] Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats. Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. [Preview Formatting] Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats. Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. [Preview Formatting] Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and oral formats.

Findings (2005-2006) - Achievement Target: 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. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these, 7 (64%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 15 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these, 15 (94%) 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. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 11 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these, 7 (64%) completed their degrees in 6.5 years or less.
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 Pass or Decision Pending, 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, 2 (11%) received a Qualified Pass, 1 (6%) received a Conditional Pass, 3 (17%) received a Decision Pending, and 2 (11%) received a Fail. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass took their examinations 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 qualifying 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.

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. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5.3 years. 13 of the 15 students (87%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 24 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 6.48 years, while the median time was 6.3 years. Fourteen of the 24 students (58%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2006-2007) - Achievement Target: Met 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 6.48 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 (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.

Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met Sixteen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 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. Those 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 qualifying 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.

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. Achievement Target: 50% of students who receive their Ph.D.s will have spent 6.5 years or less in the doctoral program. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 17 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2008-2009 academic year. The average time from entry into the program until receipt of degree was 5.6 years, while the median time was 5 years. 15 of the 17 students (88%) completed their degree work in 6.5 years or less. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Met 24 students received their Ph.D.s from the Biology Department during the 2007-2008 academic year. The 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.
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(Drs. G. Pierce, C.-D. Liu, and C. Jiang). Analysis Answers What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention? The percentage of students who passed the Ph.D. qualifying examination dipped below the goals set by the department during 2007-2008. This may reflect the fact that this year certain changes were made to the format for the Ph.D. examination. Specifically, students were no longer required to prepare a full NIH-style proposal with multiple specific aims. Instead, they were required to propose a single specific aim and defend it orally. Faculty committee input was also decreased: faculty were limited to providing one set of comments for the pre-proposal and one for the rough draft of the final proposal. The relatively low percentage of students who passed this year may be due to 1) a statistical anomaly, 2) the need for students and faculty alike to adjust to the new examination format, or 3) a defect in the examination process that must be addressed. The pass rates will be monitored closely next year and, based on the results, modifications may need to be made in the exam format.

Source of Evidence: Efficiency

**M 2: Details for Action Plans Established this Cycle (O: 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(Drs. G. Pierce, C.-D. Liu, and C. Jiang). Analysis Answers What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention? The percentage of students who passed the Ph.D. qualifying examination dipped below the goals set by the department during 2007-2008. This may reflect the fact that this year certain changes were made to the format for the Ph.D. examination. Specifically, students were no longer required to prepare a full NIH-style proposal with multiple specific aims. Instead, they were required to propose a single specific aim and defend it orally. Faculty committee input was also decreased: faculty were limited to providing one set of comments for the pre-proposal and one for the rough draft of the final proposal. The relatively low percentage of students who passed this year may be due to 1) a statistical anomaly, 2) the need for students and faculty alike to adjust to the new examination format, or 3) a defect in the examination process that must be addressed. The pass rates will be monitored closely next year and, based on the results, modifications may need to be made in the exam format.

Source of Evidence: Efficiency

**M 3: Ph.D. Qualifying Exam**
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 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). 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 100% of the students complete the two 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 classes that meet the attendance policy and will be measured (O 2 & 3). The Ph.D. Qualifying Exam 1) During the second year students are required to complete Bio 6801 “Survival Skills in Academia”. At the beginning of the third year students must register Bio 9991 or 9992, these are discipline specific graded courses used to mentor and evaluate students based upon the preparation of a scientific proposal. 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 graduate in a timely manner Beginning in their third and continuing through graduation students are expected to attend and present their research results at regional, national and international meetings. This provides the opportunity to establish scientific collaborations as students begin establishing their own scientific networks.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
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 rational 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 (M: 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.

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.

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.

SLO 4: Software Skills (M: 4)

Students will acquire expertise in the selection and use of key decision making software packages.

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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All students scored 3 or higher in their ability to do qualitative analysis.

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
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 variables and 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, transforming the data. 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Quantitative Model building ability is the cornerstone of the Business Analysis program, and all students did well in this regard. Their work on projects shows that they can develop statistical models for forecasting, optimization, and other tasks very well.

**M 3: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

At least 80% of the students scored 3 or above on this measure. A couple of students showed some weakness in the mathematical concepts behind the techniques used. Additional resources can be made available in the future to assist such students, such as video instruction online.

**M 4: Software Skills (O: 4)**

This measure evaluates the students’ expertise in using key software in business decision analysis and problem solving situations. It will be assessed during the completion of projects and assignments across the curriculum.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Software Skills**


**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Software skills tend to have the most variation among students. Still, most students were competent enough in their software abilities to score 3 or higher on the scale. Some recurring software issues tend to be problems with installation of SAS on various operating systems.

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

**Continual Improvement Actions**

The assessment data show that both the programs are currently meeting or exceeding expectations, and have shown improvement over the data in 2008. With this in mind, the key elements of the action plan are as follows: 1. To continue the efforts made over the past few years in keeping the course material current, updating cases and examples to reflect industry practices today. 2. To...
add more resources online to aid in software competency. 3. To encourage students to engage in collaborative learning. Students post projects on the web and learn from each others’ work. This strategy has over the years yielded very positive results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>05/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>BA Faculty Members</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>

**To Hire New Faculty**

Two trends have been noted in this area: 1. Analytics skills are increasingly used in business, and new techniques are being developed to analyze data. 2. Enrollment in our courses is going up. We need new faculty to meet the demand for existing courses as well as to offer new ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>We are currently in the middle of the hiring process, conducting interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>A hiring committee chaired by Dr. Subhashish Samaddar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process remains unchanged. The current version is appropriate for our objectives.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

The data show that students from various disciplines in the college of business as well as computer science, mathematics, and economics are taking our electives due to the practical, applied nature of the courses. Currently, the program is effective. However, due to the loss of several faculty members to retirement in the past couple of years, our ability to offer courses frequently enough as well as to offer new courses is constrained. Additional faculty resources are needed for growth in this area.

---
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---

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**O/O 1: Solving Problems related to chemistry (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Specific questions from the ACS exit examination for each course were chosen by the faculty. The national mean and median for these questions is known and the department uses this as an indicator of students' critical thinking skills. The national mean for all exams is between 2.5 and 3.1 questions correct. (Nationally for this subset of questions the average student answers 2.5 - 3.1 of the 8 questions correct) The departmental goal is 4 out of the 8 questions correct.

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: ACS exam questions for 1151 (O: 1)**

These questions are copyrighted and cannot be placed in report.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**

Target goal was 4 out of 8. Students averaged 6.5 out of 8.

**M 2: ACS exam in 1152 (O: 1)**

ACS results of 8 critical thinking questions off of Chem 1152 exam

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**

Goal was 4/8

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 6.7/8

**M 3: ACS Exit exam in 1211 (O: 1)**

Students got 4/8 on 1211 ACS exit exam on critical thinking problems

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**

Goal was 4/8 students averaged 3.8 out of 8.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The Goal was 4/8 students scored 4.1/8

**M 4: ACS result in 1212 (O: 1)**

Students should receive at least a 4/8 on critical thinking questions on the ACS exam

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Solving Problems related to chemistry**

Goal was 4 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.

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

**Target for O2: Using critical thinking skills to interpret data**

85% of students should receive an adequate or better.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

83 % of students received adequate or better.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

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

**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 examination or an oral presentation in class. 1d) Presentation of a poster or oral talk at a Georgia State, local, regional or national meeting.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

#### 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 interperate original data.

Relevant Associations: American Chemical Society

#### 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

### 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

### 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.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry**

Out of 8 questions related to critical thinking students should answer 4 correct. (National average is 3.9 correct)

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The average student scored 3.9/8.0 on Critical Thinking standardized questions.

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**

Out of 8 questions that relate to quantitative skills students should receive 4/8 (national average 3.8)

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average student scored 4.2/8.0 on Quantitative Questions.

#### 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.

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

**Target for O1: Oral and Written Communication Skills**

Average of "Adequate" on Rubric

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

76% of students scored adequate or better on the lab report rubric.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking in Chemistry**

Adequate or better under critical thinking on the rubric.
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 major and non-major students in 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 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 RGP initiative and STEM initiative. A three year grant based on the RGP 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 students enrolled were biology majors (59%) and 28 are chemistry majors (18%). After the General Chemistry series, the biology majors go on to take BIOL3800 – Molecular Cell Biology, which requires students to have a strong background in key chemistry concepts. Both chemistry and biology majors are then required to complete a course in Biochemistry. In addition, much of the research performed in the chemistry department at Georgia State University is biologically oriented with most of the faculty specializing in some subfield of biochemistry (biophysical, biochemical, 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 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. In 2007 the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %.
The 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.

Mission / Purpose

The chemistry department is certified by the ACS. This involves a full program review by the ACS every 5 years with a short annual review of senior research reports (our capstone courses) and student certifications. Course syllabi, including content and the number and types of courses taught, undergraduate research reports, and the professional quality of the instrumentation used in our laboratories are of prime consideration in the certification process. Additional benefits of association with the ACS is the access to standardized tests that allow us to assess our students learning outcomes compared to national standards. In order to graduate with a B.S. in chemistry and be successful in careers after college, the students should show proficiency on these exams as a measure of their obtaining fundamental knowledge of the prescribed chemistry curriculum compared to national standards. Because these tests measure fundamental knowledge we also employ an extensive laboratory curriculum that encourages analytical thought processes and concludes with development of extensive writing skills leading to final reports and oral presentations in our capstone courses. In conjunction with our use of ACS exams we also employ an internal review and revision process. We have committees in place for evaluation of each major area of the undergraduate curriculum. This includes freshmen chemistry (all first and second semester core courses), organic chemistry (second year chemistry), biochemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), physical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), analytical chemistry (third and fourth year chemistry), and review of senior research theses. A review of student outcomes and their assessment is conducted by each committee with appropriate feedback given to individual instructors to enhance our courses and continue to let them evolve to a better level.

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
**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.

**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

---
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**Mission / Purpose**
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## 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 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 2012  
- 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000 (M: 1, 2, 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Competent Speaker Measure (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 949 students in fall 2010 and 728 students in spring 2011. 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Competent Speaker evaluations were completed across all Speech 1000 sections, yielding data for 949 students in fall 2010 and 728 students in spring 2011. 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.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the PRCA measure, collected data over the past six years has fallen consistently between the following scores: Group = 12-
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In fall 2010 and spring 2011, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the PRCA-24 measure, producing 949 scores in fall 2010 and 728 scores in spring 2011. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2010 mean score indicated an overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations, from 181.4056 pre-test to 196.3284 post-test. In fall 2010, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased (from 21.66178 to 23.36701 and from 51.25136 to 57.24465 respectively) and logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2010, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2011 results showed an increase in the willingness to communicate measure, from 181.2584 in the pre-test to 197.2571 in the post-test, as well as slight increases in all other measures.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target for O1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000

For the WTC measure, collected data over the past five years has fallen consistently between the following scores: Public = 20-25; Meeting = 52-64; Group = 70-78; Dyad = 49-57; Stranger = 52-64; Acquaintance = 68-75; Friend = 63-71; Overall (total) = 188-205. Using these ranges as the target for this year’s assessment is reasonable because the data has consistently replicated and provided the necessary information to draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of Speech 1000 in meeting the university, department, and course curriculum learning outcomes.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In fall 2010 and spring 2011, all sections of Speech 1000 were selected for data interpretation using the WTC measure, producing 949 scores in fall 2010 and 728 scores in spring 2011. As shown in the above tables, the fall 2010 mean score indicated an overall increase in students' willingness to communicate in the various situations, from 181.4056 pre-test to 196.3284 post-test. In fall 2010, the public communication score and communication with a stranger score both increased (from 21.66178 to 23.36701 and from 51.25136 to 57.24465 respectively) and logic suggests that the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000 is partly (but not wholly) responsible for these results. In fall 2010, all other situations showed an increase in students' willingness to communicate. As the data above indicates, the spring 2011 results showed an increase in the willingness to communicate measure, from 181.2584 in the pre-test to 197.2571 in the post-test, as well as slight increases in all other measures.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery
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Mission / Purpose

The Communication Disorders (CD) Program is a unit of the Educational Psychology & Special Education Department. The mission of the CD Program is to offer a high quality master's degree program which educates students to implement evidence-based services across the scope of practice in speech-language pathology. The program will achieve this goal through the continual pursuit of excellence in academic and clinical education and by infusion of research and scholarly experiences appropriate to a master’s degree program. We will utilize the unique strengths of our community's diverse population and our numerous affiliated sites to prepare fully-certified speech-language pathologists who are exceptionally well-qualified to work in schools, hospitals, private clinics, and rehabilitation programs throughout the state. During the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, 100% of the students taking the Praxis II exam (16) passed it on their first attempt. Scores ranged from 620 to 770 with an average score of 705.

**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 2010-2011 - 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 5 above average.

**Target for **O14: Understand Linguistic & Cultural Diversity**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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 5 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 10 students scored within the average range; and 5 above average.

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 10 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 12 students scored within the average range; and 3 above average.

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 10 students scored within the average range; and 5 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 2010-2011 - 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 4 above average.

Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 4 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 (4-6), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II exam was 73%.

Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention
Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (4-6), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II exam was 73%.

Target for O13: Apply Technology
Due to the small number of exam questions in this area (4-6), ETS does not calculate the national average performance range. The program has targeted an overall program performance score of 70% or higher.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The overall average program performance for this section of the Praxis II exam was 73%.

M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemt) (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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

87.5% of the students (14 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Two students scored below average; 8 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

87.5% of the students (14 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. Two students scored below average; 8 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 14 students scored within the average range; and 1 above average.

Target for O6: Evaluate Research Relevance
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 14 students scored within the average range; and 1 above average.

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
94% of the students (15 out of 16) scored within the national average range or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average; 14 students scored within the average range; and 1 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.83 on this section of the portfolio.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.75 on this section of the portfolio.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.83 on this section of the portfolio.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Students achieved an average rating of 3.92 on this section of the portfolio.

M 13: Portfolio Section 5 (Std 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students achieved an average rating of 3.75 on this section of the portfolio.

M 15: Portfolio Section 7 (Prof Issues) (O: 7)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can describe and discuss contemporary professional issues related to clinical standards, practice guidelines, and practice management.

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

**Target for O7: Discuss Contemporary Professional Issues**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students achieved an average rating of 3.25 on this section of the portfolio.

M 16: Portfolio Section 8 (Prof Credentials) (O: 8)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must outline the requirements for national and state certification and licensure.

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

**Target for O8: Outline Professional Credentials**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students achieved an average rating of 4.0 on this section of the portfolio.

M 17: Portfolio Section 9 (Comm Skills) (O: 9)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they have appropriate oral and written communication skills.

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

**Target for O9: Demonstrate Appropriate Communication Skills**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students achieved an average rating of 3.42 on this section of the portfolio.

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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students achieved an average rating of 3.84 on this section of the portfolio.

M 19: Portfolio Section 11 (Clin Skills - Interven) (O: 11)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can develop and implement functional and effective intervention programs.

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

**Target for O11: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.75 on this section of the portfolio.

**M 20: Portfolio Section 12 (Interpersonal Qual) (O: 12)**

All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must document that they have appropriate collaborative and interpersonal skills and are able to self-evaluate clinical performance.

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

**Target for O12: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities**

Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.75 on this section of the portfolio.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.92 on this section of the portfolio.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students achieved an average rating of 3.67 on this section of the portfolio.

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

**Monitor student performance**

Two students scored below the national average on the Clinical Management subtest of the Praxis II exam. This was surprising for two reasons; both students performed well in their clinical experiences, and the program graduates have met or exceeded the national average on this subtest every year since 2006-2007. The program faculty do not believe any action is needed at this time; however, the scores for this subtest will be monitored during the next two years for potential trends in student performance.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Management) | Outcome/Objective: Apply Technology
- Measure: Praxis II Exam Category VII Score (Prof Issues) | Outcome/Objective: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct

Implementation Description: Students' scores for this subtest will be monitored during the next two years for potential trends in student performance.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator.
Additional Resources: None

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The Communication Disorders Program did not make any changes in our assessment process this past year. We completed a comprehensive curriculum review in 2010-2011. We will be reviewing student and program assessment tools during the 2011-2012 academic year and may decide to modify the assessment tools that are currently used to measure learning outcomes.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

The Communication Disorders Program completed a comprehensive curriculum review in 2010-2011. Two new courses are being proposed in addition to changes in several existing courses in the curriculum. We believe these changes will have a positive impact on our students' knowledge and skills needed to enter the workforce.

**Challenges for Next Year**

The Communication Disorders Program will be reviewing student and program assessment tools and may decide to modify the assessment tools that are currently used to measure learning outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Communication MA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST)

**Goals**

G 1: Scholarly or creative excellence

Our highly diverse cohort of MA students can nonetheless be divided into two broad categories: those whose work is centered on scholarship and research, and those whose work is centered on the creative production of media work (films, videos, images, etc.). Students in the creative tracks are expected to develop a strong personal aesthetic vision as evidenced in their work, as well as a solid mastery of the technical demands of media production. Students in the research tracks are expected to produce a methodologically sound and theoretically rigorous scholarly exploration of a question central to the sub-field of communication which they are working in.

G 2: Broad understanding of communications fields

The MA in Communication trains students in a number of different sub-fields in our discipline, ranging from rhetorical studies to quantitative studies of media messages, from humanistic approaches to film and media to digital moving image production. Nevertheless, all students receiving the MA in Communication are expected to 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: 1)

Students should demonstrate a command of the key texts in their area of specialization. These include theoretical and scholarly literature in the area; additionally, for the Film/Video specialization, it includes a breadth of knowledge of the important artistic works, styles, and movements that comprise the film canon.

SLO 2: Written, oral, and media-making competencies (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4, 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 articulate 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.

SLO 3: Understanding of research methods (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)

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.

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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
M 1: End-of-course evaluation: knowledge of communication theory and literature (O: 1)

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. The rubric that directly measures the overall knowledge of the communication field is as follows: Course content: overall literature. 1 – student has read and mastered a good deal of the literature in the field over and above the material on the course reading list. In presenting the material, the student is fully at the level of a very good doctoral student 2 – student demonstrates a clear mastery of the literature in the form of the course readings but with significant areas of reading outside the required material. The student likely received an ‘A’ in the course. 3 – student has a good mastery of the literature of the area, with few if any major gaps. Much of the student's knowledge of the area comes from the readings required in the course. 4 – there are some significant gaps in the student’s knowledge of the literature of the area. 5 – there are wide gaps in the student's knowledge of the literature of the area. And for Comm Theory: Course content: theory: 1 - sophisticated knowledge of theoretical issues pertaining to the course, going well beyond the required readings, with an understanding of the historical and intellectual contexts of all major theoretical positions, and most importantly, evidence that the student can make theoretical interventions of some degree of originality. 2 excellent knowledge of theoretical issues pertaining to the course, going somewhat beyond the required readings, and evidencing some degree of historical and intellectual contexts of debates. The student feels comfortable making theoretical interventions, though there might be some awkwardness of execution. 3 - student evidences a good command of theoretical groundings of the course, and can accurately summarize them, but is inacurate in making theoretical interventions, and needs to understand the intellectual contexts of theoretical developments more clearly. 4 – the student has shown some difficulty in accurately summarizing theoretical arguments, in commanding theoretical vocabulary, and in making theoretical interventions. 5 – the student’s knowledge of theory is inadequate to the demands of an MA thesis Additionally, for students in the creative tracks, we have the following rubric: Cinematic language: 1 - Student has a breadth of knowledge of cinematic traditions worldwide, and can mobilize that knowledge both when analyzing others' creative work but also when thinking about his/her own work. 2 – Student has a good understanding of cinematic traditions, with perhaps a few gaps here and there. The student is able to use this knowledge in the screenings of student work. 3 – Student knows the key reference points (eg, montage schools, neorealism, etc.) but would benefit from a wider vocabulary from which to draw upon. 4 – Student has difficulty translating knowledge of cinematic traditions to new works being viewed. 5 – Student has little or no knowledge of cinematic traditions.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions

The scale on these rubrics has been set deliberately very high, so that we can have a better spread across the numbers so as to be able to identify problem areas. By the second year in the program, all students should be averaging a 2.5 or higher. Students in the first year should score 3.0 or higher. An average in any given semester of 3.5 or below represents a significant problem, which could hinder the student's performance in the program.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

54 students were evaluated in the Fall; 44 in the Spring. In the area of knowledge of the literature, in both semesters 13 students (24% and 30%) were assessed below 3.0; in Fall, 11 students were assessed at 3.0, while 8 were assessed at 3.0 in Spring. None of these figures was correlated with year in program; relatively equal percentages of students scored below expectation no matter their year in program. In the area of competence in theory, in Fall 12 students fell below 3.0 and 14 scored at 3.0; in Spring, 8 students fell below 3.0 and 11 were at 3.0. Again, these did not correlate to semester in program. In the MA program, while we would like the student to score at a level of 2.5 by the end of program, an MA student averaging a 3.0 in these areas would likely not be at risk in the program, since the rubrics have been set to doctoral expectations. However, those students scoring below 3.0 in these areas should be considered to be performing at a level which might put them at risk in the program.

M 2: End-of-course evaluation: knowledge of methods in communication study (O: 3)

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. The rubric which measures student command of the literature in the field. (See Measure #1)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Understanding of research methods

The scale on these rubrics has been set deliberately very high, so that we can have a better spread across the numbers so as to be able to identify problem areas. By the second year in the program, all students should be averaging a 2.5 or higher. Students in the first year should score 3.0 or higher. An average in any given semester of 3.5 or below represents a significant problem, which could hinder the student's performance in the program.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

54 students were evaluated in the Fall; 44 in the Spring. Because of the interdisciplinarity of the department, methodology is measured by the rubric which measures competence and knowledge of the literature of the field. (ie, because methodology in rhetorical studies will be different than methodology in cultural studies or content analysis.) In the area of knowledge of the literature, in both semesters 13 students (24% and 30%) were assessed below 3.0; in Fall, 11 students were assessed at 3.0, while 8 were assessed at 3.0 in Spring. None of these figures was correlated with year in program; relatively equal percentages of students scored below expectation no matter their year in program.

M 3: End-of-course evaluation: writing skills (O: 2)

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. We have two rubrics which measure student writing skills based on the final papers, proposals, and other writing assignments in the MA seminars. Overall writing effectiveness: 1 - the final paper is of a level you would expect of a very good doctoral student 2 - the final paper is quite effective, but is not quite what one would expect at the doctoral level (ie, the student is still working through other people's arguments rather than fully articulating a critical problem of his/her own) 3 - the paper is good, but requires a significant reconceptualization of the thesis, or a major reorganization of the argument, and/or a reconceptualization of the theoretical groundwork 4 - the paper is weak in more than one of the areas in (3) above 5 - the paper is not of graduate-seminar quality Writing Style: 1 - the writing is not only lucid and effective, but also elegant. Not only are there no technical errors in the writing, but the writer...
has full mastery of his/her voice, full command of rhetorical strategies and rhythmic cadences of prose style. 2 – a strong, effective paper (it probably received a grade of A). There are only very few, if any, technical errors, and an overall solid command of the language. 3 – a competently written paper which is marred by a few recurrent technical errors, unfortunate word choices, or other stylistic lapses that mark the essay as that of a “student.” 4 – Writing with technical errors sufficient enough to lose the reader, and/or with repeated passages which are difficult or impossible to comprehend, or which illustrate that the writer is not in control of his/her language 5 – Writing which technically is not expected at the graduate level

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

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

The scale on these rubrics has been set deliberately very high, so that we can have a better spread across the numbers so as to be able to identify problem areas. By the second year in the program, all students should be averaging a 2.5 or higher. Students in the first year should score 3.0 or higher. An average in any given semester of 3.5 or below represents a significant problem, which could hinder the student's performance in the program.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Two rubrics are used for writing competence, one measuring overall effectiveness of the writing (argumentation, organization) and another measuring the readability, style, and voice of the writing. In Fall, 11 students (or 20%) fell below 3.0 in writing effectiveness, while 8 fell below 3.0 in style (15%). In Spring, 8 students fell below 3.0 in writing effectiveness (18%), while 7 (16%) fell below 3.0 in style.

**M 4: End-of-course evaluation: oral presentation proficiency (O: 2)**

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. For proficiency in oral presentation and advocacy, we have two rubrics to measure both the student's ability to present material formally, and the ability to make astute and targeted interventions in class discussion and in the discussion of the work of colleagues. Oral communication skills: presentations 1 – in presenting an article to the seminar, the student has done the work of finding out the intellectual context of the argument, and clearly articulates the central problem the article is engaged in answering. The presentation is driven by the student's own intellectual engagement with the material, and the student's voice is not hijacked by that of the article's author. The student understands the article on its own terms, while still being able to actively interrogate it throughout the presentation. 2 – the student's presentation of an article is overall excellent: the student clearly understands the stakes of the argument, can present it without significant error or distortion, and can actively interrogate it. The student, however, still might compartmentalize these areas of the presentation, leading to a less dynamic presentation than that at level '5' above. 3 – student can present a competent summary of his/her aesthetic project to the workshop. 4 – the student's interventions in seminar discussions are not only clear, sharp, and to-the-point, but also evidence a keen and subtle understanding of the nuances of the discussion; the student answers difficult questions directly and with clarity. 5 – the student cannot coherently present his/her work in the workshop

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

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

The scale on these rubrics has been set deliberately very high, so that we can have a better spread across the numbers so as to be able to identify problem areas. By the second year in the program, all students should be averaging a 2.5 or higher. Students in the first year should score 3.0 or higher. An average in any given semester of 3.5 or below represents a significant problem, which could hinder the student's performance in the program.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

54 students evaluated in Fall; 44 in Spring. Two rubrics are used to measure oral proficiency: one which measures quality of presentation, the other which measures the quality of oral interventions, whether via discussion, question/answer, etc. In the area of presentations, in Fall 12 students fell below 3.0; in Spring, 8 students did. This represents 22% and 18%. In the area of discussion, the students falling below 3.0 were, Fall: 14; spring: 9. (20%; 20%)

**M 5: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
Of the 14 MA students defending prospectuses this year, one (or 7%) was ranked fair in articulation of the research problem; two (14%) were ranked fair in theoretical underpinnings of the work; and three (21%) were ranked fair in methodological soundness. This represents an improvement over the numbers in the last cycle. It also suggests that methodology remains the single area most in need of improvement in MA thesis prospectuses. An action item should be formulated.

M 6: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
Of the five creative theses completed this year, two evaluations were completed. All categories were ranked good or excellent for these two theses. Of the 14 research theses completed this year, six evaluations were completed. One out of the six was ranked at the level of fair in all categories. The low turnout here needs to be examined. Since there was 100% compliance with completion of evaluations for prospectus defenses, perhaps faculty were not aware that theses needed to be evaluated after the defense.

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 an 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We did not put in place a mechanism for measuring this. No findings will be reported this cycle.

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

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
### Measure student engagement with new media

On hold. Once we implement the end-of-year reporting system for all MA students, then we can set measures and targets for this.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** On-Hold
- **Priority:** High

#### Implementation Details:

**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

### Annual reports submitted by all grad students

While our MA students are highly active in their participation in film festivals, engagement with new media, and in other creative and scholarly activities, we do not consistently gather information here. Typically, we only see the cv’s of MA students if they have a teaching assignment. Thus, beginning this year, we will require all MA students to complete a questionnaire in which they describe in detail the various outside activities, recognitions, and so forth that they have been involved in. These can include film festival participation, new media work; conferences or publications; etc. After this is in place, we can develop a measure and a target for these activities.

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

#### Implementation Details:

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** End-of-course evaluation: knowledge of communication theory and literature
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions

**Measurement:**
- **Measure:** End-of-course evaluation: knowledge of methods in communication study
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of research methods

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

### Begin new assessment system based on data collected 2010-11

#### Background:

Last year, the department implemented an online evaluation system with six rubrics, for all MA and doctoral students in the program, for every course that they took. The results were aggregated by year-in-program, program of study, and were averaged for each student across all the seminars the student took. The results have been reported throughout this WEAVE report as findings;

- **Priority:** High

#### Implementation Details:

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** End-of-course evaluation: knowledge of communication theory and literature
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions

**Measurement:**
- **Measure:** End-of-course evaluation: knowledge of methods in communication study
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding of research methods

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee, Graduate Faculty

---

**Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High
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 three primary areas of emphasis: Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Image 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 Rhetoric/Politics, Media and Society, and Moving Image Studies are all 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 (Rhetoric and Politics, Media and Society, or Moving Image Studies), professional interaction with leading scholars in their areas of research, publication in journals, and service activities in the graduate student caucuses of the professional organizations in their area.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Research proficiency (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
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).

Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
Measures, Targets, and Findings

O/O 6: Professional development (G: 3) (M: 6, 7)
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.

O/O 7: Increase student engagement with new media (M: 9)
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.

O/O 8: Enhance recruitment of graduate students
We find that we are losing some of our best applicants to programs at other universities, and we need to find ways to increase the yield of our top-tier applicants.

O/O 9: Enhance ongoing intellectual life outside the seminars
Having a vibrant intellectual life outside the regular seminars is a vital part of a doctoral program, making it more attractive to potential students as well as providing enormous if intangible benefits to current students. The department has just inaugurated what we hope to be an annual workshop, in which an internationally renowned senior scholar brings in a book manuscript s/he is completing to be workshopped by faculty and advanced graduate students. Dudley Andrew from Yale inaugurated our first departmental workshop in Spring 2010; while internationally renowned Ernesto Laclau will come in Spring 2011. These workshops should continue. In addition, the department should work to increase the number of distinguished scholars we bring in for lectures and/or workshops. Finally, a group of faculty in Moving Image Studies (Restivo, Raengo, Barker) is currently organized what promises to be a major Moving Image Studies conference in Feb 2011, on the theme "Rendering the Visible." Many highly visible film-media scholars will be here. Hopefully the MIS conference can continue with that name and a different theme each time; perhaps not every year but biannually.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: End-of-course assessment: competence in theory (O: 1, 2)
We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses.

Competence in theory will now be directly assessed with the following rubric: 1 - sophisticated knowledge of theoretical issues pertaining to the course, going well beyond the required readings, with an understanding of the historical and intellectual contexts of all major theoretical positions, and most importantly, evidence that the student can make theoretical interventions of some degree of originality. 2 excellent knowledge of theoretical issues pertaining to the course, going somewhat beyond the required readings, and evidencing some degree of historical and intellectual contexts of debates. The student feels comfortable making theoretical interventions, though there might be some awkwardness of execution. 3 - student evidences a good command of theoretical groundings of the course, and can accurately summarize them; but is insecure in making theoretical interventions, and needs to understand the intellectual contexts of theoretical developments more clearly. 4 – the student has shown some difficulty in accurately...
summarizing theoretical arguments, in commanding theoretical vocabulary, and in making theoretical interventions. 5 – the student's knowledge of theory is inadequate to do doctoral-level research.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Research proficiency**

These rubrics were set deliberately high, and the "1"s are designed to represent the standards of the profession. Since the assessments will be done at the end of every seminar, every semester, we will be able to track how aggregate performance moves during the years of coursework. By the end of coursework, we expect all students to be performing at the level of 2 or better; students in the first year of coursework might be expected to fall between 2 and 3, with a small percentage falling below 3. A score of 3.5 or below indicates a serious problem that could affect performance in the program.

FINDINGS 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

In the rubric that measures the student's mastery of the overall literature and methodologies in the various sub-specializations, the mean/median in the fall were 2.5/2.6, and in the spring were 2.3/4.25. In the category of students falling below the performance benchmark of 3.5, three were in that group in the Fall (evenly distributed by year in the program), and 3 fell into that group in the Spring (though in the spring all three were in the first year of the program). Since we have only just begun to use these rubrics this year, it is too early to be able to explain variances in performance over time; hopefully explanations will emerge as we gather more data over a longer time frame. Significantly, though, this rubric was the one which registered the highest frequency of "3" rankings: 10 students in Fall and 9 in Spring. A full 40-50% of students in the third year of coursework were assessed at 3 or lower; while among students in the second year of coursework, 35-50% were assessed at 3 or lower; and the percentage among students in the first year of the program scoring 3 or lower was invariant for the two semesters, at 36%. The 3 in this rubric indicates that the student's knowledge of the area comes almost entirely from course readings and little from independent study. This finding may have some explanatory power in relation to the poor performance on the comprehensive exams this year, insofar as those depend on reading lists of material much of which is not covered in coursework.

**Target for O2: Proficiency in communication theory**

These rubrics were set deliberately high, and the "1"s are designed to represent the standards of the profession. Since the assessments will be done at the end of every seminar, every semester, we will be able to track how aggregate performance moves during the years of coursework. By the end of coursework, we expect all students to be performing at the level of 2 or better; students in the first year of coursework might be expected to fall between 2 and 3, with a small percentage falling below 3.

**FINDINGS 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In Fall the mean/median for competence in theory were 2.37/2.5. In Spring the mean/median were 2.33/2.0. These rubrics, we consider 3.5 (and to a significant degree 3.0) to be a significant point to register doctoral expectations and might need extra help: in Fall 4 students fell below 3.5, and in Spring 3 students fell below that number. Interestingly, the lower performing students in Fall were distributed evenly across 3 years of the program, while in Spring, all of the lower performing students were first-year students. More significant, perhaps, was that there was an even split between students measured at level 2 (the goal at end of coursework) and level 3 (8 and 8 students); these did not correlate to semester in program. Given that the "3" assessment in theory suggests that, while the student can demonstrate knowledge of the theory, the student is uncomfortable in making theoretical interventions or interconections among the positions, the fact that there were 3's among the 2nd year students might explain some of the issues that have come up in Comprehensive Exams. Nevertheless, since this is the first year we have assessed with these rubrics, it is too early to be able to discern long-term trends in student progress through the program.

**M 2: End-of-course assessment: Research competence (O: 1)**

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. Two rubrics will measure the student's ability to conduct high-level research in the field: the rubric assessing competence in theory (see Measure and the rubric measuring the student's understanding of the literature in the field which is the province of the seminar. This latter rubric is: Course content: overall literature: 1 – student has read and mastered a good deal of the literature in the field over and above the material on the course reading list. Student fully understands the intellectual contexts within or against which the various developments within the field have positioned themselves. You could comfortably recommend that the student would be able to teach this material in a graduate seminar. 2 – student demonstrates a clear mastery of the literature in the field, largely covered in coursework readings, but with significant areas of reading outside the required material. The student likely received an 'A' in the course. The student is not yet an expert in the area covered in the seminar; or the student—given her/his research interests—may not need to become an expert in the area. 3 – student has a good mastery of the literature of the area, with few if any major gaps. Much of the student's knowledge of the area comes from the readings required in the course. 4 – there are some significant gaps in the student's knowledge of the literature of the area. 5 – there are wide gaps in the student's knowledge of the literature of the area.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Research proficiency**

These rubrics were set deliberately high, and the "1"s are designed to represent the standards of the profession. Since the assessments will be done at the end of every seminar, every semester, we will be able to track how aggregate performance moves during the years of coursework. By the end of coursework, we expect all students to be performing at the level of 2 or better; students in the first year of coursework might be expected to fall between 2 and 3, with a small percentage falling below 3.

**FINDINGS 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

In the rubric that measures the student's mastery of the overall literature and methodologies in the various sub-specializations, the mean/median in the fall were 2.5/2.6, and in the spring were 2.3/4.25. In the category of students falling below the performance benchmark of 3.5, three were in that group in the Fall (evenly distributed by year in the program), and 3 fell into that group in the Spring (though in the spring all three were in the first year of the program). Since we have only just begun to use these rubrics this year, it is too early to be able to explain variances in performance over time; hopefully explanations will emerge as we gather more data over a longer time frame. Significantly, though, this rubric was the one which registered the highest frequency of "3" rankings: 10 students in Fall and 9 in Spring. A full 40-50% of students in the third year of coursework were assessed at 3 or lower; while among students in the second year of coursework, 35-50% were assessed at 3 or lower; and the percentage among students in the first year of the program scoring 3 or lower was invariant
for the two semesters, at 36%. The 3 in this rubric indicates that the student's knowledge of the area comes almost entirely from course readings and little from independent study. This finding may have some explanatory power in relation to the poor performance on the comprehensive exams this year, insofar as those depend on reading lists of material much of which is not covered in coursework.

M 3: End-of-course assessment: Writing competence (O: 3)

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. Two rubrics are devoted to assessment of the student's writing in the seminar. (The writing assessed is generally an article length final paper, as well as other smaller writing assignment produced in the seminar.) Overall writing effectiveness: 1 - the final paper can with very minor revisions be submitted to a journal 2 - the final paper is quite effective, but would require some substantial revision(s) before submission to a journal 3 - the paper is good, but requires a significant reconceptualization of the thesis, or a major reorganization of the argument, and/or a reconceptualization of the theoretical groundwork 4 - the paper is weak in more than one of the areas in (3) above 5 - the paper is not of graduate-seminar quality Writing Style: 1 - the writing is not only lucid and effective, but also elegant. Not only are there no technical errors in the writing, but the writer has full mastery of his/her voice, full command of rhetorical strategies and rhythmic cadences of prose style. 2 - a strong, effective paper (it probably received a grade of A). There are only very few, if any, technical errors, and an overall solid command of the language. 3 - a competently written paper which is marred by a few recurrent technical errors, unfortunate word choices, or other stylistic lapses that mark the essay as that of a "student." 4 - Writing with technical errors sufficient enough to lose the reader, and/or with repeated passages which are difficult or impossible to comprehend, or which illustrate that the writer is not in control of his/her language 5 - Writing which technically is not expected at the graduate level

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

Target for O3: Proficiency in writing

These rubrics were set deliberately high, and the "1"s are designed to represent the standards of the profession. Since the assessments will be done at the end of every seminar, every semester, we will be able to track how aggregate performance moves during the years of coursework. By the end of coursework, we expect all students to be performing at the level of 2 or better; students in the first year of coursework might expect to fall between 2 and 3, with a small percentage falling below 3.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Two rubrics are used for writing competence, one measuring overall effectiveness of the writing (argumentation, organization) and another measuring the readability, style, and voice of the writing. In general, writing style was assessed at a higher level than writing effectiveness: In fall, median for effectiveness was 3.0, style 2.0; in spring, effectiveness 2.42 and style 2.0. In the Fall the number of students whose writing effectiveness ranked at 3.5 or lower was 7; in spring it was 3. For writing style, assessment followed the same pattern, with 4 receiving below 3.5 in Fall and 2 in spring. There was no correlation here between low ranking and year in program. (Note that 3.5 in writing suggests problems that would likely seriously affect performance through the program; thus, an action item seems recommended for identifying students here.) If, on the other hand, we take 3.0 as a dividing line, we find that in both semesters, and across students in all 3 years-in-program, there is close to a 50%/50% split. Since our ultimate goal is to move students up from the 3.0 level to the 2.0 level, action should be taken in the area of writing proficiency.

M 4: End-of-course assessment: Proficiency in oral expression/advocacy (O: 4)

We have developed an online system that is tracking graduate student performance in seminars by having faculty complete an evaluation of the overall performance of each student, at the end of every seminar, in specific areas connected to learning outcomes. This data is anonymized and aggregated, so that we can get a picture of overall programmatic strengths and weaknesses. For proficiency in oral presentation and advocacy, there are two rubrics: one which measures the student's formal presentation of material to the seminar, and the second which measures the quality of the student's interventions in discussion during the seminar. Oral communication skills: interventions in the seminar, the student has done the work of finding out the intellectual context of the argument, and clearly articulates the central problem the article is engaged in answering. The presentation is driven by the student's own intellectual engagement with the material, and the student's voice is never hijacked by that of the author's article. The student understands the article on its own terms, while still being able to actively interrogate it throughout the presentation. 2 – the student's presentation of an article is overall excellent: the student clearly understands the stakes of the argument, can present it without significant error or distortion, and can actively interrogate it. The student, however, still might compartmentalize these areas of the presentation, leading to a less dynamic presentation than that at level '5' above. 3 – student can present a competent and accurate summary of an article to the seminar. However, the student cedes her/his voice to that of the source, with little active intervention until the end of the presentation, when the student might give a "strengths and weaknesses" speech. 4 – the presentation has significant problems: either the student does not clearly articulate the logic of the argument, or the student gets portions of the argument wrong. 5 – the student presentation clearly does not evidence an understanding of the article; it is likely a rote, blow-by-blow description, with little sense of the logical connections, and mistakes in understanding the concepts. Oral communication skills: interventions 1 – the student's interventions in seminar discussions are not only clear, sharp, and to-the-point, but also evidence a keen and subtle understanding of the nuances of the discussion; the student answers difficult questions directly and with clarity. 2 – the student's interventions in seminar discussions are clear, sharp, and to-the-point; the student is generally able to articulate answers to difficult questions posed to him/her. 3 – the student's interventions in discussion are for the most part on-point, though sometimes not as clear or precise as would be expected in the context; the student does a fairly good job handling difficult questions, though may at times seem evasive, unsure or hesitant in the response. 4 – the student's interventions in discussions are sometimes off-point, unclear, or vague; the student has trouble handling questions. 5 – the student's interventions in discussions are often off-point, unclear, or vague; the student cannot respond clearly to questions posed in seminar.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O4: Strong oral presentation and advocacy skills

These rubrics were set deliberately high, and the "1"s are designed to represent the standards of the profession. Since the assessments will be done at the end of every seminar, every semester, we will be able to track how aggregate performance moves during the years of coursework. By the end of coursework, we expect all students to be performing at the level of 2 or better; students in the first year of coursework might expect to fall between 2 and 3, with a small percentage falling below 3.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In the assessment of oral proficiency, two rubrics were used: one which assesses student proficiency in formal presentation, and the other which assesses informal oral proficiency (seminar discussion, interventions, responses to questions). Overall, our students were assessed highly in both of these areas. For the 30-33 students assessed, the mean and median in both
Fall and Spring was 2.0. In the Fall only 3 students were assessed at 3.5 or lower (and 2 of those were in the first semester); while in Spring only 2 students were assessed at 3.5 or lower (both first-year students). Thus it would seem that this rubric is showing that oral skills among our students develop more consistently through their coursework.

**M 5: Comprehensive doctoral examinations (O: 2)**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Of the 17 students scheduled for comprehensive examinations this year, there were a significant number (4) of failures in one or all areas, as well as a significant number of postponements (4) of the exam. Thus, close to 50% of the students scheduled for comps either failed or postponed. Of the nine students who passed, three were accorded the grade of High Pass on the exams.

**M 6: Presentation of work at conferences (O: 6)**

Students are expected regularly to present conference papers at both the international professional organizational conferences in their area, and at smaller, boutique conference related to their specific line of research. In our annual review meetings we now do an annual credential check, requiring CV submission, and those are carefully discussed so that ongoing plans of study are matching actual accomplishment. (Note: we are splitting a current measure, “Conferences and Publications,” into two separate measures, as achievements are significantly different in the two areas.)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O6: Professional development**

All doctoral students are expected to present, minimally, one conference paper per year (after the first year in the program), and to publish at least one article before defending the dissertation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In the past year, our doctoral students have presented 45 papers at international, national, and regional conference (with 5 additional presentations locally). A significant number presented at the conference of the professional organization of their areas, SCMS, NCA, or other. One student organized a panel for SCMS. Four of the presentations won top paper awards (NCA).

**M 7: Publication in peer reviewed journals (O: 6)**

Students are expected to have submitted work to journals by the time they reach the comprehensive exam stage. After that, they are expected to try to place one publication per year in a peer reviewed journal. In our annual review meetings we now do an annual credential check, requiring CV submission, and those are carefully discussed so that ongoing plans of study are matching actual accomplishment. (Note: we are splitting a current measure, “Conferences and Publications,” into two separate measures, as achievements are significantly different in the two areas.)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Professional development**

We will not adopt a rigid target percentage on this, except that all students should have at least one article accepted in a peer-reviewed journal or collection by the final year of dissertation writing (as they prepare to go on the job market). The reasons for this flexibility are that, first, there is legitimate disagreement among graduate educators whether doctoral students should take time away from dissertation writing to produce journal articles; and second, the time-frames of academic journal publishing (ie, from the time of submission, to ‘revise-resubmit,’ to final acceptance) vary so widely that one cannot set expectations that are tied to academic years.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

It appears that our students this year are publishing at a significantly higher rate than in past years, which is in keeping with our action plan items designed to produce more publishable writing among the students. Two book chapters were published, with 10 more book chapters forthcoming. Three journal articles were published, with three forthcoming. Three book reviews were published. And students curated three theme weeks of the online journal In Media Res, while three published interventions in that journal.

**M 8: Student teaching evaluations (O: 5)**

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 O5: Teaching excellence**

All students are expected to receive average student evaluations of their teaching that fall between 4 and 5.

**M 9: Number of students engaged in new media (O: 7)**

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 O7: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

If we are to keep this outcome, then we need to devise a system to measure. This year, we did not have one in place.

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

**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

**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 drags 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

**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:** On-Hold
- **Priority:** High

**Revised doctoral proseminar curriculum**

At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new prosem format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosem at least twice during their doctoral residence, once before comprehensive exams, and once in the dissertation-writing period. We believe that this shift in focus in the proseminar will help bring the students more quickly up to speed in the theoretical foundations of the field, and in their oral and written proficiency.

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

---

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

- Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
- Measure: End-of-course assessment: competence in theory | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
- Measure: End-of-course assessment: Writing competence | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in writing
- Measure: Publication in peer reviewed journals | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

- Measure: End-of-course assessment: Writing competence | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in writing
- Measure: Presentation of work at conferences | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

- Measure: Student teaching evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Teaching excellence

- Measure: Student teaching evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Teaching excellence

- Measure: Student teaching evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Teaching excellence

- Measure: Student teaching evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Teaching excellence

---

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
Add writing requirement to Prosem

Beginning Fall 2011, the department is requiring that all students who present papers at proseminar (and they are required to present at minimum two papers during their doctoral studies) distribute beforehand the written version of the paper to the faculty and doctoral students. This is designed not only to produce better discussion in the proseminar after the paper is delivered, but also to serve as another opportunity for doctoral students to revise and polish written work for an audience.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee; Fujioka and Wilkin for statistical design; Restivo, Stuckey, and committee members for assessment questions.

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: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee; Fujioka and Wilkin for statistical design; Restivo, Stuckey, and committee members for assessment questions.

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

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Cheshier; departmental faculty

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Cheshier; Graduate Committee, all area faculty

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Cheshier, Graduate Committee, all area faculty

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: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee; Fujioka and Wilkin for statistical design; Restivo, Stuckey, and committee members for assessment questions.

Add writing requirement to Prosem

Beginning Fall 2011, the department is requiring that all students who present papers at proseminar (and they are required to present at minimum two papers during their doctoral studies) distribute beforehand the written version of the paper to the faculty and doctoral students. This is designed not only to produce better discussion in the proseminar after the paper is delivered, but also to serve as another opportunity for doctoral students to revise and polish written work for an audience.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year, the department implemented an online evaluation system with six rubrics, for all MA and doctoral students in the program, for every course that they took. The results were aggregated by year-in-program, program of study, and were averaged for each student across all the seminars the student took. The results have been reported throughout this WEAVE report as finding; in addition, the raw data and the interpretation of that data has been deposited in the document repository. The amount of data collected has given us valuable information with which to move forward in assessment (see below); while at the same time, it would be overkill to collect all this data every semester. (For one thing, it required that two tenure-track faculty spend over 50 hours of work during summer research time crunching data; this is clearly not something we can do on a regular basis.) Thus, we plan to redo this assessment in 7 years; in the meantime we plan to use the results to focus on targeted areas for assessment, in order to come up with more concrete revisions of curriculum, assignments, and so on. To this end, a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee will devise a system of rubrics that begins at the dissertation and moves backward through the prospectus and comprehensive exams. Then we will target two courses during coursework which will serve as assessment courses, so that we can measure student progress at every stage of the program. Because there are three very different tracks in the Communications doctoral program, we have not decided yet whether we will develop separate rubrics for each track, or whether we can have common rubrics. The data gathered from last year should help us determine this. Once the grad committee has drafted the new integrated set of rubrics, then they will be given to the faculty in each area, where further revisions will be done. We expect the entire set of rubrics to be ready by the end of Spring semester 2012.

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

We have already added a prospectus writing workshop to our course offerings, so as to allow students to complete prospectuses in a collaborative workshop environment. We have also instituted a writing component to the doctoral Proseminar, which requires students to submit the written version of their paper to the faculty and doctoral students whenever they deliver a paper there.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Computer Information Systems MBA
(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST)

**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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

**O/O 2: Manage projects and balance resources (M: 2)**
Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan. Students will be able to work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**O/O 3: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls (M: 3)**
Students will be able to articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate controls.

**O/O 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (M: 4)**
The student will be able to employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. This includes: Define the objectives of and issues associated integration of information systems applications. Explain alternative strategies for systems integration. Identify commonly used tools for integrating information systems, describing the benefits of using each. Explain how Web services can aid in systems integration, identifying the underlying tools and technologies that facilitate the creation of such services. Discuss the characteristics of systems integration projects, emphasizing the management issues and practices associated with them. Identify information systems application and organization characteristics that are most likely to cause an organization to employ a systems integration company to carry out the project work.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by IT, and manage the required change (O: 1)**
Students will be able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the required organizational changes.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Build and renew business via technology and process**
75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the midterm and final exams in CIS 8010. Learning Objective: Identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. 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 not able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes. Students were able to accurately identify and diagnose problems in business process, design improved configurations...
enabled by information technology, and manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only two MBA IS/CIS students took CIS 8020 IT Enabled Innovation during 2010-2011. This is not sufficient to measure success. Will review during 2011-2012.

**M 2: Manage projects and balance resources (O: 2)**

Manage projects and balance resources

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

**Target for O2: Manage projects and balance resources**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the following Rubric to the written assignments in CIS 8000. Learning Objective: translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were not able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only 2 MBA IS/CIS students took CIS 8010 IT Project management where this objective is assessed. This number is not sufficient for reasonable assessment measure. Will revisit during 2011-2012.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only 3 MBA IS/CIS students took CIS 8000 IT Project management where this objective is assessed. This number is not sufficient for reasonable assessment measure. Will revisit during 2011-2012.

**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 Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only 3 MBA IS/CIS students took CIS 8080 Security & Privacy during 2010-2011. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will revisit during 2011-2012.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only 2 MBA IS/CIS students took CIS 8080 Security & Privacy during 2010-2011. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will revisit during 2011-2012.

**M 4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals (O: 4)**

Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals

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

**Target for O4: Employ strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals**

75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8020. Learning Objective: Identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were not able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals. Students were able to accurately identify strategies and methods to blend interdependent systems into a unified whole to accomplish business goals.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only one MBA IS/CIS student took CIS 8020 during 2010-2011. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will review during 2011-2012.
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 11 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

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. Students 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.

SLO 2: Students will be proficient in systems design (M: 5, 6, 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 the client organizations. The ability of students to design current systems architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design current systems architectures 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.

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 using 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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Identified User Requirements (O: 1)
Acquired and scoped the system and user requirements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2</strong>: Specified System Requirements (O: 1)</td>
<td>Specified, analyzed, &amp; refined the system and user requirements</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3</strong>: Developed Program Specifications (O: 1)</td>
<td>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4</strong>: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation (O: 1)</td>
<td>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>This may be a result of programming not being a required course in the program or of the project characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M5</strong>: Developed Architecture (O: 2)</td>
<td>Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M6</strong>: Designed programs (O: 2)</td>
<td>Designed the programs according to specifications</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M7</strong>: Coded and Developed (O: 3)</td>
<td>Coded/developed the specified &amp; designed programs</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong>: Students will be proficient in systems analysis</td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2</strong>: Students will be proficient in systems design</td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong>: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 on a scale of 1 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

**M 8: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming (O: 3)**
Appropriately used an object-oriented programming language
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
4.0 on a scale of 1 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

**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 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

**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 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

**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 through 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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

**Object-Oriented Concept Use**
Need to assess whether this miss is a result of programming not being required or the result of projects not requiring Object-Oriented.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

**Implementation Description:** The CIS UPC will assess whether this miss is a result of programming not being required or the result of projects not requiring Object-Oriented

- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CIS UPC Chair

**Use of database concepts**
Teams did not use database concepts well enough to meet goal.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology (M: 1)

Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs. 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 subset of work representing all the stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall 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 subset of work representing all the stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall learning objectives. 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 (C1). 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.
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

**M 1: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system (O: 1)**
Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs.

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

**Target for O1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology**

Three facets of assessing achievement:
1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale
2) 80% of students will achieve "level 2" ("meets the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.
3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 2: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure (O: 2)**
Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Create environments for programs and systems**

Three facets of assessing achievement:
1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale
2) 80% of students will achieve "level 2" ("meets the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.
3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 3: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan (O: 3)**
Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Manage an information technology project**

Three facets of assessing achievement:
1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale
2) 80% of students will achieve "level 2" ("meets the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.
3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 4: III.2: Manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques (O: 3)**

Students will be able to manage an ongoing project using project control tools and techniques.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O3: Manage an information technology project**

Three facets of assessing achievement:
1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale
2) 80% of students will achieve "level 2" ("meets the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.
3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 5: IV.1: Identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies (O: 4)**

Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with available information technologies.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Build and renew business via technology & process**

Three facets of assessing achievement:
1) the average score for all students assessed will be 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale
2) 80% of students will achieve "level 2" ("meets the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.
3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

**M 6: IV.2: Diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations (O: 4)**

Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business processes to design improved configurations enabled by information technology.

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.

**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 standard"), according to the evaluation rubric. 3) 25% of students will achieve "level 3" ("exceeds the standard"), according to the evaluation rubric.

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

**Course instructor should follow assessment procedures**

Course instructor responsible for teaching CIS 8030 must assign individual-level projects that reflect the course objectives. In addition, the course instructor must save copies of all M.S. individual student deliverables and make them available to the assessment coordinator.

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

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
Measure: I.1: Specify the requirements for an information system  
Outcome/Objective: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology

*Projected Completion Date*: 03/2010  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Course instructor for CIS 8030

**Offer all core courses yearly; require course instructors to assign student projects that reflect course objectives.**

There are 3 components of the action plan related to this learning objective. 1) Offer all required core courses on a yearly basis (to remedy the problem that CIS 8050 has not been offered for more than two years, and that faculty assisting in the assessment process have had to assess materials from a different course that students were permitted to substitute for CIS 8050). 2) All instructors who teach courses related to this learning objective must assign individual-level student assignments that reflect the course objectives. 3) All instructors who teach courses related to this learning objective must save all M.S. student deliverables from their courses.

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

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
Measure: II: Design and implementation of information infrastructure  
Outcome/Objective: Create environments for programs and systems

*Projected Completion Date*: 03/2010  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Course instructors who teach CIS 8040, 8050, and 8070.

**Train assessors to allow for greater variability in student scores**

The only portion of the target goal that was not achieved for objective III.1 was the last part, which specifies a goal of having 25% or more of assessed students scoring at the level of "3" ("exceeds the standard"). In this case, all of the assessed students (n=8) were scored as "2" (which means that 0% of students were assessed as scoring a "3"). One contributing factor may be that course assessors have not been trained to discriminate between higher or lower scores. The Assessment coordinator will provide additional detailed criteria for participating assessors to use when performing the assessment. With the exception of this detail, all other target objectives were met.

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

*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*  
Measure: III.1: Translate project requirements and resources into a workable plan  
Outcome/Objective: Manage an information technology project

*Projected Completion Date*: 06/2010  
*Responsible Person/Group*: Assessment coordinator

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2010-2011 Computer Science Assessment of Core**  
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
**Mission / Purpose**

It is critical for all students to master a basic understanding of computing due to its pervasiveness. Also, due to its rapidly changing nature it is imperative students learn the concepts that underlie this discipline. One of the missions of the Department of Computer Science is to provide high quality instruction in the CSC 1010 course that incorporates computing fundamentals and the latest technologies.

**Goals**

**G 1: Student productivity**
- Students will be comfortable and competent in a setting which requires the use of computers.
- Students will be productive using various computer applications, for example, they will be able to produce reports, graphs, spreadsheets, charts, and slide shows.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Computer Components – Hardware and Software (M: 4)**

Students will learn about the various components that make up a computer.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 2: Word Processing Application Software (M: 3)**

Students will learn the necessary components of word processing that will enable them to write term papers, reports, and research papers.

**SLO 3: Spreadsheet Application Software (M: 1, 3)**

Students will learn the necessary components of spreadsheet applications that will enable them to enter, calculate, manipulate, and analyze data.

**SLO 5: Web Development (M: 5)**

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Chart drawing (O: 3)**

Students are to extract data from a spreadsheet and use this to draw charts for various functions. This includes formatting the charts as well.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Spreadsheet Application Software**

Proper curves should be generated for charts with appropriate labels.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

About 88.1% of the students were able to do this correctly.

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

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

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Presentation Application Software**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

A majority of students could generate the slides accordingly but imported figures were not always formatted as well as expected.

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

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

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target for O2: Word Processing Application Software**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Usually the charts were imported properly. However, the comparisons were not detailed enough. About 85.1% performed well with this.

**M 4: Comparison shopping for computer systems (O: 1)**

Students are asked to shop for computer systems for four different purposes. Each task has different requirements for the hardware and software components. Students should be able to justify why each system they chose meets the demand of the corresponding tasks.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Computer Components -- Hardware and Software**

For each environment described, the students should be able to select the appropriate components that follow:
1) motherboard/cpu; 2) memory/hard disk space/ram; 3) adapter cards; 4) video/sound; 5) application software

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

90.1% of the students did well with this objective. Occasionally, 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Web Development**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Less than 8% of the students have difficulty with the syntax of HTML. Tags were not always included properly. Linking pages tended to cause problems for some students so that the intended flow was not achieved.

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

**Additional examples and quizzes**

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Generate documents
- **Outcome/Objective:** Spreadsheet Application Software

**Additional examples and quizzes**

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Generate documents
- **Outcome/Objective:** Word Processing Application Software

**Additional examples and quizzes**

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
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

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.

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.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Alumni Surveys</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Senior Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 external design competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions. (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the writing skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

**Target for O5: Hardware Systems**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the programming skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 2, 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Programming Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the programming skills of our seniors were slightly improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Algorithm Design and Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the algorithm design and analysis skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the discrete math skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the programming skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the algorithm design and analysis skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The best samples demonstrated excellent mastery and a thorough understanding and overall the samples showed that the students demonstrated mastery of the subject domain basics. Compared to last year, on average, the discrete math skills of our seniors were slightly improved.

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
### Relationship (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  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
**Additional Resources:** none

---

**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**

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

**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.

**O/O 3: Collaboration (G: 1) (M: 4)**

Students participate effectively in collaborative activities.

**O/O 4: Communication (G: 1) (M: 1, 4, 6)**

Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing and oral conventions and formats.

**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

**M 1: Research Publications (O: 2, 4)**

Research publications in journals and conference proceedings produced by M.S. graduate students will be catalogued and made available to the Assessment Committee (ongoing).

- **Source of Evidence:** External report

**Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking**

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

M.S. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 33%.

**Target for O4: Communication**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

M.S. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 33%.

**M 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 5)**

Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

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

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the advanced skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students worked independently of project, assignments and relevant problems. They demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The presentations were of sufficient skill level.

**M 3: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 2, 5)**

An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

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

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings.

**M 4: Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee (each semester). Students are encouraged to participate in design/research paper competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions (ongoing).

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

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of
subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences

**Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences

**Target for O3: Collaboration**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences

**Target for O4: Communication**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences

**M 5: Examinations (O: 1, 5)**

Student ability will be assessed via examinations. Copies of selected examinations will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Thesis/Project Reports and Defenses (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option**

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty
Consider 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)
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.

O/O 5: Collaboration (G: 1) (M: 4)
Students participate effectively in collaborative activities appropriate to the research area in computer science.

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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Student evaluations (O: 2)
Student evaluations will be assessed to monitor the quality of teaching by our Ph.D. students.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O2: Teaching
Ph.D. students should receive positive written comments for a majority of the responses. Additionally, we expect that the average of the answers for Question #17 on the evaluation to be above a 4.0

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
This year for Honors Day, when selecting the recipient(s) for the Outstanding Teaching by a Graduate Student Award, the Honors Committee has found that most students receive high marks and comments on their evaluations.

M 2: Qualifying exam (O: 1, 6)
The Ph.D. qualifying exam covers a breadth of the foundation material for the Computer Science curriculum. All Ph.D. students are required to pass this exam within the first three semesters of entry into the program.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Qualifying Examination Committee.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery

Target for O6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
The average samples should demonstrate mastery of advanced topics of the subject domain and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of advanced topics within the subject domain. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Qualifying Examination Committee.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
The students demonstrated appropriate mastery of the subject domains. The best students showed excellent mastery

M 3: Dissertation Manuscripts and Defenses (O: 1, 3, 4, 6)
Copies of Ph.D. manuscripts and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (on going).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations
The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 8 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

Target for O3: 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...
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 8 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

**Target for O4: Research and Critical Thinking**

The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 8 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

**Target for O6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for faculty candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 8 Ph.D. students defended their dissertations during the reporting period. Each student has a high publication record in international refereed conferences and journals.

**M 4: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O3: Communication**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O4: Research and Critical Thinking**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O5: Collaboration**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and dissertation research useful and relevant to their careers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings
M 5: Research Publications (O: 1, 3, 4, 6)

Research publications in journals and conference proceedings produced by Ph.D. graduate students will be catalogued and made available to the Assessment Committee (on going).

Source of Evidence: External report

**Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O3: Communication**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O4: Research and Critical Thinking**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

**Target for O6: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Ph.D. students have co-authored many publications that have appeared in peer reviewed conferences and journals during the reporting period. A number of these were published in conferences with acceptance rates below 30%.

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

**Consider foundation material for graduate courses**

The curriculum committee is currently evaluating the coursework at the graduate level in order to assess its relevance and currency to the state of the art in computer science. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Qualifying exam | Outcome/Objective: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)
  - Measure: | Outcome/Objective: 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
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.

SLO 3: Understanding of Techniques (M: 3)
Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

SLO 4: Software Skills (M: 4)
Students will acquire expertise in the selection and use of key decision making software packages.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Qualitative Analysis of Business Situation (O: 1)
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
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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
This is an area of strength traditionally for MBA students, and they performed very well overall.

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 model building and quantitative analysis efforts. Each 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 variables and 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...
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

On-Going Improvement

The assessment data show that both the programs are currently meeting or exceeding expectations, and have shown improvement over the data in 2008. With this in mind, the key elements of the action plan are as follows: 1. To continue the efforts made over the past few years in keeping the course material current, updating cases and examples to reflect industry practices today. 2. To add more resources online to aid in software competency. 3. To encourage students to engage in collaborative learning. Students post projects on the web and learn from each other's work. This strategy has over the years yielded very positive results.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: BA Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
To Hire New Faculty

The business analysis area is showing increasing enrollment, and there is unfilled demand for our courses in the PMBA programs as well. The analytics field is growing quickly in industry, and additional courses in this area can be offered to keep up with the demand. However, with the loss of faculty to retirements, new hiring is necessary to grow the area to its potential.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Non-tenure track positions in Business Analysis were announced, and the recruitment process is currently in progress.
**Responsible Person/Group:** Recruitment committee chaired by Dr. Subhashish Samaddar

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process remains the same as last year. The goals and assessment rubric have been clearly set to match the objectives of the program.

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

The courses in this area are updated with current cases as frequently as possible. Student feedback indicates that these are practical courses that help students apply the skills to real life business situations.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Enrollment is increasing in our program due to the need for analytics skills in businesses today. This means that class sizes will go up, and that will require improvement in the delivery of the courses to ensure that greater numbers of students are served just as well. Using online resources better is one of the goals for each of the classes. As more and more businesses adopt analytics as part of their strategy, bringing in more current cases and guest speakers from industry is important to our continued success.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA**

**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.

**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.

**O/O 3: Resource Acquisition Skills**

Students understand how to gather resources to move a business opportunity to the marketplace.

**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.

**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.

### 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Entrepreneurship Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Entrepreneurship Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**

(As of 12/12/2016 04:10 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.

### Goals

**G 1: Basic functions of HRM**
To graduate students from the MBA program in HRM with an understanding of the role of the basic functions of Human Resources Management in a variety of organizations.

**G 2: Ability to solve HR problems**
To graduate students from the MBA in HRM program with the ability to solve Human Resources Management problems.

**G 3: Linkage of HR actions and corporate strategy**
To graduate students from the MBA in HRM program with an understanding of the importance of the role and interface of the HR functions with organizational strategies.

**G 4: Understanding of employment legal issues**
To graduate students from the MBA in HRM program with an understanding of the basic employee-related legal issues in organizations.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: The Role of HR in Organizations (G: 1) (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.

**SLO 2: Problem Solving (G: 2) (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.

**SLO 3: Links with Business Strategy (G: 3) (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.
The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify and address potential legal issues, relevant laws, and appropriate policies to address.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Faculty rating of 1.75/3.0. 66% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Faculty rating of 1.82/3.0. 68% of MBA/HR students above 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

54% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria. Faculty rating of 1.7.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

71% of MBA/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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

64% of MBA/HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.
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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
53% of students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

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

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: Finished
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)

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: Finished
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)

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)

Lecture Changes Integrating Law and Policy
Review in more detail written assignments in MGS 8320 and MGS 8300 concerning the linkages between HR law and policies. Discuss in class and compare student products, giving feedback and analysis. Reevaluate after next offering.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Understanding and Interpreting case Law | Outcome/Objective: HR Law

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Lecture Modifications on Concepts
Add a 30 minutes to the lecture on differences among, importance of, and usage of job descriptions, analysis, and performance measures. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
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)

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Resource Identification in HR | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add additional hands-on work in linking HR law and HR policies
Add homework assignments and in-class activities to MGS 8300 and MGS 8320 requiring students to link HR laws and HR policies. Spend additional time reviewing and critiquing in class. Compare student work in class, giving feedback and analysis.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Law and Issue Identification | Outcome/Objective: HR Law

Implementation Description: Instructors of MGS 8300 and MGS 8320 will write hands-on cases and activities to lead students through the process of drawing lessons from court decisions and laws to formulating HR policies as a result of those legal constraints.

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8300 and MGS 8320.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add additional in-class activity on job analysis
Continue to use 30 additional minutes of class time on job analysis, job descriptions, and performance measures. Add an in-class activity in MGS 8390.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: General Understanding of HR in Organizations | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations

Implementation Description: Instructor will write and administer in-class activity and give feedback in class.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add additional time for strategy in MGS 8300
Add 30 minutes to the presentation in MGS 8300 devoted to linkage between corporate strategy and HR strategy.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Links with Business Strategy | Outcome/Objective: Links with Business Strategy

Implementation Description: Develop a concise lecture and handouts on corporate strategies and appropriate HR strategies for each.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add homework assignment in MGS 8390 about strategy
Require a homework assignment in MGS 8390 concerning linkages between business strategies and components of compensation decision making. Spend additional class time reviewing results of assignment and critiquing student products.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Links with Business Strategy | Outcome/Objective: Links with Business Strategy

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8390
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add in-class activities on performance measures and job analysis
Add to both MGS 8360 and MGS 8390 classes in-class activities on job analysis, job descriptions, and performance measurement, and the linkages among them. Spend additional class time reviewing and critiquing.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Instructors will write short hands-on cases to illustrate appropriate usage of job methods and performance measures.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8360 and MGS 8390.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add in-class activity and lecture
Continue to use 30 minutes of class time on differences among, importance of, and usage of job descriptions, analysis, and performance measures. Add an in-class activity in MGS 8390 with student practice on topics. Reevaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Add in-class activities to supplement additional lectures on topics.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None

Add in-class activity to MGS 8300
A short in-class activity in MGS 8300 will be designed to illustrate the linkage between case law and HR policy. Feedback for improvement will be given in class.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Understanding and Interpreting case Law | Outcome/Objective: HR Law

Implementation Description: A short in-class activity using a case that will then be used to have students practice writing rules and regulations.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Add module on HR problem solving to MGS 8300
An additional module on HR problem solving will be added to MGS 8300. Module to cover problem identification, process, and selecting viable outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Identify and evaluate critical HR problem issues. | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving

Implementation Description: Combination lecture and experiential activity on HR problem solving will be designed and assigned.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8300
Additional Resources: None

Additional feedback on homework re policy formulation
15 additional minutes of class time will be spent helping students edit and rewrite HR policy statements, and more detailed feedback on homework will be given.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: HR Formulation Techniques | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations

Implementation Description: Students will be coached to rewrite policy statements.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Kay Bunch
Assign readings to MGS 8360
Assign one additional set of readings to MGS 3860 concerning resource allocation in HR.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Resource Identification in HR | Outcome/Objective: Problem Solving

Implementation Description: Add readings to MGS 8360
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None

Assign rewrites of 2 legal papers in MGS 8320
Students in MGS 8320 will write legal interpretations (including implications for policy). For two of those assignments, students will be required to use instructor feedback to rewrite the papers and make improvements.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Law and Issue Identification | Outcome/Objective: HR Law

Implementation Description: Assign rewrites of 2 papers in MGS 8320
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Kay Bunch
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We specifically tracked the effects of changing the degree requirements to force students in the MBA/HR program to take both Compensation and Selection. Specifically, we compared student progress on the rubrics pertaining to those topics from the past year to see if students were reaching more of our targets. We also met more often to make decisions about changing the amount of class time spent on various topics and activities and to review the assignments we were using in various courses. We looked at where overlap and repetition were beneficial and where they may be wasteful and made adjustments accordingly.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We adjusted class sessions to include additional work relating to application of material and higher-level understanding of the material. We incorporated additional writing in the Law course especially to help students learn to express their ideas effectively and to give accurate information and to write persuasively. We began to think about new opportunities to include more original cases to move students toward our objectives. We began to look at assignments that would give students opportunities to learn new material in depth but also to give them some skills and ideas to use in the workplace.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Concentration in Operations Management MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the MBA Concentration in Operations Management is to provide students pursuing a broader MBA degree (vs. the MS in Operations Management) with a moderate level of breadth and depth of understanding with respect to the major operations management issues confronting organizations of all types today.

Goals
G 1: Most Up-to-date Courses and Materials
One goal of the MBA Concentration in Operations Management program is to offer students the most contemporary offering of any Concentration in the MBA program through continual revision and improvement of the curriculum.

G 2: Attract Higher Performing 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 to formulate and implement effective strategic actions.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

**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.

**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.

**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 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 excels at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

**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 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.

**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 Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3 Performance The student is not able identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities.
Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student is not able identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student 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.

**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.

**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. Learning Objective 3: Develop a 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 can be developed 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.

**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 indicated by average returns on peer evaluations. The student develops strong team skills by indicated by very positive returns on peer evaluations.

**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, New York Times or Wall Street Journal about aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering. · Add an in-class exercise based on a case about operations making significant difference for a company' long term shareholder value. The case can be either a Harvard case or one that is created by the OM faculty members in the department. Evaluate after next offering.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The implementation will be continued to have enough results for further analysis
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
- 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 sustainability. Evaluate after next offering.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: OM faculty will continue to implement these actions. We have seen more and more companies aware of the initiative.
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
- 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.

**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.

**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.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

Ability to organize, developed and advanced a operations management business plan and vision using critical thinking through writing at a business level, as opposed to an academic level. With the use of a well developed rubric for the CTW course, we are able to establish viable outcomes and objectives based on the learning outcomes for the course.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

There is no class in CTW requiring the measurement of attributes involving the development of a thesis and the advancement of the thesis.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

Our assessment regarding need for a CTW course for the concentration in Operations Management MBA program is that there is no immediate need.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?**

There has been no changes to date, as there is no CTW course at present.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The has been minor changes in the evaluation/ assessment process of Operations Management MBA regarding the project content requirements, such as, sustainability. The balance of the required and elective course requirements, i.e., two exams and multiple cases have remained unchanged. The basic outline for these courses regarding the assessment process has been deemed successful with the students.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

There has been no changes to the curriculum, courses or the sequencing of the courses during the past year's term.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

No changes of significance have been made, despite the addition of new course materials in the MGS 8710 Operations Planning and the selection of a new text.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

The evaluations and anecdotal comments made by students assure the Operations Management faculty that the courses are being well received and the objectives/ outcomes of the courses are practical and create value for the students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The OM faculty continues to review updated text that are felt to improve the learning experience for the students. This is an ongoing process. Our current syllabus consisting of two major exams covering 5 to 6 chapters each, weekly case analysis of relevant articles and cases, and a major team based operations project has been quite successful with our objectives and outcomes developed for these courses.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2010-2011 Concentration in Organization Management MBA

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The manager in today's business environment deals with a variety of complex concerns including structural and organizational design, people issues and managing people, power and politics, and cultural dimensions. The Master of Business Administration in Organization Management prepares managers to analyze issues, events, problems, resource constraints, and change from the vantage point of each of these concerns and to consider each as they make decisions to chart the organization's future. Organizations are composed of people, and people bring unique challenges to the workplace. These challenges include working with people as individuals, people in work groups, and people collectively in organizations.

**Goals**

**G 1: Diagnose Organizational Events and Problems**
Goal 1: To graduate students from the MBA in Organizational Management with the ability to diagnose the basic causes of organizational events, issues, and problems.

**G 2: Recommendations for Org. Events & Problems**
Goal 2: To graduate students from the MBA in Organizational Management with the ability to recommend appropriate responses to organizational events, issues, and problems.

**G 3: Understand Impact of Power & Politics**
Goal 3: To graduate students of the MBA program in Organization Management with an understanding of the impact that power, influence, and political behavior have on general organizational success and upon the success of specific initiatives in organizations.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Analyze Organizational Situations (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Outcome/Objective 1: Analyze a variety of organizational situations and identify the causes of effective and ineffective movement toward meeting the organization's agenda. Full Description: Organizational issues, events, and problems have causes that simultaneously emanate from structural, human, political, and cultural roots. Therefore, most significant issues, events, and problems must be viewed from multiple perspectives to obtain a reasonably complete understanding. Graduate should be able to simultaneously see issues, events, and problems from multiple perspectives. Related Measures Case assignments and exam questions in MBA 8165, MGS 8435, and MGS 8440.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

**SLO 2: Specify Courses of Action (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Outcome/Objective 2: Review a variety of organizational events, issues, and problems and specify appropriate courses of action the organization should take as a response. Full Description: Organizational issues, events, and problems have causes that simultaneously emanate from structural, human, political, and cultural roots. Graduate should be able to simultaneously see issues, events, and problems from multiple perspectives and to formulate responses that reflect an understanding of these multiple roots. Related Measures Case assignments and exam questions in MBA 8165, MGS 8435, and MGS 8440.
### SLO 3: Analyze Political Realities (G: 3) (M: 3)

Outcome/Objective 3: Effectively analyze political realities in organizational situations. Full Description: The MBA graduate will be able to identify the effect of power and politics on resource allocations, personnel decisions, and other decisions that organizations make. Related Measures Exam questions, cases, and projects in MGS 8435.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Find Four-Perspective Causes of Events /Problems (O: 1)

M1: Students can examine organizational events, issues, and problems and identify structural, human, political, and cultural elements in the cause of situation.

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

**Target for O1: Analyze Organizational Situations**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to randomly selected case assignment and exam questions.

#### M 2: Recommend Responses Incorporating Four-Perspective Analysis (O: 2)

M2: Students can recommend organizational responses to problems that are cognizant of structural, human, political, and cultural dimensions to the situation.

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

**Target for O2: Specify Courses of Action**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to randomly selected case assignments and exam questions.

#### M 3: Identify Political Dimensions of Decisions (O: 3)

M3: Students can identify political dimensions of organizational decisions.

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

**Target for O3: Analyze Political Realities**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 3 Rubric to randomly selected exams, cases, and projects.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

These findings come from MGS 8435. This course is currently taught once per year in May Session. From May Session 2011: There were 5 students in the course from this MBA concentration. Findings are as follows:

### 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: Finished  
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: Finished  
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.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Concentration in Real Estate MBA
As of 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Average on Criteria: 2.20 100% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
Average on Criteria 1: 1.80. 40% students met standard. Average on Criteria 2: 2.80. 100% 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 using material from both real estate and MBA core classes. Criterion: Identify key criteria and evaluate alternative real estate strategies to support common business strategies (RE 8100)
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Average on Criteria: 2.00. 80% 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.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria: 2.20. 100% 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

**Review assessment task for O2.M2.C1**

Review assessment task for O2.M2.C1

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

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

- **Measure:** Understand real estate as a contributor to achieving human resources goals
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Course Instructor

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Counseling Psychology PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Clinical Competence**

Develop Competence in understanding and applying theoretical knowledge in ethical practice, sensitive to multicultural issues.

**G 2: Research Competence**

Develop competence in understanding and applying research methods.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 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.

**SLO 2: Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice (M: 3, 4, 5)**

Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- **2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).**
Knowledgeable about the tenets of ethical practice

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**SLO 3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession (M: 6, 7)**

Proficiency in psycho-educational interventions, diagnosis, prevention, remedial interventions, psychotherapy, consultation, and supervision.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**SLO 4: Understands relevant theories (M: 8, 9)**

Understand theories of human development, psychopathology, counseling process, and behavior change.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

**SLO 5: Use and conduct research (M: 10)**

Use and conduct research

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association Accreditation Domain B

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 1)**

Evaluation by practicum supervisor. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all items to be satisfactory.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Effectiveness with diverse groups of clients**

90% of students meet evaluation target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420) Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students received grades of B or better in didactic courses related to key areas of the profession (e.g., Assessment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received grades of B or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 7: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will receive a score of 3 or higher on practicum evaluation items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met target goal of receiving scores of 3 or higher on practicum evaluation items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 8: Performance in theories courses (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in theories courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660) Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Understands relevant theories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will receive grade of B or higher in theories courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received grade of B or higher in theories courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 9: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 receive a grade of pass or fail. Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Understands relevant theories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will receive passing grade on Theory Comprehensive Question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received passing grade on Theory Comprehensive Question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 10: Performance in research courses (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Use and conduct research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will receive grade of B or better in research courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received grades of B or higher in research courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comprehensive Examination Orientation**

Present an orientation the the comprehensive examination to enhance students' preparation for the theories portion of the comprehensive examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Comprehensive examination question on theory
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Understands relevant theories
- **Projected Completion Date:** 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

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Met target goals. Students successfully secured Accredited internship sites.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Practicum supervisor evaluations of students in later practica reflect increased critical thinking over the evaluations given earlier in students’ programs.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Continued evaluation of course content and assignments to ensure greatest impact.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
Increased faculty discussion and consideration of program emphases in this area.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No changes made this year. Program faculty have plans to reconsider comprehensive examination structure.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Data suggest that objectives are being met. We did adjust the curriculum by eliminating one course that, based on student feedback and a change in the course content, appeared to no longer be contributing to the mission of the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
Results from last year’s assessment indicated that all objectives were met. We added a more regular review of students’ progress through the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
Students successfully met objectives.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Review of research coursework and sequences of qualitative and quantitative research methods.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Counselor Education PhD
As of 12/12/2016 04:10 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 become proficient in critiquing and conducting 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 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.

**SLO 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.

**SLO 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.

**SLO 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
There were nine students enrolled in CPS 9963. Three were not assessed for this section because they were not engaged in the teaching internship or working as a teaching assistant. Of the six (6) that were assessed, all six received a 2 out of 3 points.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the students received at least a 3 point on question 5 of the teaching evaluation form. The average for this question was 4.8 points.
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Teaching</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the teaching effectiveness question of the Teaching Evaluation Form students will receive at least a 3 out of 5 with 80% receiving either a 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the students received at least a 3 out of 5 points on this question, with the average being 5.0.

### M 4: Research (O: 2)
Students will complete and submit their predissertation project.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Research</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will complete and submit their predissertation study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
All students who completed their predissertation study received a pass on the 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Research</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will receive a pass on the research portion of their written comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Five students attempted their comprehensive examination during this period. Four (4) of the five (5) passed the research portion of the comprehensive examination for a pass rate of 80%.

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Clinical Skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will receive at least 3 out of 5 on the relevant questions on the Supervisee Evaluation Form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Counseling theory: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 with an average of 4.8 Diversity: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 with an average of 4.8 Advocacy: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 with an average of 4.8 Ethics: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 with an average of 4.9

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Supervision</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will receive at least 3 on the relevant questions of Supervisor in Training Evaluation Forms, with 80% receiving at least a 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
1. Supervision theory: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 points with an average of 4.0 2. Diversity: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 points with an average of 4.0 3. Ethics: All students received at least a 3 out of 5 points with an average of 4.0

### 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: Terminated  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

**Clinical practice**  
to reevaluate the supervision evaluation form.  

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Clinical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Skills  
Implementation Description: The supervision evaluation form used in practicum and internship will be reevaluated.  
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: CEP program coordinator  
Additional Resources: none  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Supervision**  
Continue to monitor the SIT evaluation forms.  

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Supervision | Outcome/Objective: Supervision  
Implementation Description: The SIT evaluation form will be reassessed.  
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: CEP program coordinator  
Additional Resources: none  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Teaching-goals/objectives**  
Reevaluate the items in the teaching portfolio.  

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching  
Implementation Description: The teaching portfolios will be reassessed to determine if the required elements are appropriate.  
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: CEP program coordinator  
Additional Resources: none  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Teaching-preparedness**  
Reevaluate the teaching evaluation rubric.  

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching  
Implementation Description: The teaching evaluation rubric will be reassessed.  
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: CEP program coordinator  
Additional Resources: none  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

This year the program revamped our evaluation system to be consistent with our accreditation body (CACREP). This is relates to our action plans because the new system allows us to monitor student progress more closely.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

We are better able to evaluate and assess student critical thinking since we are now collecting artifacts from their courses.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

none at this time.
CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

Since the last report, our faculty have updated the way we collect assessment information.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have changed the way we gather assessment information. Most of the assessment information have been incorporated into the doctoral competency portfolio. Our learning outcomes have remained the same since they are a part of our accreditation requirement.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will you make in the coming academic year? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have made changes to curriculum this year (to be effective next year) as a result of program requirements by the College of Education. The core of our program of study however remains the same and is a part of our required accreditation standards.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Our department consolidates the data and publishes the results on our website and to our alumni and community advisory committee. Changes to the curriculum and assessment procedures were made so that we were consistent with our accreditation standards.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

The new assessment procedure established this year appears to be a good way to collect student outcome information.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

I will be more intentional about collecting data and re-evaluate at the end of each semester instead of the academic year. I anticipate this will assist with the final report writing.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2010-2011 Criminal Justice Assessment of Core

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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 occuring 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 2010-2011 academic year.

**Goals**

G 1: Students will demonstrate critical thinking (BORIII)

Students will develop, enhance, and demonstrate critical thinking skills in the context of contemporary issues in crime and criminal justice.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)

Students will effectively analyze a wide range of contemporary crime and justice issues to which they are exposed using a social science perspective

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

Standard Associations

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

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 (such as Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Japan, and America).

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

Standard Associations

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Embedded examination questions (O: 1, 2, 3)

Multiple sections (n=5) of CRJU 2200 were offered during both the Fall, 2010 (n=3) and Spring (n=2011) semesters. Four of the five sections used objective examinations throughout the term; the fifth section was an honors section and utilized essay exams. The examinations in the non-honors course sections each covered approximately one-third (1/3) of the course, for a total of three exams in each of these sections. Two objective questions per objective were embedded on each of the three exams in each of the non-honors sections taught. All students in these sections were required to answer each assessment question. Instructors had the discretion of what questions to include; some of the questions included were similar across sections, other questions differed. This year's assessment focuses on the core course offerings in the non-honors sections of CRJU 2200.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target for O1: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues

Each instructor included two questions assessing students' knowledge of contemporary crime/criminal justice issues on one 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

A total of 308 students (N=119 for Instructor A; and N=189 for Instructor B) were enrolled in the four CrJu 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions for across by instructor and section are reported below. Instructor A (same questions across semesters): Q1 Pass Rate – Fall: 82%; Q1 Pass Rate – Spring: 91%. (Overall: Met target) Q2 Pass Rate – Fall: 93%; Q2 Pass Rate – Spring: 50%. (Overall: Partially met target) Overall Target: Partially met. Instructor B (some questions differed across semesters; these are noted by different labels): Q1 Pass Rate – Fall: 75%; Q1 Pass Rate – Spring: 82%. (Overall: Partially met target) Q2a Pass Rate – Fall: 67%; Q2b Pass Rate – Spring: 86%. (Overall: Partially met target) Overall Target: Partially met.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

A total of 308 students (N=119 for Instructor A; and N=189 for Instructor B) were enrolled in the four CrJu 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions for across by instructor and section are reported below. Instructor A (same questions across semesters): Q1 Pass Rate – Fall: 95%; Q1 Pass Rate – Spring: 70%. (Overall: Met target) Q2 Pass Rate – Fall: 97%; Q2 Pass Rate – Spring: 100%. (Overall: Met target) Overall Target: Partially met. Instructor B (some questions differed across semesters): Q1 Pass Rate – Fall: 98%; Q1 Pass Rate – Spring: 97%. (Overall: Met target) Q2a Pass Rate – Fall: 91%; Q2b Pass Rate – Spring: 97%. (Overall: Met target) Overall Target: Met.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

A total of 308 students (N=119 for Instructor A; and N=189 for Instructor B) were enrolled in the four CrJu 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions for across by instructor and section are reported below. Instructor A (same questions across semesters): Q1 Pass Rate – Fall: 97%; Q1 Pass Rate – Spring: 89%. (Overall: Met target) Q2 Pass Rate – Fall: 100%; Q2 Pass Rate – Spring: 94%. (Overall: Met target) Overall Target: Met. Instructor B (some questions differed across semesters): Q1 Pass Rate – Fall:
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: In-Progress
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 Cr.Ju 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 Cr.Ju 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: In-Progress
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues |

Implementation Description: Fall 2010
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Criminal Justice Undergraduate Committee and Cr.Ju 2200 teaching faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues |

Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: instructors and undergraduate committee

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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues |

Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: instructors and undergraduate committee

Training on assessment for PhD Instructors
With implementation of Ph.D. Program the department has added a number of Teaching Assistants and as a part of this implementation, the department has developed a teaching seminar. As part of this seminar, students will be subjected to assessment issues and questions as a part of this conference. With this implementation, a section of the seminar will be consistently oriented to
ensure that curriculum of the department and assessment issues are considered in course development. As well, required data collection elements will be discussed and collected as a part of this course.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Blackwell

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Because the department recently initiated a Ph.D. program with the inclusion of a number of T.A. positions, a number of which will be involved in teaching CRJU 2200, the department will focus in the coming year on ensuring that all instructors, particularly new instructors, have a clear understanding about the importance of considering learning outcomes and assessment in the building and delivery of their courses. As part of this process, review of the items used for assessment and discussion of delivery to enhance learning outcomes will be discussed.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Currently no degree program changes, with a specific focus on CRJU 2200 are planned in the coming year as a result of assessment.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Criminal Justice BS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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: Develop/Enhance Written Communication Skills
Students will develop and/or enhance their written communication skills, with a specific focus on communication about issues of crime and justice, 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 oral communication skills
Students will develop and enhance their oral communication skills, with a specific focus on their ability to orally communicate about issues in crime and justice, in order to excel in in professional positions.

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.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
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.

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.

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.

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, 3)
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.

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.

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) (M: 3)
Students should be able to identify and evaluate ethical issues that arise within the criminal justice system.

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. The assessment rubric is attached, and includes the different sections for the separate learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses
Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of four sections of CRJU 4930: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Assessment data reported here include three of these four sections; the fourth section was taught in the Fall 2010 semester by an adjunct from whom assessment data were unavailable. Findings reported here thus are based on one section of the capstone offered in the fall, Section A (n=28) and two sections, Section B (n=32) and Section C (n=30) offered in the spring, for a total N of 90 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 3 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.5; Section B average = 3.8; and Section C average = 2.6. Overall, 44% of students’ paper were rated as a 4, 26% were rated as a 3, 11% as a 2, and 19% as a 1. Students submitted multiple drafts of the paper, and rubric scores over time indicated that 54% of the students improved in...
their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 12% decreased and 34% demonstrated no improvement where it was possible.

Target for O2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

A total of four sections of CRJU 4930: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Assessment data reported here include three of these four sections; the fourth section was taught in the Fall 2010 semester by an adjunct from whom assessment data were unavailable. Findings reported here thus are based on one section of the capstone offered in the fall, Section A (n=28) and two sections, Section B (n=32) and Section C (n=30) offered in the spring, for a total N of 90 students.Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 2.7 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.4; Section B average = 3.3 and Section C average = 2.3). Overall, 27% were rated as a 4, 29 % were rated as a 3, 30% as a 2, and 14% as a 1. Students submitted multiple drafts of the paper, and rubric scores over time indicated that 48% of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 40% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and 12% decreased. Collectively these enrollees met our goals; 86% scored 2-4, 66% scored 3-4, and 27% scored a 4).

Target for O3: Application and analysis

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

A total of four sections of CRJU 4930: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Assessment data reported here include three of these four sections; the fourth section was taught in the Fall 2010 semester by an adjunct from whom assessment data were unavailable. Findings reported here thus are based on one section of the capstone offered in the fall, Section A (n=28) and two sections, Section B (n=32) and Section C (n=30) offered in the spring, for a total N of 90 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 2.7 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.4; Section B average = 3.3 and Section C average = 2.3). Overall, 31% were rated as a 4, 27 % were rated as a 3, 27% as a 2, and 15% as a 1. Students submitted multiple drafts of the paper, and rubric scores over time indicated that 47% of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 42% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and 11% decreased. Collectively these enrollees met our goals; 85% scored 2-4, 58% scored 3-4, and 31% scored a 4).

Target for O4: Generation of conclusions

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

A total of four sections of CRJU 4930: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Assessment data reported here include three of these four sections; the fourth section was taught in the Fall 2010 semester by an adjunct from whom assessment data were unavailable. Findings reported here thus are based on one section of the capstone offered in the fall, Section A (n=28) and two sections, Section B (n=32) and Section C (n=30) offered in the spring, for a total N of 90 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 2.7 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.4; Section B average = 3.3 and Section C average = 2.4). Overall, 30% were rated as a 4, 28 % were rated as a 3, 26% as a 2, and 16% as a 1. Students submitted multiple drafts of the paper, and rubric scores over time indicated that 57% of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 34% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and 9% decreased. Collectively these enrollees met our goals; 86% scored 2-4, 58% scored 3-4, and 30% scored a 4).

Target for O5: Written communication skills

80% of student papers will be rated as a 2, 3, of 4 on an assessment rubric at the end of the senior seminar. Please see attached rubric for achievement meanings associated with each category.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

A total of four sections of CRJU 4930: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. Assessment data reported here include three of these four sections; the fourth section was taught in the Fall 2010 semester by an adjunct from whom assessment data were unavailable. Findings reported here thus are based on one section of the capstone offered in the fall, Section A (n=28) and two sections, Section B (n=32) and Section C (n=30) offered in the spring, for a total N of 90 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 3.2 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 3.1; Section B average = 3.9, and Section C average = 2.6). Overall, 50% were rated as a 4, 21 % were rated as a 3, 24% as a 2, and 5% as a 1. Students submitted multiple drafts of the paper, and rubric scores over time indicated that 62% of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 32% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and 6% decreased. Collectively these enrollees met our goals; 95% scored 2-4, 71% scored 3-4, and 50% scored a 4).
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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Report This Cycle**

We did not assess outcomes using this measure this year.

**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).

**M 3: Ethics in Criminal Justice: Ethical Issues on Television Assignment (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7)**

CRJU 4060: Ethics in Criminal Justice was moved into the position of an 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 writing assignments in this course assess students’ ability to critically evaluate material and apply course concepts to ethical issues in the criminal justice system. In this particular assignment, the third of three assignments, students consider how plea bargaining practices impact aspects of procedural and substantive justice. Students examine the advantages and disadvantages of plea bargaining in the US. The assignment is based on class lectures and a documentary on the topic (see attached file named Ethical Issue Assignment). This assignment also assesses students' ability to express ideas in writing.

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.

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

A total of two sections of CRJU 3060: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters (Section A in the fall, n=35; and Section B in the Spring, n=37). The assessment data reported here comes from Section B. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 28 on the 1-4 scale on Application and Analysis. Overall, 22% were rated as a 4, 57% were rated as a 3, 22% as a 2, and 0% as a 1. Students submitted multiple drafts of the paper, and rubric scores over time indicated that 62% of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 32% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and 6% decreased. Collectively these scores fell just short of our goals; 79% scored 3-4, 22% scored a 4.

**Target for O4: Generation of conclusions**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the third assignment.

**Target for O5: Written communication skills**

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

A total of two sections of CRJU 3060: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters (Section A in the fall, n=35; and Section B in the Spring, n=37). The assessment data reported here comes from Section B. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 3.0 on the 1-4 scale on written communication skills. Overall, 43% were rated as a 4, 41% were rated as a 3, 5% as a 2, and 10% as a 1. Collectively these scores fell just short met our goals; 84% scored 3-4, 43% scored a 4.

**Target for O7: Identification of ethical frameworks**

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to identify and state topic issues/hypotheses at the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 or 3 in this rubric dimension and at least 25% should rate as a 4.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

A total of two sections of CRJU 3060: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice were offered during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters (Section A in the fall, n=35; and Section B in the Spring, n=37). The assessment data reported here comes from Section B. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 3.0 on the 1-4 scale on written communication skills. Overall, 32% were rated as a 4, 51% were rated as a 3, 16% as a 2, and 0% as a 1. Collectively these scores fell just short met our goals; 83% scored 3-4, 32% scored a 4.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Review all learning outcomes**
Review syllabi and curriculums to ensure that all basic learning outcomes are relevant, measurable and achievable.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

**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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Written communication skills
  - Measure: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
- **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:** In-Progress
- **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
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
- **Implementation Description:** This year the committee reviewed departmental syllabi to determine the degree to which oral presentations are required in the curriculum. The coming year the committee will assess the viability of inclusion of this as a learning outcome seen as important by the faculty. If the outcome is continued, then the committee will work to ensure that curriculum structure leads in a linear manner to ensure that students develop requisite skills for success.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate coordinator/committee

**Continued Monitoring**
The department will continue monitoring outcomes annually to ensure that new cohorts continue to demonstrate success in achieving this learning outcome.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay  
- Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information</td>
<td>Generation of conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication skills</td>
<td>Written communication skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brenda Blackwell and undergraduate committee

**Continued Monitoring**

The department will continue monitoring to ensure that future cohorts continue to demonstrate success.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Capstone Seminar: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay  
- Outcome/Objective: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brenda Blackwell and undergraduate committee

**Data Collection**

The department will cycle in data collection for determining achievement of this target in the upcoming year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Capstone Seminar: Oral Presentation Assignment  
- Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brenda Blackwell and undergraduate committee

**Improve data collection efforts**

The Department is reviewing the evaluation rubric to further enhance evaluation and data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**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

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We continue to annually review and discuss our learning outcomes and the course curriculum to address student learning objectives. This year’s data and reporting from faculty has led us to reassess the structure of assignments in the capstone course for the coming year. Currently, the undergraduate committee, which includes the CTW ambassador, coordinating with the internship coordinator, is discussing the measurement of learning outcomes, specifically in reference to the assignments included in the bookend CTW courses: CRJU 3060 (Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice) and CRJU 4930 (Capstone Seminar). This year, shifts were made, with a new CTW Ambassador put into place. With new leadership in this position, new ideas are being generated about how to restructure and examine learning outcomes, targeted outcomes, and strategies to continue to improve programmatic and teaching strategies. To answer the questions posed here specifically, decisions were made last year to not change or revise learning outcomes in any major way. Instead, revisions occurred based on feedback on last year's report. Specifically, Learning Outcomes/Objectives 5 and 6 were modified to provide greater clarity and specificity, separating written and oral communication skills to a greater degree. With this change came the need to discuss how we would measure Learning Objective 6. The committee will work with instructors for CRJU 4930 in the fall to determine the viability of applying a rubric to score oral reports required in this course. In addition, during the fall semester, faculty will be surveyed to identify what courses require oral communication. Faculty will also be engaged in a discussion about the importance of this objective and how best to ensure that students are obtaining these skills in our curriculum. In addition, with the revision of the course sequencing that occurred in the fall 2010 catalog and the placement of a new CTW Ambassador, plans will progress to link assignment requirements across the two CTW courses to develop a within student – across year measurement of change over time in a number of learning objectives. This is currently in progress as a result of this year's reporting efforts. In addition, with the advent of the new Ph.D. program in integration of beginning T.A. Instructors teaching in the undergraduate curriculum, a training course was implemented (Ph.D. level Teaching Seminar) that will ensure sound development of beginning instructors to ensure appropriate consideration of curriculum level learning outcomes, the translation of appropriate outcomes into individual level courses, appropriate delivery strategies for higher order learning outcomes, consideration of assessment strategies, and data collection of assessment information to inform curricular goals and improvements.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**  
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on
As a result of the 2008-2009 report, the department moved to make curriculum changes in course sequencing to put into place a course that students would take in their junior year to allow comparisons across time, keeping the Capstone course as a required course for students' last semester. As a result of such planning, four courses (Methods of Criminal Justice, Criminological Theory, Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice, and Ethics in Criminal Justice), 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, were structured as co-requisites in the this reporting year (2010-2011). With the move to a new college, we will work to ensure that advisement strategies and curricular requirements in banner appropriate reflect and address these changes to ensure that assessment of curriculum outcomes, as well as retention strategies are appropriately applied to enhance student success and higher order student learning outcomes. We continue to examine assessment strategies for these courses (see comments on above question). In the coming year, we will survey faculty to determine the importance of learning objective 6 and will examine syllabi for these four courses to determine if early attempts integrate this objective into course materials exists. Information obtained will influence how the committee proceeds. Because shifts were made in curriculum structure this year, we are not significantly altering our learning objectives or assessment tools, as we want to determine if these structural changes have the desired improved outcomes. We also are planning to continue assessment of current strategies in light of college level service provisions as well as new resources and recommendations in the coming year.
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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.

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.

SLO 3: Understand criminological theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology

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

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
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

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.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students (O: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

This is a 16 item faculty-rated assessment instrument used to evaluate non-thesis students. It replaces the previous 18 item assessment survey. The items are rated on a 4 point scale, ranging from poor to excellent. The instrument is to be completed by members of the graduate committee shortly after the end 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 70% of students with an average rating score of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) across the six items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Seven non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2011. All 7 students were evaluated on all 6 of the items that measure this objective. The average score on these six items was a 2.98, with scores ranging from 2.87 to 3.58. Only 2 students out of 7 (approximately 29%) met the target rating score of 3.0 or better.

**Target for O3: Understand criminological theory**

The desired performance is to have at least 70% of students with an average rating score of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) on the one item that measures this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2011. All 7 students were evaluated on the one item that measures this objective. The average score on this item was a 3.0, with scores ranging from 2.0 to 4.0. Five of the seven students (approximately 71%) met the target rating score of 3.0 or better.

**Target for O4: Understand theory of criminal justice responses**

The desired performance is to have at least 70% of students with an average rating score of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) on the one item that measures this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2011. All 7 students were evaluated on the one item that measures this objective. The average score on this item was a 3.07, with scores ranging from 2.00 to 4.0. Five of the seven students (approximately 71%) met the target rating score of 3.0 or better.

**Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact**

The desired performance is to have at least 70% of students with an average rating score of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) across the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2011. Only 4 out of 7 students were evaluated on at least one of the two items that measure this objective. The average score on these two items for the students that were evaluated was a 2.88, with scores ranging from 2.5 to 3.0. Three of the four students (75%) met the target rating score of 3.0 or better.

**Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology**

The desired performance is to have at least 70% of students with an average rating score of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) across the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Seven non-thesis students completed the capstone seminar during the Spring semester 2011. All seven students were evaluated on the two items that measures this objective. The average score across all seven students on this measure was 2.68, with scores ranging from 2.0 to 3.5. Only two of the seven students achieved the target rating of 3.0 (approximately 29%).

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have at least 70% of students with an average rating score of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) across the four items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven non-thesis students completed the Capstone Seminar during the Spring semester 2011. All 7 students were evaluated on the 4 items that measures this objective. The average score on these items was a 3.27, with scores ranging from 2.5 to
Six of the seven students (approximately 86%) met the target rating score of 3.0 or better.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Two students completed a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July 1 assessment data. (One student will be defending next week.) 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 4.33 and 5, giving an overall average of 4.66. With only two thesis students in this evaluation, and one falling just 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July assessment deadline. Both students were assessed on one each of the 3 items measuring this outcome. The average scores across these 3 items was a 4.33 and a 5.0, giving an overall average of 4.66. With only two students writing theses, only 50% of the students reached the desired target performance level of 4.5, thus the target was not met.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July assessment. Both students were assessed on one item measuring this outcome. Both students received a 5 on this item, thus the performance target was met with 100% of the students scoring 4.5 or higher.

**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 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July assessment. One student was assessed on 4 of the 5 items measuring this outcome, while the other student was assessed on only 1. The average scores for both of the two students on these items were 5; therefore 100% of the students had an average rating score above 4.5.

**Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact**

The desired performance is to have at least 80% of students with an average rating score of 4.5 or higher (on a 5 point scale) across the items measuring this learning outcome.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July assessment. Both of the students were assessed on the 2 items measuring this outcome. The average score across these items for both students was a 5. Therefore, the targeted performance level of 80% of the students achieving a score of at least a 4.5 was 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July assessment. Both students were assessed on at least 1 of the two items measuring this outcome. The average score on these items for both students was a 5. With 100% of the students scoring a 5, the desired target performance level of 80% having a rating score of 4.5 was met.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Two students complete a Master's thesis during the 2010-2011 academic year in time for the July assessment. Both students were assessed on all three of the items measuring this outcome. Both students (100%) had an average rating on these 3 items of 5.0, thus the desired performance target of 80% being rated at a 4.5 or higher was met.

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
- 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
- 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
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Mission / Purpose
All accounting students take a core business course (BUS3000) that serves as the first CTW course an introduction to critical
thinking through writing. Students take BUSA3000 in their sophomore or junior year. The second CTW course for accounting majors is Auditing (AC4610). Students enroll in the Auditing class during their senior year. Usually, students are enrolled in the course during the last semester of their undergraduate studies. CTW is applied in two quizzes and two written assignments: a written case analysis that includes an oral presentation and a report based on a review of operations and internal controls at a simulated audit client.

**Goals**

**G 1: Auditing issues**
The goal of the CTW component of the course is to familiarize students with the types of higher order level thinking and analytical skills that will be expected of them in a professional career in accounting. The School of Accountancy would like graduates in accounting to demonstrate mastery in critical thinking through writing. 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. Their conclusions and recommendations must be complete, plausible, and compelling, and demonstrate an understanding the accounting problem. The ability to demonstrate critical thinking skills in a time-pressure environment is an important attribute to achieve a successful career in accounting. Therefore, we would like students to be able to solve problems and communicate the results of their analysis under restricted time constraints. Analysis: Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze cases of audit failure to identify strong vs. weak audit approaches, develop alternative audit procedures, and make recommendations to improve governance and control conditions at audit clients. Communication: students will demonstrate the ability to communicate their knowledge of auditing directly to their peers. They prepare oral presentations and written reports that demonstrate their analysis. They will provide theoretical support and corroborating data to support their conclusions. Research Skills: Students will learn to research the appropriate audit standards and regulatory requirements to support their analysis.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Internal Control and Fraud Risk Assignment (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Auditing Alchemy Inc. is the long CTW assignment. It is worth approximately 15% of the semester grade. The objective of the assignment is have students adopt the role of an independent auditor who is responsible for reviewing the client’s production and revenue recognition process. Students must identify fraud risks and internal control weaknesses based on a simulated “walkthrough.” The will analyze the type of fraud that can occur, identify internal control weaknesses and then prepare a memo to the files that describes the issues at the client and recommendations to correct the problems that they detected. This task is similar to tasks that junior public accountants will perform at real audit clients. We use a simulated production system and video interviews between auditors and representatives of the simulated client. Students must review background materials and client prepared documents before they begin the simulation.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression

**SLO 2: Audit Objectives**
Objectives of the course are as follows: Differentiate among the various types of auditing and the procedures applied on financial statements audits and audits of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting Evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified. Apply the opinion formulation process to specific attestation engagements and clearly communicate the results of procedures performed as part of the opinion formulation process. Understand and evaluate the auditors' responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled. 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 the audit problem.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: CTW Evaluations (O: 1)**
The CTW program conducted a survey of the students enrolled in AC 4610 during the 2010-11 AY. There was a very low response rate (less than 5% of the students enrolled). The low response rate requires that any responses be interpreted with caution. Nonetheless, the following observations were made. The accounting respondents had lower ratings (.4 points or lower) than the summary CTW responses (for all CTW courses) in four areas: CT is important in my discipline, CT is important in the field I plan to pursue, helps me ask relevant questions, formulate a testable hypothesis. Accounting respondents indicated more favorable responses than the summary CTW responses in four key areas: helps make accurate inferences, evaluate the validity of evidence, CTW rubric helped me understand the expectations for the CTW assignment, CTW assignments helped me learn the material for this course. It is not surprising that the respondents had low ratings on the formulation of testable hypotheses metric because the audit course is not designed to emphasize this attribute. However, it was surprising that students did not recognize how important CT is to a career in accounting. It was pleasing to note that the students found the rubric to be helpful. During 2010-11 AY, we had revised the rubric and had students peer review each other using the rubric. It seems that this contributed to their satisfaction with the metric.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We revised our rubric significantly. Changes to the rubric were based on feedback from former AC 4610 students, knowledge gained from CTW workshops and the CTW faculty. The CTW survey results indicated that the students' satisfaction with the rubric had increased several points. In the past the satisfaction with the rubric was less than 3 and below the CTW overall summary. This year the satisfaction score was significantly above the CTW overall summary. We held a 2 hour training session for all faculty and CTW consultants to develop a plan of action and agreed upon procedures to be instituted in all AC4610 CTW classes. This led to a clearer understanding of responsibilities, improvements in the willingness of actors to adhere to the CTW plan and greater consistency in the delivery of the course across semesters and instructors. During the year we also added an outline requirement for the long CTW assignment. Sample outlines and "how to write an outline" tip sheet were posted on the course’s website. CTW consultants provided timely feedback on the outlines that were submitted. The outline helped the students to organize their reports and we saw a significant improvement in the quality of the reports that were submitted.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

We saw a significant decline in the "top 20 GSU writing errors.” It was clear that distributing copies of the leaflets to the students had an impact on their propensity to make such errors. Students’ case analysis were improved in the dimensions of organization and clarity as well as internal consistency of the arguments presented. We believe that these improvements were the result of following an agreed upon action plan with the CTW consultants that emphasized feedback on these areas. The CTW consultant gave feedback to each group, forcing the group of students to think about their writing and to re-phrase ill-constructed sentences and rectify illogical errors. Group members became more active in their self-assessment and correction. They became more critical with the information presented to them. They asked relevant questions regarding the assessment and tried harder to remain objective, as auditors. Additionally, each group members were asked to rate the performance of each of their peers. The peer evaluations allowed the student to genuinely observe and give an objective grade to each of his/her team members. Accordingly, peer evaluations motivate students to participate in group efforts and serve as a control mechanism empowering students to penalize group members who shirk group responsibilities.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We need to work on developing better short assignments that emphasize CT under time pressure constraints. We currently use two 15 min. quizzes that require students to select an objective response and then to articulate the analysis that supported their selection. We have noticed wide variance in the performance on quizzes. Some students excel (scoring 95%+) and others struggle (scoring less than 50%). It has been difficult to develop questions that test the learning objective and that require students to demonstrate the knowledge that they have acquired. We have posted a sample quiz to familiarize students with the types of analysis that we expect on the assignment. We will increase the time dedicated to modeling CT under pressure so that the students can learn by example.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

We have seen a marked improvement in the ability of students to engage in critical analysis to solve auditing problems. During this academic year performance on the comprehensive final examination was 8-10 points higher than the norm. We held the rigor and breadth of the exam consistent with prior years. We believe that the quizzes and written analyses forced the students to evaluate and support their responses on those assignments and that this approach helped them to analyze their exam questions in greater detail to arrive at more accurate responses. Several students reported that when they were forced to provide support for their objective responses, they discovered that they had made logical errors or selected the incorrect response. They were happy that developing the written responses allowed them to correct their errors. They were then able to apply this method of thinking to other assignments. The major changes we made were to increase the number of opportunities for feedback and revision of the students’ drafts for the written assignments. In our view this was the single most important factor in improving the quality of the final submissions. During the prior years many teams received low grades on their final product but in the current year that was not the case.
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)**
In comparing initial submissions to subsequent submissions, students in AAS will demonstrate improved CTW (as determined by the assignment rubric). Further, CTW strengths in the following domains will be apparent: 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)**
At minimum, the final research paper will exhibit, on average, CTW in the high “developing” range (as determined by the assignment rubric). Further, students in AAS will demonstrate CTW strengths 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 literature review, b. analysis; and c. discussion support the conclusions offered by each author (30%). 2. Does the author provide specific support from the article for a decision to include or exclude each article from the literature review (30%); 3. Is there evidence of critical thinking (see rubric) (10%) 4. Is the article free of written errors? (10%) Initial critiques will not be assigned a grade although I will provide you with feedback. You will have the option of submitting one revision of each critique. It is my expectation that each revised submission will more completely meet the criteria.

**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, Nardone & 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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Article Annotation (O: 2)**
To assess and demonstrate CTW performance on the article annotations, initial submissions were compared to the final submission. In comparing the performance of twelve students across 34 submissions, the average increase on the CTW portions of the assignment (1. the author assess the strength and weakness of the degree to which the article’s conclusions are supported ; 2. Does
the author assess the strength and weakness of the degree to which the article’s conclusions are supported) was 18.99/60 (see rubric). Without exception, each student demonstrated improved CTW on this assignment.

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

**Target for O2: CTW Objective 1**

Moving forward, we expect that a minimum of 75% of the students will earn a grade of 75% or above on the CTW portion of this assignment.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Objective: Moving forward, we expect that a minimum of 75% of the students will earn a grade of 75% or above on the CTW portion of this assignment. Finding: AAS accomplished this objective. The average CTW grade was 55.2/60 (90%).

**M 2: Research Paper CTW Assessment (O: 3)**

In reviewing the research papers of nine students, it is apparent that students demonstrate strengths in CTW. Specifically, the overall average rating on AAS' CTW rubric is 4.87 (across all five criteria) with no criterion falling below 4.3 (criterion 5). In comparing the ratings (2010-2011/2009-2010), CTW has increased in each criterion with the exception of criterion 5. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the problem, question, or issue (5/4.5) Identifies and considers the influence of the researcher (4.3/4.09) Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position. (4.8/4.68) Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence. (4.8/4.64) Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences. (4.3/4.45)

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

**Target for O3: CTW Objective 2**

Moving forward, we expect that the minimum average score on each criterion of the rubric will be 4 (high developing), with a minimum overall average CTW rating of 4 (high developing) as well.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

AAS accomplished this objective as indicated in the summary.

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

**Revise Research Paper Rubric**

I will revise the CTW research paper rubric for the 2010-2011 academic year. This rubric will be inclusive of both general and CTW-specific assignment requirements.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Research Paper CTW Assessment | Outcome/Objective: CTW Objective 2
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Jonathan Gayles

**CTW Sessions**

To maintain the CTW progress evidenced during the past year, AAS will devote one class session to CTW in each of our CTW courses. The purpose this action is to provide students with specific examples of CTW in AAS using previously-submitted CTW assignments that best demonstrate CTW. If possible, these sessions will be conducted with the assistance of CTW staff.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: 1. Identify and make anonymous outstanding/poor CTW assignments (sum’ 2011); 2. Discuss collaboration w/CTW staff (sum’ 2011); 3. Develop instructional activities for students that will elucidate evidence of CTW in the selected assignments as well as provide them with opportunities to identify and discuss the CTW strengths/weaknesses of each assignment (late sum’ 2011); and 4. Identify specific date and location for fall/spring term CTW sessions (late sum’/fall 2011).
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Jonathan Gayles
- Additional Resources: Possible collaboration with CTW staff
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

This semester’s research papers were particularly strong. In fact, four students presented their papers at the National Council for Black Studies Conference in Cincinnati, Ohio. In terms of CTW, students appear to be more comfortable with that which CTW represents. Of course, much of this improvement should be attributed to the fact that AAS CTW courses are taught as a two-course sequence by the same instructor. As a result, the intersection of CTW expectations across two semesters culminated in especially strong research paper submissions this semester.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

General CTW performance has increased but the most significant increase is found in student performance on the annotated bibliography. Students initially struggle on the CTW portion of the assignment but as they submit revisions, their performance and grasp of CTW improved. I believe that this improvement influences their research papers.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the
CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

What areas of CTW in your program still need development?
None.

What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic?
None, presently.

What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

Students’ grasp of CTW and ability to produce scholarly work is enhanced by AAS CTW efforts. AAS is considering producing an undergraduate research journal that will provide student work with a broader audience. The only change to our CTW efforts is a slight change to the Annotation Rubric.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

Our departmental CTW efforts are limited to the two courses. At present, there is no broader departmental impact.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Our departmental CTW efforts are limited to the two courses. At present, there is no broader departmental impact.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

It appears that our efforts to increase CTW are successful and that this success culminates in strong research papers.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

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

I will continue to consider student performance in CTW with particular attention to AAS CTW rubrics. At present, I anticipate AAS involvement to be limited to our two CTW courses and the CTW efforts of the instructor of these courses.

---
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**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.
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Action Plans for last year were effective. Eliminating peer-reviewing in 3033 fostered a more reflexive approach to topic choices. Grading drafts was also effective in ensure full student participation in online sessions. In 4970 the number of papers requiring multiple revisions was reduced, and this allowed students to put more effort into the writing assignments that still required revisions.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Overall quality seems to have improved, and students in 4970 frequently comment on how writing intensive courses have improved
the quality of their critical thinking through writing.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

With a growing major and a shrinking faculty body, it is very difficult to cap our CTW courses at 25. At the time of writing, ANTH 3033 is already full, and I keep receiving overflow requests. We are in the process of hiring a new TT faculty member, but one of our senior faculty is retiring. We need at least one more permanent lecturer to be able to handle CTW requirements without shortchanging our graduate program.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

Critical thinking has always been a central component of our discipline; however, the overall quality of student work has improved. The faculty are more concerned with students’ writing skills, and several of us have expressed an interest in teaching a writing-intensive course.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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

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

Since the data are satisfactory, no structural changes were deemed necessary. The number of writing-intensive course offerings will probably increase, even though this will create important challenges due to the competition for resources between CTW classes and our graduate program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Data were used for program evaluation and strategic plan. Several faculty have expressed an interest in teaching writing intensive courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Undergraduate students may not be ready for peer-reviewing; however, oral presentations are more conducive to thinking critically about fellow students’ work as well as one’s own.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Since the current course structures worked well in the past year, we are not going to make changes at this time.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Course format changes implemented in 2010 were effective.

Challenges for Next Year
We do not have enough faculty members as to be able to teach the CTW courses we need even as we support a thriving graduate program. One faculty member will be on leave, and one is retiring. We are hiring one TT faculty member, but we still need more resources in order to be able to support both a growing major and a successful MA program.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
intended outcomes were not modified

Modifications in Measurement Methods
Measurement methods were not modified.

University-wide Committee Participation
ANTH CTW Ambassador participated in CTW training sessions.

Publications and Presentations
not applicable

Academic Teaching Activities
not applicable

International Activities
not applicable

Contributions to Student Retention
data not available

Service to the External Community
not applicable
Georgia State University
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**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: language in society final paper (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
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.

**SLO 2: communication across cultures final paper (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Students will write a 17-22 page final paper on a microculture (e.g., dog breeders, massage therapists, yoga instructors, faculty members, graduate students, 1st graders). They will identify a microculture that interests them, observe members of the microculture interacting, identify an informant, take field notes, develop ethnographic interviewing skills, and collect and analyze ethnographic interview data. Finally, they will complete the written presentation of your project. All writing assignments in this course relate to and build toward this final paper. They will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to demonstrate an honest awareness of their feelings/thoughts about cultural difference, show awareness that they are cultural beings, present convincing arguments based on data, draw reasonable conclusions, and present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

**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: language in society 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.

**Findings 2010-2011** - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 96% of students received at least a 3 and 48% received a 4.

**M 2: demonstrates self-awareness about cultural difference (O: 2)**
Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills on their final papers for Communication across Cultures, including their ability to demonstrate an honest awareness of their feelings/thoughts about cultural difference.

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

**Target for O2: communication across cultures final paper**
The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Fails to demonstrate
The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is "Fails to demonstrate awareness of one's feelings /thoughts about cultural difference", 2 is "Does not demonstrate much awareness of one's feelings /thoughts about cultural difference", 3 is "Demonstrates much awareness of one's feelings /thoughts about cultural difference" and 4 is "Clearly demonstrates a lot of self awareness about one's feelings and thoughts about cultural difference". 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 56% of students received at least a 3 and 32% received a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: shows awareness of bias (O: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills on their final papers, including their ability to show awareness of bias.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: language in society final paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is &quot;Fails to show awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem&quot;, 2 is &quot;Partially acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem&quot;, 3 is &quot;Fully acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem; may attempt some steps to address them&quot; and 4 is &quot;Fully acknowledges prejudicial aspects of the problem and takes reasonable steps to address them&quot;. Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 96% of students received at least a 3 and 52% received a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: communication across cultures 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 that oneself is a cultural being", 2 is "Partially shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being", 3 is "Fully shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being" and 4 is "Fully shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being and demonstrates ability to mediate one's cultural behavior as necessary". 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 76% of students received at least a 3 and 44% received a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: presents convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence (O: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in their final papers, including their ability to present convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: language in society final paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is &quot;Arguments are not based on linguistic principles&quot;, 2 is &quot;Arguments are loosely based on linguistic principles&quot;, 3 is &quot;Arguments are mostly based on linguistic principles&quot; and 4 is &quot;Arguments are clearly and consistently based on linguistic principles&quot;. Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 96% of students received at least a 3 and 57% received a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: communication across cultures 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 data", 2 is "Arguments are loosely based on data", 3 is "Arguments are mostly based on data" and 4 is "Arguments are clearly and consistently based on data". 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 76% of students received at least a 3 and 44% received a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 5: draws reasonable conclusions (O: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking on their final papers through writing skills in this assignment, including their ability to draw reasonable conclusions.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: language in society final paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured this outcome on a scale from 1-4, where 1 is &quot;Conclusions are based on misconceptions of linguistic principles, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented&quot;, 2 is &quot;Conclusions are somewhat or vaguely based on linguistic arguments presented&quot;, 3 is &quot;Conclusions are largely supported by linguistically informed arguments&quot; and 4 is &quot;Conclusions are clearly supported by linguistically informed arguments&quot;. Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of this outcome, 96% of students received at least a 3 and 70% received a 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O2: communication across cultures 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 data, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented or on bias", 2 is "Conclusions are somewhat or vaguely based on data presented", 3 is "Conclusions are largely supported by data presented" and 4 is "Conclusions are clearly supported by data presented". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.
or vaguely based on misconceptions of data, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented or bias. Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In terms of this outcome, 80% of students received at least a 3 and 44% received a 4.

**M 6: presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion (O: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills in their final papers, including their ability to present ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.

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

**Target for O1: language in society 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In terms of this outcome, 96% of students received at least a 3 and 65% received a 4.

**Target for O2: communication across cultures 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In terms of this outcome, 80% of students received at least a 3 and 48% received a 4.

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

### change to course requirements for Communication across Cultures

Students had difficulty identifying cultural difference (and thus, becoming aware of their feelings and thoughts regarding such differences) and recognizing themselves as cultural beings if they were investigating a micro-culture with which they were already too familiar (e.g. Starbucks, gaming). In future offerings of Communication Across Cultures, students will be required to do their final paper on a micro-culture with which they are not at all familiar, which should help them to become more aware of cultural differences.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: demonstrates self-awareness about cultural difference | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: shows awareness of bias | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors for communication across cultures
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### discuss advising students/set possible prerequisites with faculty

Many students who signed up for the "senior-level" CTW course were not seniors and had not taken the junior-level course. The AL faculty will need to consider whether it is feasible to have the junior-level course (or senior status) as a prerequisite to the senior-level course. (Since the courses were only offered once per year in the past, such a requirement has made graduating in a timely fashion difficult for students.) Another possibility is just to work with advising so that students know to sign up for the junior-level course before the senior-level one if at all possible.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: demonstrates self-awareness about cultural difference | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: draws reasonable conclusions | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: presents convincing arguments based on appropriate evidence | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper
  - Measure: shows awareness of bias | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper

### timely data collection

The Ambassador did not try to collect data from instructors until after the semester was over. The instructors had already returned some papers, and had not always kept rubric data separately. This likely resulted in overall lower scores on the Communication across Cultures rubrics, as students who make the effort to pick up their final papers (those whose data are missing from the current report) are often those who are likely to have done a good job to begin with. The process of doing this report has already helped clarify what is needed, but in the future the Ambassador will make sure the instructors are keeping this data; at that point we will be able to better assess whether other changes are needed.
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We are no longer using the EFL practicum course as the senior-level CTW course; instead we have added Communication Across Cultures, which appears to be a much better fit and more closely parallels the junior-level course. This course was taught for the first time, with close collaboration between the two instructors. We have changed our overall measures so that they can be used for both courses, showing the parallels between the tasks we are assigning at different levels, and added achievement targets for the new course. We have also addressed our difficulties in offering enough CTW courses in part by hiring an outstanding lecturer who will teach CTW courses. Both of these accomplishments address issues raised in the 2008-2009 report (before WEAV/Enline was used).

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

From this year's data, we cannot see improvement from the junior-level class to the senior-level class; in fact, the scores in the senior-level class were lower overall. However, because of scheduling difficulties (our courses are nearly always full very quickly and few sections are offered) students are not always able to take the junior-level class before the senior-level class. This year there were at least some students in the senior-level class who had not taken the junior-level class. We will encourage students not to take the senior-level class unless they have completed the junior-level one, but we expect that this will nevertheless sometimes occur. We will also need more data over more time to see meaningful patterns since it is not the same students who are in both courses in a year, so we'd need to look at the pattern over a couple of years to be a little more confident that differences between the two courses are not just due to different groups of students. Finally, now that we have sample papers from both classes, it may be possible for faculty to meet and do some norming of the rubric grading so that we can check for our own consistency in assigning rubric scores.

The main problems thus far have been with setting in on a program (with the current, more appropriate, senior-level course being offered for the first time this past spring) and with the workload of CTW-associated faculty. The first problem seems to have been solved, but the second is still of some concern. Because we are a relatively small department in terms of faculty, service loads are high (for example, the CTW ambassador is also in charge of the PhD program and has been chair or a member of a search committee each of the last three years). An unfortunate result is that it is more of a burden for CTW instructors and ambassadors to meet to do more in-depth working together, discussion of ratings, expectations, etc. that would make the program really exciting and beneficial for both faculty and students. As our department has hired another tenure-track faculty member and a lecturer who can teach CTW courses this year, we may be in a better position to engage more fully with the challenges of the CTW program. We may also be able to CTW courses more often. However, since teaching a CTW course well typically involves more work than most other classes it would be helpful to have that taken into consideration when workloads are assigned. I am not sure what assistance is available since we are not eligible for consultants in CAS, for example, but I thought it was important to acknowledge the situation.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the program have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

The main problems thus far have been with setting in on a program (with the current, more appropriate, senior-level course being offered for the first time this past spring) and with the workload of CTW-associated faculty. The first problem seems to have been solved, but the second is still of some concern. Because we are a relatively small department in terms of faculty, service loads are high (for example, the CTW ambassador is also in charge of the PhD program and has been chair or a member of a search committee each of the last three years). An unfortunate result is that it is more of a burden for CTW instructors and ambassadors to meet to do more in-depth working together, discussion of ratings, expectations, etc. that would make the program really exciting and beneficial for both faculty and students. As our department has hired another tenure-track faculty member and a lecturer who can teach CTW courses this year, we may be in a better position to engage more fully with the challenges of the CTW program. We may also be able to CTW courses more often. However, since teaching a CTW course well typically involves more work than most other classes it would be helpful to have that taken into consideration when workloads are assigned. I am not sure what assistance is available since we are not eligible for consultants in CAS, for example, but I thought it was important to acknowledge the situation.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

We've developed a couple of very exciting courses that really challenge students to do their own research, question their assumptions, weigh options, and defend their arguments. Students are also getting substantial writing assignments in these courses, which is not always possible in non-CTW courses which are often much larger. In the next couple of years we should be able to see more specific results as we settle in with one program and are able to collect data regularly. Our major changes have centered around the change in the senior-level CTW course offered, as mentioned above.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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 second CTW assignment.

In AE 4900, 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 visual culture toward the objective of developing relevant instructional plans.


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
SLO 1: Critical Analysis of Artwork (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 2)
In AE 4900 this year, students analyzed advertisements using the Feldman method and other applicable strategies covered in class, as part of their preparation for planning a learning unit about Visual Culture.

SLO 2: Final Field Experience Reflection (G: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7) (M: 1)
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.

### Standard Associations

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

### SLO 3: Resource Review (G: 2, 5, 6, 7) (M: 3)

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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Rubric for Field Experience Reflection (O: 2)

The associated Rubric provides descriptors of competent performance in addressing the CTW objectives of this assignment. I have streamlined the criteria and expanded upon the descriptors for different levels of performance based upon last year’s results.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

90% of students met target.

#### M 2: Art Criticism assignment (O: 1)

90% were competent.

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

**Target for O1: Critical Analysis of Artwork**

75% of students will demonstrate competency based upon the rubric for art criticism.

#### M 3: Resource Review (O: 3)

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 assignment.

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

**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.

### 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: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Action plan from last year included reflecting upon the piloted resource review CTW assignment in 4200, which I did revise and assign as a CTW assignment during Fall 2010. I think it helped orient students to the level of discourse expected in these assignments, so they did a better job on the second assignment as a result. I incorporated more sophisticated questions into the undergraduate assignment during Fall 2010, based upon the results of the pilot last spring, and I was pleased with the results. In AE 4900, Spring 2011, the instructor noted a marked improvement in student performance on writing assignments. Incorporating CTW into 4900 was one of our goals for this year and I believe it has been successfully implemented and will continue to improve.

#### CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Faculty discussed our perception that, in fact, the students who have had two CTW courses did demonstrate more sophisticated skills in critical writing and analysis. Some questioned whether this was a direct result of greater emphasis on Critical Writing in the entry course, or whether this particular group just coincidentally responded to the assignments at a higher level. All agree, however, that having undergraduate students interacting in class with graduate students seems to raise the bar on achievement overall.

#### CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

In AE 4200, the two existing CTW assignments seem to be working well, but will continue to be refined each semester. In AE 4900, the instructor intends to put greater emphasis on descriptive writing during the next cycle, to accompany the gains made in critical
CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

I believe that incorporating CTW assignments into the entry level course has improved the critical thinking and writing abilities of our students and added an extra dimension to the assignments we expect them to complete. I am trying to work more closely with the instructor of the senior level course to document changes made to assignments and outcomes that result. It will be helpful to the department as a whole to see the progression of students thru these courses and reflect upon the evidence of their critical thinking skills. As we continue to refine our program, moving toward a cohort model for the undergraduate students, the CTW component will not only enhance student learning but also contribute to our efforts in program evaluation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Art History
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Inquiry</strong> Students will formulate pertinent questions about works of art or art historical problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 2: Synthesis</strong> Students will synthesize interpretations of art and art historical claims made by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 3: Evaluation</strong> Students will evaluate the creative and cultural significance of art and/or evaluate claims made by others about art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 4: Interpretation</strong> Students will compose valid interpretations of works of art or art historical problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 5: Reflection</strong> Students will reflect critically on the discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: AH4990 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assessment available for this cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: AH3000 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: AH 4990 (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no rubric available for this assessment cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: AH4990</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of students will score a 4 or better (out of 6) on the critical thinking component of the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> Not Reported This Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No findings available for this cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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...
### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 1: Technical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate competent technical and formal skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 3: Professional Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 2: Unified Body of Artwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will complete the BFA program with a mature studio practice that includes a unified body of artwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 4: Critical Writing Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students completing the BFA program will have the critical writing skills necessary for a career in the fine arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Portfolio II: Textiles Assignment (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paste Assignment Description here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 <a href="http://www.interviewmagazine.com/art/">http://www.interviewmagazine.com/art/</a> The Brooklyn Rail <a href="http://www.brooklynrail.org/">http://www.brooklynrail.org/</a> BOMB magazine <a href="http://www.bombsite.com/issues/current">http://www.bombsite.com/issues/current</a> Your interview will be graded on 1) ambition of artist choice, 2) rigor of questions, 3) appropriate formatting, and 4) accurate grammar &amp; spelling. There is no minimum or maximum length requirement. DUE DATE: last day of class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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: <a href="http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Quizzes/BeliefOMatic.aspx">http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Quizzes/BeliefOMatic.aspx</a> 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: DP Portfolio II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio Project Proposal Your proposal must: * outline the concept for your project by discussing the ideas behind it. Where did your idea originate? What motivates you to explore this idea through this project? Is this idea connected to your past work and, if so, how are you pushing the idea further in this project? What kind of thoughts do you want to provoke with this project? What kind of questions do you want to pose? What kind of discussion do you hope to elicit? Why is it important for you to do this work? And why do it now? * provide an art historical context for your project. What kind of work has been done in the past on the subject of your project and how does your project relate to this historical work? If you don't know, then do some research so you can address this intelligently. How does your project relate to contemporary art practice and the issues being addressed in contemporary art today? If you don't know, again, do some research so you can be informed and can address this thoughtfully. Include some discussion of current artists or projects that will influence the development of your project. Whose work are you looking at? Whose work do you want to learn more about? What is it about their work that inspires you? * briefly detail any equipment, materials and technical processes you intend to utilize to produce the work. * provide a projected timeline over the course of a semester for the production of the project. * state a goal for the completion of the project in terms of final presentation, such as the number pieces, the potential scale of the work, installation considerations, presentation needs, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: 3DS 4945 &amp; 4955, Ceramics Portfolio I &amp; II (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 turning in your artist statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: GRD 3910 History of Graphic Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assignment description exactly as the students received it: Read Chapter 6 “Modernism” from Graphic Design as Communication by Malcolm Barnard and answer study questions in the worksheet as directed. Post three possible thesis statements for your paper by Tuesday, September 21. Your topic will be whether a piece of graphic design is, or isn't, a modernist work. Write about design created 1900 or later which is not discussed by Barnard. It should be an example of graphic design (as opposed to fine art, architecture, etc.) If it is mass produced and communicates with text, it is probably graphic design. Examples of good thesis statements go beyond simple, obvious arguments: ~ Jan Tschichold's flyer for Die Neue Typographie is an excellent example of modernism, even though it has justified paragraphs and capital letters. ~ Bruce Rogers’ page from The Centaur of 1915 shows that book design continued classical forms well into the twentieth century, despite the popularity of modernism in other areas of graphic design. ~ 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 – Paper follows directions regarding length, format, and timeframe, cited sources, etc. – The 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. – Research goes beyond merely stating general knowledge. Research may involve consulting other design critics besides Barnard or reading historical accounts of design. – Writing craft: Graphic design gives form to the written word, and you will be expected to honor the conventions of writing. Get a trusted friend to proofread your paper before you turn it in. Run spellcheck. Edit. – Synthesis: conclusions leave the reader feeling that you have said something interesting and important. Spend time working out your conclusions and make sure they are clear and well supported. Grading rubric used to assess the assignment, as it appeared on syllabus: Projects are scored using a rubric, with 17 - 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, research, writing craft, and synthesis.

SLO 8: ART 4950 / Portfolio II (3D) (M: 7)

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

SLO 9: PHOT 4950 Portfolio II (M: 9)

ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION Portfolio II is the capstone course for students completing the BFA in Studio Arts with a Concentration in Photography. As the capstone course for the major, Portfolio II is designated as a Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW) course. This means that a component of the course requires students to engage, through writing, in critical thinking in relation to their studio work. The University 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.” (Bascham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, p. 1.) The CTW component of this course is addressed in a written artist statement that supports the final portfolio work. The CTW writings and the final artist statement count for 20% of the final grade. 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. You will have an opportunity to write two drafts in order to arrive at a strong statement at the end of the course… No further opportunities for improvement will be available after the third submission.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Assignment (M: 1, 5)

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: Rubric (O: 2)

Rubric description. Cut and paste the rubric or upload the file in the repository.

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

Target for O2: Portfolio II: Textiles Assignment

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.

M 3: Artist Interview

ART 3910- Fall 2010 Craig Drennen Student # Criteria#1 Criteria#2 Criteria#3 Criteria#4 1 2 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 4 2 4 2 3 3 5 1 1 1 6 3 2 3 3 1 2 3 2 8 1 1 2 2 9 3 2 3 3 1 0 3 2 2 3 1 1 3 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 2 3 2 1 4 2 2 3 1 5 3 3 3 3 1 6 2 2 2 2 1 7 2 1 2 2 1 8 3 2 2 3 1 9 1 1 1 1 2 0 3 3 3 2 1 4 3 3 3

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 4: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art

Pam Longobardi/ Critical Thinking Through Writing ART 3910 Fall 2010 Writing Assignment #4: DUE Tues Sept 28 Belief Systems: Go to beliefinet.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 'Religious' - Bill Maher and discuss

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 5: DP Portfolio II (O: 1)**

1. 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) 1. 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)

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 6: 3DS 4945 & 4955, Ceramics Port. I & II (West) (O: 6)**

1 Criteria Assessment (1-4) 1 3 2 3 4 4 3 2 Criteria Assessment (1-4) 3 2 1 2 3 4 4 4 4 3 Criteria Assessment (1-4) 3 1 2 3 4 4 4 4

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 7: GRD 3910 History of GD (Throop) (O: 8)**

Rubric for each student who completed the assignment

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**M 8: ART 4950 / Portfolio II (3D) (Wsol) (O: 3)**

Grading Rubric: Rubric for ART 4950 / Portfolio II • Comments on effective solutions/strategies (4) • 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) 8 • 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: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**M 9: HOT 4950 Portfolio II (Floyd) (O: 9)**

GRADING RUBRIC

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

---

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

**Assignment revision**

needs to grow out of what you have learned from the data.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Portfolio II: Textiles Assignment

Responsible Person/Group: Craig Drennen

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW Biology**
Mission / Purpose

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.

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, 2)
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

M 2: Scientific Report (O: 1)
Students were asked to organize a report communicating their experiments. The structure paralleled that of professional manuscripts.

Target for O1: Lab Report
85% of the class improved by 15% points over the course of the semester

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

Standardize Rubric for all CTW faculty according to feedback
All of the CTW instructors for Cell & Mol biology are due to meet in August to discuss restructuring the rubric for the reports so that the students are more closely aligned to the course objectives (with less emphasis on grammatical corrections).

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Frank Cruz

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
This year we offered our second CTW course, BIOL4980 - Senior Seminar. It was taught in both Fall and Spring Semester by Dr. Therese Poole and Dr. Teryl Frey. Students reported feeling more comfortable with analyzing primary literature and presentations by
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Students are able to analyze data from experiments more proficiently. They are also better able to construct appropriate graphs and figures. In addition, they are also able to better recognize good writing/presenting from poor writing/presenting. Students are better able to write coherent paragraphs that are logical as well as knowing when to begin a new paragraph instead of just putting all of the ideas into one big paragraph.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We have nearly 2000 majors so we have many sections of CTW courses. One of the major concerns is whether all of the different sections and courses are "equivalent" in their rigor as it regards the CTW paradigm. We want to make sure that all of the instructors are appropriately trained and that they are willing to dedicate that time it takes to properly implement their CTW course.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

The biggest impact on students is that some of the more mediocre students are really able to increase their skill levels, which will serve them well in the "real world". The biggest impact on the faculty is that those instructors that were already using a lot of writing and critical analysis in their courses feel appreciated for their efforts and rewarded by the fact that they only have 25 students in their CTW course. (most of our 3000 level classes have 50-75 students and most of our 4000 level have 48 students)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW Birth through Five**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST

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

---

**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 critical thinking and apply the readings and in-class experiences to new situations that require thoughtful analysis, evaluation and application.

**G 3: Develop a Personal Philosophy**

This assignment is designed to assist preservice teachers in developing their personal philosophies about children's early literacy and language development. Students are to base their philosophies off of academic course content (i.e., readings and lecture). Students' emergent literacy and language philosophies focus on both how children develop these skills as well as the best ways to promote such learning. Specifically, students are encouraged to detail pedagogical approaches to assist children in achieving strong language and literacy achievement.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Language and Literacy Philosophy (G: 3) (M: 3)**

Students will critically reflect on their beliefs and experiences surrounding literacy and language development and pedagogy. They will utilize course material (i.e., readings, lectures, practicum experiences and in class experiences) to develop an insightful language and literacy philosophy. Full Description In order to teach literacy, teachers 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. To help you begin making these connections, you will be observing structured learning environments in the community, reading scholarly books and articles, and adding to your understand through course lectures and discussions. Your emergent literacy and language philosophy is a 2-5 page essay describing your philosophy about literacy and language instruction for children from birth to age five. As you write your philosophy, think about your own educational experiences, beliefs, and understanding related to the way literacy and language should be taught and the way literacy and language are best learned. Think about your beliefs related to how children become literate and support your thinking with examples and research.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 3: Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophy (O: 2)**

To teach literacy, teachers 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. To help preservice teachers begin making these connections, they will participate in observing structured learning environments in the community, reading scholarly books and articles, and adding knowledge through course lectures and discussions. The emergent literacy and language philosophy is a 2-5 page essay describing preservice teachers’ philosophy about literacy and language instruction for children from birth to age five. As students write their philosophy, they are encouraged to think about their own educational experiences, beliefs, and understanding related to the way literacy and language should be taught and the way literacy and language are best learned. Specifically, teachers are encouraged to think about their beliefs related to how children become

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Critical Thinking and Application of Material (G: 2) (M: 2)**

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**
  - 1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
  - 3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

- **Institutional Priority Associations**
  - 2 Student promotion and progression

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

- **Strategic Plan Associations**
  - 1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.

---

**M 2: Professional/Ethical Quick Write Rubric (O: 1)**

Criteria

- **Excellent** (2 points) Satisfactory (1 points) Unsatisfactory (0–5 points) Purpose: Fully reflects on the issue/critically 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 used to support stance. No examples or strategies used to support stance. Communication: 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; creativity 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

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

**Target for O1: 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.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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.

Emergent Language and Literacy Philosophy Evaluation

Student performance on this objective was high for the first semester of implementation. The utilization of class time and the opportunity to receive feedback on drafts assisted students in thinking and writing about their emergent literacy and language development philosophies. In addition, students’ practicum experiences and work placements allowed them to make clear connections between theory and practice. Although students did rather well on this assignment, we will be studying students’ writing as part of the emergent literacy and language philosophy assignment. We will look at first, second and third drafts to determine the amount of support, feedback and length of time required to meet our performance objectives. In addition, we wonder if more time to reflect might improve the quality of student work.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We made considerable progress toward improving the efficiency and clarity of our CTW goals during 2009-2010. This progress was made in re-envisioning assignments and rubrics for our Language, Literacy, and Cognition course (BTFV 4370) as well as making small, stream-lined, changes to our Professional Development and Ethics (BRFV 3250) assignments. We worked in collaboration with our counterparts in the Early Childhood Education, Bachelors in Education program in re-developing our B-5 assignments. Specifically, based upon student performance and feedback from the previous year, we deleted the constrained/unconstrained assignment from the B-5, Language, Literacy and Cognition course and we added an assignment focusing on teachers' Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophies. Making this change has allowed our students to critically think about the important skills associated with children’s early literacy and language learning and reflect on the type of pedagogy that best promotes such development.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

We retooled our one assignment for BRFV 4370 (Language, Literacy, and Cognition) in order to improve students comprehension of the course material and to allow for additional critical thinking and writing opportunities. Student learning on this assignment is evident in students’ performance from first to last draft on their Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophies. Students significantly improved the quality of their drafts as evidenced by an overall improvement in scores during the redrafting process. In fact, students, on average progressed approximately 40% points during this process. Learning was evident in students’ responses to the Professional and Ethical Practice Quick Write assignments. Students made significant progress from first drafts to final drafts. This was evidenced by 100% of students achieving assessment targets (a 9 out of 10) on the quick write assignments on their final drafts. In addition to change over time in students’ performance on CTW assignments, course instructors have noted that students have
demonstrated marked improvements in their general writing abilities and thoughtfulness in other, non CTW, assignments. Although anecdotal in nature, this information is encouraging and appears to suggest that students may be applying knowledge and skills gained in CTW assignments to other instructional contexts and tasks.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

Although significant retooling of the CTW BRFV 4370 assignments took place for 2010, it was still evident from student work that students would have benefited from additional time writing and thinking about their language and literacy philosophies. Because of this perceived need, considerable discussions have taken place regarding how we can allow students more time to think and write around these issues. One constraining factor associated with this course is the fact that it is offered during a condensed summer semester. Summer semester may not be the best time to implement this CTW course as students do not appear to have ample amounts of time to reflect, write, and revise drafts of their papers. As a BRFV faculty, we are currently having discussions around ways that we can address this important issue.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?**

The BRFV CTW courses have played a critical role in helping us determine the activities that contribute to the skills and dispositions that we expect a teacher of young children to possess. CTW has impacted the way that we think about student development and achievement. It has also positively impacted our assessment practices. For example, most of the assignments in our BRFV courses utilized rubrics similar to those that are used in CTW courses. This has allowed us to more effectively conceptualize and document student learning. We also believe that it has assisted students’ learning. As noted earlier in this report, the changes that we have made during the previous academic year primarily relate to our BRFV 4370, Language, Literacy and Cognition course. We have revamped key assignmnet associated with BRFV 4370, Emergent Literacy and Language Conceptualization, in consultation with the CTW faculty. We are currently having discussions around these issues. One constraining factor associated with this course is the fact that it is offered during a condensed summer semester. Summer semester may not be the best time to implement this CTW course as students do not appear to have ample amounts of time to reflect, write, and revise drafts of their papers. As a BRFV faculty, we are currently having discussions around ways that we can address this important issue.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have revised a key assignment associated with BRFV 4370. This assignment, entitled Emergent Literacy and Language Conceptualization, encourages students to critically reflect on and write about their beliefs and experiences with young children’s language and literacy development. We changed this key assignment because the previous assignment was too long and constrained students' thinking, required them to read a cutting edge research article about children's language and literacy development, and many students significantly struggled with the complexity of the reading as well as the complexity of the constructs discussed. This new assignment is better aligned with our professional standards and we believe it will be of greater impact to students’ classroom practices. Although we are currently discussing ways to allow students additional time and support to complete this assignment, our impressions of the results from this new assignment in BRFV 4370 is that it is promoting critical thinking through writing outcomes.

---

**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, is to see 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, (b) to see how they can be mixed, or overlap with, another discipline, 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. As the largest BIS program, Theatre has its own definition of Critical Thinking: As a multidisciplinary art form, theatre engages students in a variety of critical thinking activities, including the synthesis of
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. Apply script analysis and the evaluation of critical and historical source materials to solving specific research and production problems related to play scripts. Evaluate productions and production plans based on clear critical and historical criteria. 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 an analysis 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.

**SLO 7: THEA 3100 Research Paper (M: 7, 8)**
Students will demonstrate their abilities to analyze and evaluate critical source materials by creating a concise summary of the interpretations underlying two different academic articles analyzing a specific play and then synthesize their research to create a comparison of those two interpretations. Students will demonstrate organizational skills of presentation without distracting grammatical errors or lapses in academic language or citation mechanics. Students first submit a list of the two journal articles to be used in the paper, then submit a draft for instructor review before turning in the final paper.

---

**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 is related to Persuasion). 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 that 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, go beyond simple summary to demonstrate learning, and express a real ownership of the ideas.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: THEA 4070 Research Paper (O: 1)

Students complete a research paper of 10-12 pages, prove a thesis focused down from broad research topic in theatre. The assignment requires four different submissions: 1) A one-page report (20 points) that including focused topic and proposed thesis statement, stating what the student will look for (evidence) to support his or her claim. 2) An annotated bibliography, in MLA style, with 15 sources. No more than 5 of these sources may be available exclusively as electronic media. 3) A complete first draft with a worked cited page. 4) The final draft of the paper.

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, Evaluation/Development, Knowledge and Structure. Of those Knowledge was consistently the strong point in the research papers, with an average of 4.9. Development came in second, with an average score of 4.1. Third was Structure, with an average of 3.6. Argumentation/Critical Thinking came in the lowest, with a 3.5 average. The overall CTW average for the 27 papers turned in was 4.025. These are not good numbers and reflect a definite need to rethink the CTW component of this class. Unlike THEA 3100, which I had the opportunity to teach for the first time this past spring and build around the needs of a CTW course, THEA 4070 has been in my schedule for several years, and I feel I am still struggling to incorporate CTW materials without losing course content. This is particularly distressing when one compares scores for the first microtheme, application of concepts from Sue-Ellen Case's "Classical Drag" to The Oresteia, to the final draft of the research paper. That comparison suggests that students actually declined in CTW skills during the semester, with an overall drop of .3083 in the CTW average and drops of .73 in Structure and .34 in Development. The only area in which students improved was Knowledge, with an overall improvement of .01. Although the decline in structuring skills can be at least partially excused as a product of the difference in the two assignments, the overall drop in the CTW average needs to be addressed. More encouraging is the improvement between the first and final drafts of the research paper. Students improved .225 overall, with particularly significant gains in Argumentation/Critical Thinking (.722) and Development (.456). Nonetheless, these numbers need to be improved. Last year, I suggested targets 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. The only one of these achieved was Knowledge, which actually reached 4.9 overall. I will be keeping the same targets for 2011-2012 and exploring additional CTW work to do in class that, I hope, will help improve these skills.

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 Extremely 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 claim/conclusions effectively 1 2 3 4 5

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

#### M 5: CTW for BIS Students: Geog4768/His4320/Soci4279 (O: 3)

Students in this course were evaluated in CTW via several written assignments (e.g., museum exhibit critique, essay exams, demographic project, and term paper). A rubric used in CTW evaluation is shown below. CRITICAL THINKING THROUGH LEARNING Outcomes Assessment Form Metropolitan Atlanta (Geog 4768, Hist 4320, Soci 4279) Undergraduates COURSE NAME: ________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE #</th>
<th>Faculty Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Days and time of course:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW MANY STUDENTS IN THIS COURSE FIT INTO EACH CATEGORY?** Poor Good Very Good Excellent The demonstration of their understanding of course research reports/articles/books/theories was: Their analyses, interpretations, or syntheses of these research reports/articles/books/theories was: Their ability to articulate coherent and logical arguments on course material was: Their ability to use results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions was:

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. The rubric used in Speech 3250’s analytical reaction essay is shown here:

#### Target for O3: Museum Exhibit Critique

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 (or a "very good" or "excellent") on the evaluation rubric used for a particular project or assignment.

**M 6: CTW for BIS students in Hist 3000 & PoS 3800 (O: 2)**

BIS students in these courses were few in number and were evaluated for CTW along with all non-BIS students (the vast majority) via written assignments. For a description of these assignments and the rubrics or other measures used to assess student progress please refer to the CTW reports prepared by the CTW Ambassadors from the departments that offer these courses.

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

**Target for O2: In Class Writing Exercise**

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 (or a "very good" or "excellent") on the evaluation rubric used for a particular project or assignment.

**M 7: THEA 3100 Research Paper (O: 7)**

Students will choose a play from the list supplied and write a five page research paper comparing two interpretations of the play found in academic articles located in journals in the GSU Library or through an on-line journal search using Galileo. These are not to be reviews, but rather critical analyses of the works as theatrical art. The list of plays on which you may write is: David Henry Hwang--Golden Child, Tony Kushner--Angels in America: Part One--Millennium Approaches, Eduardo Machado--Broken Eggs, Paula Vogel--How I Learned to Drive, Oscar Wilde--The Importance of Being Earnest, Tennessee Williams--The Glass Menagerie, August Wilson--Fences

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

**M 8: Findings for THEA 3100 (O: 7)**

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 5. Development came second, with an average score of 4.928. Third was Structure, with an average of 4.519. Argumentation/Critical Thinking came in the lowest, with a 4.333 average. In part this reflects a pitfall of the assignment—the temptation to summarize everything in each article, which in a five page paper makes it impossible to offer evidence in support of each element of the article’s interpretation. The overall CTW average for the 27 papers turned in was 4.694. In terms of improvement from first to final draft of the paper and overall from first microtheme to final research paper, the greatest growth was in Argumentation/Critical Thinking, which improved 1.368 over the course of the semester and .458 between first and final draft. Structure would seem to have deteriorated overall, with a drop in .14 in average score, but that would be more a reflection of the difference between a microtheme simply requiring the student to state and support an opinion (is Freud right in suggesting that the timeless appeal of Oedipus Rex is a result of its reflection of a basic psychological conflict shared by all people) and a research paper requiring the careful synthesis of two complex interpretations. Between first draft and final paper, Structure improved .644, more than any other rubric. Our target should be an average of 4.75 in the four key rubrics, 4.5 in Argumentation/Critical Thinking, 5 in Development, 5 in Knowledge and 4.75 in Structure. One possible avenue for this might be the assignment of a scholarly article on one of the six plays read by the class as a whole so that students are required to discuss that specific interpretation.

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

---

**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 re-write their microthemes. 3-Revising or completely changing microtheme prompts for which students consistently score poorly on Argumentation/Critical Thinking and Appropriateness. To accommodate this, the peer review assignment may have to be cut back or dropped.

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

**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.

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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this
Goals

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.

G 1: Critical Thinking Skills and Processes

Students graduating with a major in Managerial Sciences in the Business Analysis concentration will be able to apply critical thinking skills and processes with addressing problems in the field.

G 2: Effective Writing Skills

Students graduation with a major in Managerial Sciences and a concentration in Business Analysis will be able to effectively communicate their decision processes and conclusions on Business Analysis problems in the written format used in contemporary organizations.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Problem Identification (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to identify correctly the nature of a problem that an organization is facing that is amenable to a business analysis recommendation.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 2: Choice of Analytical "Tools" (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to identify the proper, established business analysis tools and skills for addressing the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 3: Application for Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to apply the proper, established business analysis tools and skills to the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 4: Drawing Conclusions from Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to draw a conclusion from among the identified viable alternatives that best addresses the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 5: Written Process Communication (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to communicate, in writing, the process of critical thinking that they used in arriving at the recommendation made for the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**SLO 6: Written Communication of Conclusions (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to communicate, in writing, the basis for their conclusion relative to the other alternatives reasonable presented for the identified problem.

Relevant Associations:

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Problem Solving Memos (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
In this course students will be asked to write effective business memoranda addressing a problem that requires the systematic application of the tools of analysis developed in this course. Students will do an initial analysis early in the semester. Following a review on both the merits and the effective communication of the student's critical thinking and writing skills in the memorandum, the student will be asked to re-write the memorandum addressing the issues raised. The second memorandum will then be resubmitted and again, in addition to being graded on the merit of the assignment, the student will be required to attend a feedback session with a CTW ambassador or writing consultant on how to further improve the paper. The syllabus in which these assignments are set out, the actual assignments used, and the rubric used in assessing the assignments are set out in the Document Repository.

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

**Target for O1: Problem Identification**
Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the second criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score on this dimension was 3.0 on the second iteration of the assignment. No students were below 2.0 and 25% (3/12) were at 3.0.

**Target for O2: Choice of Analytical "Tools"**
Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the third criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
This element came out strong after the second iteration, but was weak on the first version. Students seemed to make large assumptions about what the reader understood about the tools in Excel for analysis and about how this overcomes cognitive bias. The average score on this dimension was 3.3 on the second iteration of the assignment. No students were below 2.0 and 8.3% (1/12) were at 3.0.

**Target for O3: Application for Analysis**
Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the fourth criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
The average score on this dimension was 3.0 on the second iteration of the assignment. No students were below 2.0 and 17% (2/12) were at 2.0.

Target for O4: Drawing Conclusions from Analysis
Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the fifth criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
Students could report the conclusions of the software, but they had difficulty expressing the results in the larger context of the decision. Even with the data outputs students had a hard time mixing the data and the prose in making the recommendations. The average score on this dimension was 3.0 on the second iteration of the assignment. No students were below 2.0 but 33% (4/12) were at 2.0.

Target for O5: Written Process Communication
Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the first criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The rubric item here is mis-specified and does not focus on the items that need to be assessed for this objective.

Target for O6: Writen Communication of Conclusions
Students will achieve a class average that exceeds a 3.0/4.0 on the fifth criterion in the rubric for problem. With respect to the distribution of scores, there will be no more than 5% of student that will be below 2.0 and no more than 30% of students will be below 3.0 on this measure.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Students were very clear on their writing of the conclusions. In part, however, this may be because the Excel spreadsheet was relied on heavily. Without that pre-existing support the writing will be more of a challenge. The assessment is for this assignment. The average score on this dimension was 3.5 on the second iteration of the assignment. No students were below 2.0 and no students were below 3.0.

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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Ensure staffing for the course
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Bill Bogner
Additional Resources: Full time faculty time or adjunct faculty funding.
Budget Amount Requested: $10,000.00 (recurring)

Assignment Revision
The assignments in the CTW exercises rely heavily on the student's use of software programs that run on the Excel spreadsheet. While Excel is an important tool in business analysis, there is very little in terms of choices that the students have to make, explain and defend in the problem solving process. This hurts both the assessment of the depth of the student's critical thinking skill and the degree to which their writing is challenged. Revisiting this assignment so that these skills are more student-dependent and less software-dependent will help enrich the assessment of both CT and W skill sets.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Problem Solving Memos | Outcome/Objective: Choice of Analytical "Tools" | Written Communication of Conclusions
Implementation Description: Re-wording of hte CTW assignements
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Jim Shi and Bill Bogner
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Review and Improvement of New CTW Processes in BA
In the 2010-1011 cycle new assignments, and a revised rubric were put in place for this course. At the end of the year these will be reviewed for how effectively they are linking the skills of a successful Business Analysis student with the skills of Critical Thinking and Writing. This review is in addition to the analysis of findings on individual learning outcomes. It is a meta-level analysis of the CTW approach in the BA concentration more oriented toward th Goals set out for BA student.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Rubric Update and Alignment
In the process of recasting the Goals and Objectives the Rubric needed to align findings with the new objectives did not translate well. Other items fit but are poorly stated. This revision will be put in place for the 2011-2012 cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Problem Solving Memos | Outcome/Objective: Written Process Communication

Implementation Description: Revise rubric.
Responsible Person/Group: Jim Shi and Bill Bogner
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
The goal of the action plan last year was to make the transition to a new instructor and to make changes in the assignments and the assessment process. We accomplished both to a large extent. We were able to find ad transition to a new instructor. Dr. Bogner has filled in as the ambassador for this class and oversaw this transition. Dr. Shi taught the class and did a very good job. Thus the action plan from last year was considered finished and two new action plan items were created in their wake.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
At this time we do not have the ability to compare students in this way. This will be a major challenge for the College as it is the real measure of skill development.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
There does not appear to be any resource needs at this time. The Department expects a wave of students entering into the CTW courses beginning in the 2011-2012 cycle and this could push up the grading responsibilities. That, in turn, will impact the feedback given. In the current class size we can have two required one-on-one coaching sessions with the ambassador that last fifteen minutes each. If enrollments double (and they might), then this will become a resource challenge.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
Since the last assessment report the Department held assessment session in each of the discipline areas to help in the revision of all assessment processes. The idea here was that the discipline areas could get more out of the assessment process with better input and focus. It is hoped that this will increase the impact of the assessment results on continual improvement not only of CTW, but of all assessment programs.
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

G 1: 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.

G 2: 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Appropriate Title that represents actual work done in lab (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)

Students must 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. NA 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. NA 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 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 interrelationships 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

M 1: Reports 1 through 3 in Chemistry 4000 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

There were a total of 45 students which were enrolled in chemistry 4000 in the academic year 2010-2011. 43 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 3.17/4.0). All 43 completers and 2 of the non-completers were at (adequate) of higher by the final submission of the final paper. (3.9/4.0) Description: Most students had difficulty with the introduction on the first submission of paper 1 (1.94/4.0). 41 out of the 50 completers were judged as adequate or better on the last submission of the final paper. (3.2/4.0) Experimental: Most students had difficulty with the experimental section of the first paper. (1.3/4.0). All completers were judged as adequate or higher along with 1 non-completers by the final submission of paper 3. (3.6/4.0) Results: Many students had difficulty with the results section of the first paper. (2.1/4.0). All completers were judged as adequate or higher along with 1 non-completer by the final submission of paper 3. (3.4/4.0) Figures and Tables were not required for paper 1. Many students had difficulty with tables and Figures (usually trying to place too much information or illogical information in tables) on the first submission of paper 2. (2.3/5.0). All 43 completers were judged as adequate or better on the last submission of the final paper. (3.7/4.0) Discussion and Conclusion: Most students had trouble on the Discussion/Conclusion portion of paper 1 (1.1/4.0). 41 of the 43 completers were judged as adequate or better on the last submission of paper 3. (3.4/5.0)

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

M 2: Final Paper of Capstone Course (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

38 students took Chem 4160 in 2010-2011. Of these 38 students 34 have received passing grades (the others are in progress). The 34 completers received adequate or better in every category by the final submission. The average number of submissions was 4. Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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

Decrease average submission numbers in Chem 4000

We will attempt to decrease submission numbers in Chem 4000 by adding reviews of papers as part of the course. Students will have to critically evaluate a series of papers in order to determine if the paper shows the critical thinking skills set forward by the rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Instructors will write papers that illustrate various degrees of critical thoughts in the areas of the rubric.
Responsible Person/Group: Barrow

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We were very happy with the percentage of students who were deemed adequate on the final submission.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Critical thinking skills are very bad in the beginning of the 400 course. While they improve during the first course they are still not adequate for the capstone course. Many instructors use portions of the capstone papers for writing larger papers for peer-reviewed journals so for many of these students "adequate" is not considered adequate by the Professors who teach the capstone course. Many students must resubmit papers deemed adequate until they are excellent.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
More examples are needed in the lecture portion of the course. This will be tricky as the curriculum for the course will be altered in order to make room for writing exercises.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
None
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Computer Information Systems
(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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 2011 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) May 31: Phase 4 (Draft Paper Consultation / Paper Exchange) April 21: Phase 5 (Lesson 7 and Final Paper) 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.

Target for O1: Articulate Requirements and Constraints
The CIS CTW Rubric Version 2 provides a 0 to 4 score for student work. The targets set for 2010-2011 are an overall average of.
3.4 with fewer than 20% making less than 3.2. This a combined score across the outcomes which we will work to separate in 2011-2012 scoring.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on Spring 2011 results, the average was 3.5 with 14% making less than 3.2. This a combined score across the outcomes which we will work to separate in 2011-2012 scoring.

**Target for O2: Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions**

The CIS CTW Rubric Version 2 provides a 0 to 4 score for student work. The targets set for 2010-2011 are an overall average of 3.4 with fewer than 20% making less than 3.2. This a combined score across the outcomes which we will work to separate in 2011-2012 scoring.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on Spring 2011 results, the average was 3.5 with 14% making less than 3.2.

**Target for O3: Consider Ethical and Social Issues**

The CIS CTW Rubric Version 2 provides a 0 to 4 score for student work. The targets set for 2010-2011 are an overall average of 3.4 with fewer than 20% making less than 3.2.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on Spring 2011 results, the average was 3.5 with 14% making less than 3.2.

**Target for O4: Select Best Solution with Justification**

The CIS CTW Rubric Version 2 provides a 0 to 4 score for student work. The targets set for 2010-2011 are an overall average of 3.4 with fewer than 20% making less than 3.2.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on Spring 2011 results, the average was 3.5 with 14% making less than 3.2.

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The CTW assignments are now part of the CIS 4970 Field Study in Information Systems course...
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011

**Integrate CTW into CIS 4980 System Development Project Capstone course**

The CTW component needs to be fully integrated into our CIS 4980 System Development Project Capstone course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

**Split CTW assignment assessment into objective components**

The assessment of the CTW assignment submissions needs to be broken into objective components rather than a single overall assessment value.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Preserve the objective component scores when assessing student submissions.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Instructor

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

CIS 4970 has now been designated a CTW course. This is the CIS field study course which is an alternate choice to the CIS 4980 Capstone course. Students in CIS 4970 are just this summer for 2011 being required to complete the same CTW activities as required for CIS 4980 students.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

2010-2011 is the first time CTW performance has been quantified. The scores will be tracked and trends evaluated going forward.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**
With the implementation of CTW in CIS 4970 Field Study in CIS, additional time will be required to manage and grade student CTW work. Currently, the instructor of record does not receive load credit for CIS 4970. Since both CIS 4980 and CIS 4970 are offered each semester (one section each at this point), the CTW consultant for CIS 4980 will be expected to assist both sections. Any additional changes will depend on success of this initial solution.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?**

To date, the only changes have been to bring CIS 4970 Field Study in CIS into CTW status and to quantify scoring of student CTW work.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Quantified measures were added so we may track progress and improvement. In the coming year, the quantification will be separated to reflect individual objective performance. CIS 4970 will also incorporate the CTW activities.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

None at this point other than the addition of CIS 4970 Field Study to CTW.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

The qualitative assessment of CTW performance indicated continuing on the current path for CTW activities. Quantification was added to scoring this year to enable future tracking of performance.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

A very few students took a zero on the CTW part of their grade rather than spending the time on CTW. We will increase encouragement to students to take full advantage of CTW. We will also begin to track these opt-out numbers. If the encouragement is not successful and the number of students opting out is significant, the portion of the final grade that depends on CTW will be increased.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

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

Detailed feedback on CTW assignments will be increased to encourage improvement and to encourage participation. Having added quantification to CTW scoring, relative improvement will be observed and communicated. Although our measures for this year were all met, we set our improvement goal at 20%.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the computer science department is to educate students in fundamental topics like programming languages, data structures, algorithms, data base systems, computer architecture, communications, and software engineering. For Computer Science, critical thinking is defined as documentation, clearly stating assumptions, explaining logic with regard to the chosen solution (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 inefficiencies (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 for the chosen solution, 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 with regards to the chosen solution (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 inefficiencies (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)

This is the grading criteria used in the CSc 4350 class. The achievement target is as follows. We expect a large number (around 50%) to perform excellently, then another 40% to meet these criteria better than average, though below excellent. Some (about 15%) will do an adequate job, while the remaining 5% will not participate fully in the project and not do well in exams (because this is a class whereby the students do a group project that is worth 50% of the total grade and questions in the exams have a direct bearing to work completed in the project as well as overall knowledge acquired over the semester). Student deficiencies included the not participating fully in projects and hence not being able to do as well in exams early. Our findings were somewhat consistent with this prediction, and are reflected in the grades for this class. 16 out of 25 (64%) completed the course with an excellent grade, 7 out of 25 (28%) received a very good grade, and only 1 student (i.e., 4%) received an average grade and only 1 student (i.e. 4%) received a failing grade (this student stopped attending classes after 3 weeks and never withdrew). The projects attempted are at par with real-world situations - in fact these projects can be used in the real world with just a few adjustments to their database implementation and maintenance and upgrading during its lifetime. 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), bloat (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 submitter 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 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 successful 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. Accuracy, completeness, and organization of the Final Report 3. Agreement of project with System Description 4. 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 use, readability of user manual, correctness and completeness of user manual, etc.) 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 This is the grading criteria used in the CSc 3410 class. In this class, students are given a number of programming assignments (an example given above i.e. under GOALS). The grading for these assignments are broken into two parts - 44% allocated for Documentation (as explained in the assignment) and 56% for the program (which includes following of instructions for name, etc.) As the example assignments (below) shows, the students did fairly well in these assignments which I think lead them to do well in the exams. Overall, the grade more or less reflects their combined performance for assignments and exams. There were 25 students in the class with 2 withdrawals and 1 F and there were 9 A's, 5 B's and 8 C's. Overall therefore, we had 88% of the students getting a passing grade ranging from C to A and only a 12% withdrawal/failure. Furthermore, from the pre and post surveys, the students have been able to grasp the idea of CTW and were able to utilize the procedures (as laid out in the syllabus/assignments) to do well.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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

Continue having students doing documentation for programs

Explaining algorithms used to solve the problem, then implement that algorithm. Have all preconditions and postconditions listed for all of the functions used in a program. Also, attach a user guide for executing the program. Overall, continue on the same path we have been doing over the past year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Surveys and student specifications

Next year, we plan to achieve the same level of excellence that we have accomplished this year. The classes are working very well, so we plan to continue as is. I think that from reading the documentation submitted by the students, they are able to explain in detail what they are doing and how they are achieving their solutions to the problems.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Software Engineering measures | Outcome/Objective: Assignments to introduce CTW to our students

Implementation Description: Adjust the software engineering instructions to allow students more room to make the type of decisions that project managers make.

Responsible PersonGroup: The CSc 4350 instructor(s).

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

I think that our department has been doing well in implementing the CTW. It is more a situation of documentation and maintenance and upgrading during its lifetime. 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), bloat (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 submitter 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 successful 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 losses 22 points, etc. 2. Quality, completeness, and organization of the Final Report 3. Agreement of project with System Description 4. 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 use, readability of user manual, correctness and completeness of user manual, etc.) 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 This is the grading criteria used in the CSc 3410 class. In this class, students are given a number of programming assignments (an example given above i.e. under GOALS). The grading for these assignments are broken into two parts - 44% allocated for Documentation (as explained in the assignment) and 56% for the program (which includes following of instructions for name, etc.) As the example assignments (below) shows, the students did fairly well in these assignments which I think lead them to do well in the exams. Overall, the grade more or less reflects their combined performance for assignments and exams. There were 25 students in the class with 2 withdrawals and 1 F and there were 9 A's, 5 B's and 8 C's. Overall therefore, we had 88% of the students getting a passing grade ranging from C to A and only a 12% withdrawal/failure. Furthermore, from the pre and post surveys, the students have been able to grasp the idea of CTW and were able to utilize the procedures (as laid out in the syllabus/assignments) to do well.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Once they start incorporating the documentation, then it follows through more or less naturally. So, after the first assignment where I...
would comment where they need improvements, then the students are generally able to explain their solutions thoroughly.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
None. So far, no assistance needed.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
I don't think that there have been much changes or impact. Yes, it is true that the students have been encouraged to do documentation more, especially in the lower level CTW class. But, they have always been doing well in the upper level CTW class with lots of documentation for their projects. Based upon this, I don't think there are any changes that will be considered. And if any are considered, it would likely be very very minor. No changes were made from last year's report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
None. None.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
None. There were only about 4 persons that respond to the survey. No changes in educational program are projected nor any changes in curriculum.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
Just continue to impress upon the students the importance of critically analyzing a problem to be able to come up with the best solution. And to record such analysis via documentation.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
The students have continued to apply critical thinking to problem solving i.e. critically thinking through the solution to a computer programming problem and thus get the best solution possible.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
There is not a whole lot of room for improvements - because they have to generate a program for a problem and implement that program so that it can execute on a computer. Maybe some students can come up with even more clever ways for solving the problem and implementing it on the computer.

---
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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 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: 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.

SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 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.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 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.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 4: Generation of conclusions (G: 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.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 5: Written communication (G: 6) (M: 1, 2)
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.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 6: Identification of ethical issues (G: 3, 4) (M: 2)
Students should be able to identify and evaluate the criminal justice system and issues that arise within it.

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. Finally, 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

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 topic 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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
There were 4 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2010 and spring 2011. An adjunct instructor taught a section of 12 students in the fall for which we were unable to obtain assessment data due to miscommunication of reporting expectations. The other section in the fall had 28 students. The sections in the spring had 32 and 30 students respectively.
The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data contains data for these 90 students. At the end of the semester, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 3.0 (2.5 in fall section and 3.8 and 2.6 in the spring sections). The following percentages for the Identification of an Issue and Hypothesis rubric dimension were reported on the final draft of the CJ Issue Essay: 4 - 44%; 3 – 26%; 2 – 11%; 1 – 19%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (81% scored 2-4, 70% scored 3-4, and 44% scored a 4). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 54% exhibited an increase in the Identification of an Issue and Hypothesis rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 12% exhibited a decrease, and 34% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 4 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2010 and spring 2011. An adjunct instructor taught a section of 12 students in the fall for which we were unable to obtain assessment data due to miscommunication of reporting expectations. The other section in the fall had 28 students. The sections in the spring had 32 and 30 students respectively. The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data contains data for these 90 students. The average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.7 (2.5 in fall section and 3.2 and 2.3 in the spring sections). The following percentages for the Comprehend and Synthesize Information rubric dimension were reported on the final draft of the CJ Issue Essay: 4 - 27%; 3 – 29%; 2 – 30%; 1 – 14%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (86% scored 2-4, 66% scored 3-4, and 27% scored a 4). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 48% exhibited an increase in the Comprehend and Synthesize Information rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 12% exhibited a decrease, and 40% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 4 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2010 and spring 2011. An adjunct instructor taught a section of 12 students in the fall for which we were unable to obtain assessment data due to miscommunication of reporting expectations. The other section in the fall had 28 students. The sections in the spring had 32 and 30 students respectively. The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data contains data for these 90 students. At the end of the semester, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.7 (2.4 in fall section and 3.3 and 2.4 in the spring sections). The following percentages for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension were reported on the final draft of the CJ Issue Essay: 4 - 31%; 3 – 27%; 2 – 27%; 1 – 15%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (85% scored 2-4, 58% scored 3-4, and 31% scored a 4). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 47% exhibited an increase in the rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 11% exhibited a decrease, and 42% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 4 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2010 and spring 2011. An adjunct instructor taught a section of 12 students in the fall for which we were unable to obtain assessment data due to miscommunication of reporting expectations. The other section in the fall had 28 students. The sections in the spring had 32 and 30 students respectively. The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data contains data for these 90 students. At the end of the semester, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.7 (2.3 in fall section and 3.2 and 2.4 in the spring sections). The following percentages for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension were reported on the final draft of the CJ Issue Essay: 4 - 31%; 3 – 27%; 2 – 27%; 1 – 15%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (86% scored 2-4, 66% scored 3-4, and 27% scored a 4). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 47% exhibited an increase in the rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 11% exhibited a decrease, and 42% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 4 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2010 and spring 2011. An adjunct instructor taught a section of 12 students in the fall for which we were unable to obtain assessment data due to miscommunication of reporting expectations. The other section in the fall had 28 students. The sections in the spring had 32 and 30 students respectively. The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data contains data for these 90 students. At the end of the semester, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.7 (2.3 in fall section and 3.2 and 2.4 in the spring sections). The following percentages for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension were reported on the final draft of the CJ Issue Essay: 4 - 31%; 3 – 27%; 2 – 27%; 1 – 15%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (86% scored 2-4, 66% scored 3-4, and 27% scored a 4). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 47% exhibited an increase in the rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 11% exhibited a decrease, and 42% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).
of 12 students in the fall for which we were unable to obtain assessment data due to miscommunication of reporting expectations. The other section in the fall had 28 students. The sections in the spring had 32 and 30 students respectively. The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data contains data for these 90 students. At the end of the semester, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 3.2 (3.1 in fall section and 3.9 and 2.6 in the spring sections). The following percentages for the Writing Quality and Style rubric dimension were reported on the final draft of the CJ Issue Essay: 4 - 50%; 3 – 21%; 2 – 24%; 1 – 5%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (95% scored 2-4, 71% scored 3-4, and 50% scored a 4). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 62% exhibited an increase in the Writing Quality & Style rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 6% exhibited a decrease, and 32% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric forskill levels associated with each rubric point).

**M 2: Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice (O: 3, 4, 5, 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**

This is the third assignment of 3 in a junior level class, although it was only this year that the department was able to enact a policy that assures all 3000 level courses will be completed before they can proceed to register for 24 hours of 4000 level required or elective course work. The target is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on Application and Analysis rubric dimension for the third assignment. Additionally, 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

There were 2 sections of the Ethics class (CRJU 3060) offered for the period of fall 2010 and spring 2011 (1 course each semester). Due to miscommunication of reporting expectations, the full-time faculty member who taught the a section of 35 students in the fall did not amassed usable assessment data. As such, the spring section of 37 students is the only source of our assessment data for this reporting cycle. The attached file named Ethics Rubric Data contains data for these 37 students. For the third assignment considered here (see Ethical Issue Assignment attachment), the average score for the Application & Analysis rubric was 2.8 on a 1-4 scale. Rounding decimal points upward at the .5 level, the following percentages for the Application & Analysis rubric dimension were reported: 4 - 22%; 3 – 57%; 2 – 22%; 1 – 0%. Collectively these enrollees just missed our goals (79% scored 3-4 and 22% scored a 4). (see attached rubric forskill levels associated with each rubric point).

**Target for O4: Generation of conclusions**

80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the third assignment.

**Target for O5: Written communication**

This is the third assignment of 3 in a junior level class, although it was only this year that the department was able to enact a policy that assures all 3000 level courses will be completed before they can proceed to register for 24 hours of 4000 level required or elective course work. The target is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the Mechanics rubric dimension for the third assignment. Additionally, 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 2 sections of the Ethics class (CRJU 3060) offered for the period of fall 2010 and spring 2011 (1 course each semester). Due to miscommunication of reporting expectations, the full-time faculty member who taught the a section of 35 students in the fall did not amassed usable assessment data. As such, the spring section of 37 students is the only source of our assessment data for this reporting cycle. The attached file named Ethics Rubric Data contains data for these 37 students. For the third assignment considered here (see Ethical Issue Assignment attachment), the average score for the Mechanics rubric was 3.0 on a 1-4 scale. Rounding decimal points upward at the .5 level, the following percentages for the Mechanics rubric dimension were reported: 4 - 43%; 3 – 41%; 2 – 5%; 1 – 10%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (84% scored 3-4 and 43% scored a 4). (see attached rubric forskill levels associated with each rubric point).

**Target for O6: Identification of ethical issues**

This is the third assignment of 3 in a junior level class, although it was only this year that the department was able to enact a policy that assures all 3000 level courses will be completed before they can proceed to register for 24 hours of 4000 level required or elective course work. The target is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 3 (Acceptable) or 4 (Outstanding) on the Key Issue Addressed rubric dimension for the third assignment. Additionally, 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 2 sections of the Ethics class (CRJU 3060) offered for the period of fall 2010 and spring 2011 (1 course each semester). Due to miscommunication of reporting expectations, the full-time faculty member who taught the a section of 35 students in the fall did not amassed usable assessment data. As such, the spring section of 37 students is the only source of our assessment data for this reporting cycle. The attached file named Ethics Rubric Data contains data for these 37 students. For the third assignment considered here (see Ethical Issue Assignment attachment), the average score for the Key Issue Addressed rubric was 3.0 on a 1-4 scale. Rounding decimal points upward at the .5 level, the following percentages for the Key Issue Addressed rubric dimension were reported: 4 - 32%; 3 – 51%; 2 – 16%; 1 – 0%. Collectively these enrollees met our goals (83% scored 3-4 and 32% scored a 4). (see attached rubric forskill levels associated with each rubric point).
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 and 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

Consistent use of rubrics and reporting of corresponding data
CTW ambassador will conduct consultation with CRJU 3060 instructors in advance of the term to encourage more consistent and complete use of rubrics for more than 1 of the ethical issue assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice | Outcome/Objective: Identification of ethical issues

Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador

EmpHASIZE student improvement over time
We have increased our expectations this year with the introduction of graduated targeted outcomes that apply to minimal expectations and higher expectations. These targets only apply to the work provided by students in the final draft of a paper submitted in the last weeks of their undergraduate experience. We plan to focus more on within student improvement. Targets for next year will stress improvements in scores across the first and final drafts of the CJ Issue Essay that is assigned in the capstone class (CRJU 4930). A recent policy change mandates that CJ majors must complete the other CTW class, Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060), before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives. The department’s undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Comprehend and Synthesize Information measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information

Implementation Description: Assessment efforts next year will analyze the within student improvements for CRJU 4930 students. The CJ Undergraduate Committee will fashion a proposal to allow for assessment and measure linkages across CRJU 3060 and 4930 and seek faculty approval.
Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador and CJ faculty

Emphasis on student improvement over time
Gradation was added to achievement outcomes to enhance standards. Second, a recent policy change mandating that CJ majors complete the Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060) before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives raises the opportunity for linked assignments across CRJU 3060 and 4930. The department's undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Application and Analysis measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Written communication

**Implementation Description:** Assessment efforts next year will analyze the within student improvements for CRJU 4930 students. The CJ Undergraduate Committee will fashion a proposal to allow for gradation and measure linkages across CRJU 3060 and 4930 and seek faculty approval.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and CJ faculty

---

**Emphasize student improvement over time**

We have increased our expectations this year with the introduction of graduated targeted outcomes that apply to minimal expectations and higher expectations. These targets only apply to the work provided by students in the final draft of a paper submitted in the last weeks of their undergraduate experience. We plan to focus more on within student improvement. Targets for next year will stress improvements in scores across the first and final drafts of the CJ Issue Essay that is assigned in the capstone class (CRJU 4930). A recent policy change mandates that CJ majors must complete the other CTW class, Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060), before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives. The department's undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Comprehend and Synthesize Information measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Application and analysis

**Implementation Description:** Assessment efforts next year will analyze the within student improvements for CRJU 4930 students. The CJ Undergraduate Committee will fashion a proposal to allow for gradation and measure linkages across CRJU 3060 and 4930 and seek faculty approval.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and CJ faculty

---

**Emphasize student improvement over time**

We have increased our expectations this year with the introduction of graduated targeted outcomes that apply to minimal expectations and higher expectations. These targets only apply to the work provided by students in the final draft of a paper submitted in the last weeks of their undergraduate experience. We plan to focus more on within student improvement. Achievement targets and pre-semester ambassador-led consultation for next year will stress improvements in scores across the first and final drafts of the CJ Issue Essay that is assigned in the capstone class (CRJU 4930). A recent policy change mandates that CJ majors must complete the other CTW class, Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060), before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives. The department's undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Identify and State Topical Issues measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**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

**Implementation Description:** Assessment efforts next year will analyze the within student improvements for CRJU 4930 students. The CJ Undergraduate Committee will fashion a proposal to allow for gradation and measure linkages across CRJU 3060 and 4930 and seek faculty approval.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and CJ faculty

---

**Emphasize student improvement over time**

We have increased our expectations this year with the introduction of graduated targeted outcomes that apply to minimal expectations and higher expectations. These targets only apply to the work provided by students in the final draft of a paper submitted in the last weeks of their undergraduate experience. We plan to focus more on within student improvement. Targets for next year will stress improvements in scores across the first and final drafts of the CJ Issue Essay that is assigned in the capstone class (CRJU 4930). A recent policy change mandates that CJ majors must complete the other CTW class, Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060), before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives. The department's undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Comprehend and Synthesize Information measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | Outcome/Objective: Written communication

**Implementation Description:** Assessment efforts next year will analyze the within student improvements for CRJU 4930 students. The CJ Undergraduate Committee will fashion a proposal to allow for gradation and measure linkages across CRJU 3060 and 4930 and seek faculty approval.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and CJ faculty
before they are eligible to enroll in CRJU 3060 and CRJU 4930. The department's undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce an assignment that taps the Comprehend and Synthesize Information measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Generation of conclusions

**Implementation Description:** Assessment efforts next year will analyze the within student improvements for CRJU 4930 students. The CJ Undergraduate Committee will fashion a proposal to allow for adssignment and measure linkages across CRJU 3060 and 4930 and seek faculty approval.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and CJ faculty

**Enhance data collection, reporting and connect CRJU 3060 to 4930 assessment**

Last year, the previous CTW ambassador made the following recommendation: "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." While we achieved enhancements in the use of rubrics for the spring term, the introduction of a new CTW ambassador led to failure in this regard for the fall and a change in direction with regard to action plans. First, gradation was added to achievement outcomes to enhance standards. Second, a recent policy change mandating that CJ majors complete the Ethical Issues in CJ (CRJU 3060) before they are eligible to enroll in 4000 level electives raises the opportunity for linked assignments across CRJU 3060 and 4930. The department's undergraduate committee will consider ways to introduce into CRJU 3060 an assignment that taps the Application and Analysis measure in order to allow for within and across student comparisons over a broader time frame.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Application and analysis

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and CJ faculty

**Oral presentation assignments**

CTW ambassador will encourage instructors to use rubric assessed oral presentation assignments to further enhance the medium through which students engage in critical thinking on topics related to ethical issues in criminal justice. The data for these rubrics will be reported for assessment purposes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Identification of ethical issues

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador

**Revision feedback in CRJU 3060**

Instructors of CRJU 3060 will be encouraged by the CTW ambassador to include a dimension of revision and resubmission for at least one of the 3 ethical issue assignments during the term.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Written communication

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador

**Revision feedback in CRJU 3060**

Instructors of CRJU 3060 will be encouraged by the CTW ambassador to include a dimension of revision and resubmission for at least one of the 3 ethical issue assignments during the term.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Application and analysis

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

We experienced a change in our CTW ambassador. This led to a steep learning curve and a breakdown in communication that produced missing data for the fall term. That said, we managed to add gradations to our achievement targets and trained and deployed 3 new CTW writing consultants and 2 new instructors. These training opportunities further allowed the new CTW ambassador to gain confidence in the expectations and structures of the effort. Improvements were made in the data collection for CRJU 3060 in the spring and will continue moving forward.
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

With only 1 exception, we met achievement targets for all measures. All sections of CRJU 4930 showed significant within student improvements across the first and final draft paper submissions.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We need to achieve more consistency in the rubric usage of our instructors. Noticable differences were observed in the average scores (1-4 scale) across the 3 CRJU 4930 instructors. the CTW ambassador needs to provide better training and oversight of adjunct instructors to assure quality control. It is expected that we will draw more heavily on CTW central office to assist in these training efforts. There also exists inconsistent use of writing consultants across sections. In part this is the byproduct of instructor styles and preferences but also seems to be linked to poor communication about expectations and potential benefits to writing consultant usage. Here again, added emphasis will be provided by CTW ambassador.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

Faculty are begging to fully internalize and implement the ideals of revision based writing and the use of rubrics. We currently use a one-size-fits-all rubric for CRJU 4930 that is mandated for use by all instructors. This rubric makes the separation of feedback and grading difficult for some. We will explore the possibility of a menu of rubrics and ways to link assessment measures and assignments across CRJU 3060 and 4930 to allow for more precise and meaningful assessment. The biggest change in our CTW program has been the introduction of a new CTW ambassador. The learning curve stunted our collective growth and it is hoped that substantive improvement can become the focus once again now that compliance has been achieved.

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

Mission / Purpose

Mission: To build upon future teachers' understanding of how to apply critical thinking skills to their teaching practices and their own professional development to improve students' critical thinking skills through composition. 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 recognize, challenge, and 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 organizations, they will demonstrate developing awareness and use of critical thinking.

G 2: Expand Understanding of Educational Issues through Written Inquiry
Students will explore their literacy pedagogy, practice, and current trends and issues impacting education by researching existing literature on the topic, participating in whole and small group discussions, interviewing public school personnel and policy makers, and engaging in study groups. Through multiple drafts of an expressive product, students will 1) make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do based on experiences, readings, conversations, etc., and 2) demonstrate the willingness to recognize and challenge personal biases and assumptions.

G 3: Communicate Ideas Effectively
Students should be able to craft a comprehensible message for a particular audience using appropriately selected media, format, and genres of communication. Part of critical thinking is the ability to understand the influence of audience and the medium of expression upon how an author decides to craft her ideas. Students need to have working knowledge of a variety of expressive media, format, and genres and understand how audience impacts how she uses these three writing constructs to express ideas.

G 4: Explore and Evaluate Personal Subjectivities through Composition
Students will explore and evaluate their personal literacy philosophies by revising multiple drafts of an expressive product to examine their beliefs associated with teaching literacy and fostering literacy-rich learning environments for students. Multiple drafts will include reflections of research, readings, experiences, and conversations leading to a culminating composition evidencing the exploration and evaluation of personal subjectivities and how they have contributed to a final personal philosophy of literacy.

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 1: Exploring Children’s Literature to Expand Literacy Beliefs and Practices (G: 1, 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Objective: 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 literacy development. Outcomes: Students will read and "log" at least 100 children's books in this online environment. "Logging" a book includes reading it, designing a virtual bookshelf within which it fits, and adding a review. Reviewers should let the reader know how students connected with the text, as opposed to a plot summary. Online discussions are begun by students, occur longitudinally throughout the semester, and are facilitated by the instructor. Online discussions may relate to how to continue using this site in future classrooms or sharing other online resources that could benefit future teachers teaching of literacy. A final written reflection and visual representation of the experience is the culminating product.

**SLO 2: Inquiry into Educational Issues (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)**

Objectives: Students will become advocates for educational policies at district, state, and national levels. Taking on the persona of a "press secretary," students will become familiar with Governor candidates' beliefs and future plans for education to the extent they can write a mock speech for the candidate to give at a speaking event to voting constituents with an interest in education. Students will attempt to contact the candidate, become familiar with the candidate's websites, Facebook page, tweets, etc., watch candidates debates, and infer their thinking about educational policy and plans with strong justifications for those thoughts. This writing will require a structured and mandatory cycle of feedback and revision with the help of the Critical Thinking through Writing consultant and small group meetings with "peer consultants". Outcome: Based on their research, readings, experiences, and conversations, students will write candidates campaign speeches related to literacy teaching and learning.

**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.

**SLO 3: Literacy Outreach (G: 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Objective: Students will communicate their understanding of literacy-related best practices and pedagogy in the elementary school classroom, locate and read professional literature to inform and support their thinking, and produce a written product aimed at communicating their learning. Details follow: Outcome: Students will submit a written mock interview with a public school principal highlighting (1) possible interview questions related to literacy practices and pedagogy and, (2) responses that reflect an understanding of best practices supported by research, readings, conversations and experiences. To support the design of the mock interview, students will conduct research related to public school interviews, current policies, and best practices in literacy. Student will meet with administrators and teachers to discuss possible interview questions. Students will meet in small groups to discuss possible responses and locate research that substantiates their answers. Their writing will go through a structured and mandatory cycle of feedback and revision with Critical Thinking through Writing Consultant and with a peer consultant to expand thinking about the topic. Feedback will include suggestions about how/where to add examples, use citations, add voice, more directly address the prompt, evaluate and acknowledge biases and subjectivities, etc.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 4: Literacy Compass Rose (G: 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Objective: Provide opportunities for students to examine their own lives, literacy practices, and to do so in a context that helps them connect these experiences to their roles as teachers and learners. Mini-lessons throughout the semester help students examine their own beliefs associated with teaching literacy and fostering literacy-rich learning environments for students. Students will create and revise their own Literacy Compass Rose. Creating this rose should help determine major and minor themes in understanding and teaching literacy to young children. In the rose, the major “directions” (N, E, S, W) are the major ideas involved in literacy and the subsets of the main ideas become the minor directions (NE, NW, SE, SW). Outcome: Through the compilation of cycles of inquiry capturing critical thinking, students present a final Literacy Compass Rose composition that connects students’ experiences and beliefs to their roles as teachers and learners. A portfolio of thinking linked to a final written “artist statement” highlights exploration, growth, and examination of beliefs and practices related to their literacy learning. Ultimately, the literacy compass rose will offer “direction” in future teachers’ own teaching of literacy.

**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 (G: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Based on our Action Plan designed in 2009-2010, we separated the Critical Thinking components on the Scoring Scale for Early Childhood Education BSE CTW Assignments. Instead of one indicator on a rubric, it is broken into two to allow for greater instructor understanding of evidence of kinds of critical thinking. The rubric is as follows: Evidence of Critical Thinking Component #1: 5: Makes reasonable decisions about what to believe and what to do based on experiences, readings, conversations, etc. 4. Attempts to link decisions about what to believe and what to do based on experiences, readings, conversations, etc., but the link is tenuous or
cursory 3. Makes statements about what to believe and what to do based only on experiences without consulting additional resources 2. Makes statements about what to believe or do, but they are not convincingly linked to experiences, readings, conversations, etc. 1: Makes superficial statements about what to believe or do without supporting reasons for positions

Evidence of Critical Thinking Component #2: 5: Demonstrates the willingness to recognize and challenge personal biases and assumptions 4: Indicates awareness of personal biases and assumptions but doesn't demonstrate a willingness to challenge them 3: Needs to challenge personal biases and assumptions 2: Needs to show more awareness of personal biases and assumptions 1: Seems unaware of personal biases and assumptions

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

**Target for O1: Exploring Children’s Literature to Expand Literacy Beliefs and Practices**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Our target is for 50% of our students to score a 5 out of a 5 pt. scale on this assignment. The breakdown is as follows: END OF SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking on Indicator #1 (n=141): 113 scored a 5; 22 scored a 4; 6 scored a 3; 0 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1; 80% of students scored a 5. END OF SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking on Indicator #2 (n=108): 110 scored a 5; 25 scored a 4; 4 scored a 3; 0 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 78% of students scored a 5. BEGINNING of semester scores were: 25 scoring a 5; 40 scoring a 4; 33 scoring a 3; 7 scoring a 2; 3 scoring a 1; 23% of students scored a 5.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Our target is for 50% of our students to score a 5 out of a 5 pt. scale on this assignment. The breakdown is as follows: At the end of the semester, our scores were as follows: END OF SEMESTER: Evidence of Critical Thinking Indicator #1 (n=54): 40 scored a 5; 11 scored a 4; 3 scored a 3; 0 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 74% scored a 5. END OF SEMESTER: Evidence of Critical Thinking Indicator #2 (n=54): 44 scored a 5; 7 scored a 4; 3 scored a 3; 0 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 81% scored a 5. BEGINNING of Semester Scores: 9 scoring a 5; 12 scoring a 4; 22 scoring a 3; 8 scoring a 2; 3 scoring a 1. 16% had scores of 5 at the beginning of the semester.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Our target is for 50% of our students to score a 5 out of a 5 pt. scale on this assignment. The breakdown is as follows: END OF THE SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking on Indicator #1 (n=87): 51 scored a 5; 16 scored a 4; 20 scored a 3; 0 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 59% of students scored a 5. END OF THE SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking on Indicator #2 (n=87): 61 scored a 5; 15 scored a 4; 11 scored a 3; 0 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 70% of students scored a 5. At the beginning of the semester, students scored as following: BEGINNING of Semester Scores: 6 scoring a 5; 9 scoring a 4; 18 scoring a 3; 42 scoring a 2; 12 scoring a 1. 1% of students scored a 5.

**Target for O4: Literacy Compass Rose**

Our target is

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Our target is for 50% of our students to score a 5 out of a 5 pt. scale on this assignment. The breakdown is as follows: END OF SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking on Indicator #1 (n=141): 118 scored a 5; 13 scored a 4; 8 scored a 3; 1 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 84% of students scored a 5. END OF SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking on Indicator #2 (n=141): 120 scored a 5; 17 scored a 4; 3 scored a 3; 1 scored a 2; 0 scored a 1. 85% scored a 5. BEGINNING OF THE SEMESTER Evidence of Critical Thinking (n=141). 1 scored a 5; 6 scored a 4; 12 scored a 3; 98 scored a 2; 24 scored a 1.

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

**Change rubric to reflect two critical thinking categories.**

In looking at the scores, we realize that they may skew high because two critical thinking criteria were collapsed into one rubric category. By dividing the criteria into two categories, we feel that next year's scores will be a more accurate depiction of student critical thinking development.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Beginning in Fall 2010, we will create 2 categories of rubric descriptors to better capture critical thinking in our students.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassadors in consult with faculty
- Additional Resources: none
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Encourage instructors to design CTW assignments that best fit their curriculum, including multimodal and digital products.**

In 2010, the BSE adopted the NET Standards to improve teacher and student use of technology as meaning-making tools. To meet these standards, preservice teachers will need more experience working with a variety of technology and software to develop and
express critical thinking. In 2010-2011, we used online sites for students to explore and evaluate children's literature and to engage in ongoing discussions about teaching practices and education policy. To help students understand multimodal composition, we created the Compass Rose assignment, which asked them to work in image and words to express their critical thinking about literacy and literacy instruction. This multimodal composition work will translate directly into digital multimodal compositions that they will create later in their teacher preparation program.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Within the ECE B.S.E. program, CTW is well respected; however, further development is continually sought. We need a formal structure to assure the continued quality of our CTW component.

Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 80% scored a 5.
Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 81% scored a 5.
Expand Literacy Beliefs and Practices (n=141):
Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 74% scored a 5.
Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 70% scored a 5.
16% scored a 5.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

There were three major accomplishments in the ECE B.S.E. CTW Initiative:
1. The students enrolled in our Early Childhood Education courses in the B.S.E. CTW courses met every objective. In reflecting upon our Action Plan from 2009-2010, the decision to separate the critical thinking indicators on the Scoring Rubric for CTW assignments allowed instructors to more clearly explore various ways students were exemplifying critical thinking in CTW assignments. An Instructor teaching courses without the "CTW" designation adopted the Critical Thinking Indicators on the Scoring Rubric to help explore various ways her students were exemplifying critical thinking through composition.

2. Inquiry in Educational Issues (n=54)
Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 59% scored a 5.
Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 57% scored a 5.
>1% scored a 5.

3. An Instructor teaching courses without the "CTW" designation adopted the Critical Thinking Indicators on the Scoring Rubric to help explore various ways her students were exemplifying critical thinking through composition.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Based on the Critical Thinking indicators used in the scoring rubrics for CTW assignments, students critical thinking improved dramatically. Each assignment captured significant improvement in critical thinking from the beginning to the end of the semester. Increases in the use of critical thinking found in CTW assignments were evidences as follows: 1. Exploring Children's Literature to Expand Literacy Beliefs and Practices (n=141): Beginning of the Semester Score: 23% scored a 5. End of the Semester Scores: Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 80% scored a 5. Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 78% scored a 5. 2. Inquiry in Educational Issues (n=54) Beginning of the Semester Score: 16% scored a 5. End of the Semester Scores: Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 74% scored a 5. Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 81% scored a 5. 3. Literacy Outreach (n=87) Beginning of the Semester Score: 1% scored a 5. End of the Semester Scores: Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 59% scored a 5. Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 70% scored a 5. 4. Literacy Compass Rose: Beginning of the Semester Score: >1% scored a 5. End of the Semester Scores: Critical Thinking Indicator #1: 84% scored a 5. Critical Thinking Indicator #2: 85% scored a 5.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We need to fully implement this action plan during the 2012-2013 year. Consultants had been working with us for two years. However, since they either graduated in 2011 or will graduate in 2012, we will need to fully implement this action plan during the 2012-2013 year.

Implement formal workshops at the start of each semester for new CTW faculty and consultants.
As our BSE program expands, faculty and ambassadors recognize we cannot rely on prior knowledge of our faculty and consultants. We need a formal structure to assure the continued quality of our CTW component.

Structure CTW consultant training by requiring prior experiences.
We continue to see the consultant role as paramount to the success of the CTW initiative in ECE. The intense, one-on-one feedback students receive from the consultant, coupled with the writing relationship established between student and consultant, is not only crucial for critical thinking development but also models for pre-service teachers effective pedagogical practice. We have seen a marked difference in the quality of the CTW experience for students who had a working relationship with a CTW consultant well versed in course content versus students who did not have a working relationship with the consultant fostered through in-class mentoring. Because of the difference in the quality of experience for students, we are introducing pre-requisites for our CTW consultants. CTW consultants will need to demonstrate experience in either teacher development or writing pedagogy. Qualifying experience may be WAC and/or National Writing Project participation or their equivalent, or enrollment in or completion of 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. We implemented this plan during the 2010-2011 year but did not need to attend to it because our CTW consultants had been working with us for two years. However, since they either graduated in 2011 or will graduate in 2012, we will need to fully implement this action plan during the 2012-2013 year.

CTW ambassadors review CTW consultant qualifications prior to submitting names.
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. This action plan was initiated during the 2010-2011 year; however, since we had returning CTW instructors and consultants, there was no need for formal workshops. Instead, we held informal meetings to gauge the progress of the initiative.

Implemented the Compass Rose assignment, which asked them to work in image and words to express their critical thinking about literacy and literacy instruction. This multimodal composition work will translate directly into digital multimodal compositions that they will create later in their teacher preparation program.
ways to support our CTW consultants through professional development experiences. We have been fortunate to have consistent CTW consultants, but as these consultants graduate, we will need greater support for introducing new consultants to the CTW experience. In terms of assistance, it would be ideal if instructors with fewer than 25 students could still have a CTW consultant in order to fully support our B.S.E. students through the intricate feedback and revision cycles of CTW assignments. One solution would be for a CTW consultant to work with two courses with less than 25 students. In addition, as we expand across three campuses (main, Alpharetta, and Newton County) we will be faced with the difficulties of finding consultants for all three locations. As we have stressed in the past, we feel our CTW components are successful in large measure because of the strength of our consultants. As our program grows, the issue of developing and keeping effective consultants will be a significant issue.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

The primary impact of CTW on the ECE B.S.E. Program, Faculty, and Students is three fold: (1) The CTW initiative was a catalyst in developing a B.S.E. Literacy Concept Map to structure unique components of each literacy course students take; (2) Faculty teaching courses without a CTW designation have adopted the CTW scoring rubric indicators to guide their own assignments; (3) Students report an increased self-awareness as a writer and increased confidence in their ability to, and enjoyment associated with, critically thinking through writing. Since last year’s CTW assessment report, we have implemented the Action Plan designed for the 2009-2010 report. We revised the CTW scoring rubric to inform instructors of students' critical thinking in more specific ways. We continue to seek ways to support our CTW consultants and support new instructors teaching CTW courses.

---
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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).

**SLO 2: ECON 3900: Short Assignment 1 (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**

Respond to prompts about applications of macroeconomic theory. See attachments for more details.

**SLO 3: ECON 3900: Short Assignments 2 & 3 (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)**

Respond to prompts after completing readings. See attachments for more details.

**SLO 4: ECON 3900: Short Assignments 4, 5, & 6 (G: 1, 2) (M: 4)**

Respond to prompts about data interpretation and policy choices related to macroeconomics. 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 in 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 first 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 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. 3. On the final book review, at least 75 percent of students should make a grade of 85 percent or higher. 4. On the first draft, at least 60 percent of students should make a rating of 2 (on a scale of 1-4) or higher on the 2 critical thinking components of the book review assignment (economic concepts and valid opinion) 5. 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)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

We did not meet Target 1 (70 percent meet the threshold rating of 2.5). We met Target 2 (about 93 percent of students meet the threshold rating of 2.5). We met Target 3 (about 89 percent of students made a grade of 85 percent or higher on the final book review). We met Target 4 (87.5 percent and 62.5 percent made the 2 rating threshold on "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the book review in the first draft). We narrowly met Target 5 (about 61 percent and 90 percent made the 2 rating threshold on "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the book review in the first draft). We saw gains from the first to the second draft in terms of average ratings (average rating of 2.5 increased from 70% to about 93% of students). We also saw improvement on the critical thinking components, in terms of the percentage of students earning at least a 2 (from about 88% on draft one to 98% on draft two for the "economic concepts" component, and from about 63% on draft one to 100% on draft two for the "valid opinion" component), and in terms of many students now earning the higher threshold of a 3 rating (as previously reported above).

M 2: ECON 3900 Short Assignment 1 Rubric (O: 2)
See attached rubric.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students showed some improvement from the first draft to the second draft.

M 3: ECON 3900 Short Assignments 2 & 3 Rubric (O: 3)
See attached rubric.

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

Target for O3: ECON 3900: Short Assignments 2 & 3

No specific target was set this year; we are still working on this ECON 3900 course, and instructor turnover is great.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Average Grades: CTW 1: 1st draft 8.3/10; final draft 18/20 CTW 2: 1st draft 8.35/10; final draft 19/20

M 4: ECON 3900 Short Assignments 4, 5, & 6 Rubric (O: 4)
See attached rubrics.

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

Target for O4: ECON 3900: Short Assignments 4, 5, & 6

No specific target was set this year; we are still working on this ECON 3900 course, and instructor turnover is great.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

The instructor for this course gave the following qualitative analysis: I tried to communicate my expectations to the students and to explain my grading system by using a grading rubric. For the first CTW assignment, I asked them to use Excel to make a figure using data from the national income accounts and to write a paragraph explaining the figure. I viewed this assignment, as like asking an art student to paint a still life. However, most students could not construct a satisfactory paragraph describing a simple figure. In my opinion, most students did not do very well on these assignments. In many cases, the essays were poorly organized and poorly written. The essays often appeared to be hastily written rather than well crafted essays. I reluctantly concluded that the level of writing proficiency among my students is at such a low level that they need far more guidance in how to write than I could reasonably provide in a single economics course. I tried my best, but I concluded that my efforts were unsuccessful.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We met with all instructors to discuss the goals of the CTW Initiative. We still have large turnover with the ECON 3900 course and need to have more widespread discussion about specific targets for the objectives in that course - that was part of last year’s action plan and could still use work. The ECON 4999 course has more consistency across sections.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

We see progress in critical thinking skills as students move through the ECON 4999 course. They perform better on the final draft than on the earlier ones.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

High turnover of the ECON 3900 instructors and CTW consultants in general remain problematic for us. We will continue to work with the new instructors and consultants. The good news is more and more faculty are becoming aware of the CTW initiative as more of them get exposed to teaching the CTW courses, but it is difficult to keep starting over with new instructors.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

In general, it is nice to see our faculty discussing topics related to teaching and student learning. More of them are warming up to the ideas behind the CTW initiative. More students are aware of it as well. Feedback from students has been quite good - they seem to recognize that we are trying to teach them important skills.
**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of English teaches students to read and write critically and creatively. Our Department also prepares students to pursue 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 reading texts from many perspectives and working towards the expression of an informed, valid, and persuasive understanding of the text. Critical thinking activities in our discipline include analyzing elements of form; rigorous testing of ideas against evidence; articulating the relation between a text's production and its reception; summarizing a text's argument and purpose; and developing a point of view within relevant literary, historical, and theoretical frameworks.

**Goals**

**G 1: Students will comprehend texts.**

Students will learn to understand the ideas, arguments, and conventions in a text. In the process, they will examine how their own assumptions and biases might affect their critical reading of texts. They will also learn to select evidence effectively, evaluate competing ideas, and defend their interpretations.

**G 2: Students will understand and use literary and rhetorical conventions.**

Students will learn to recognize how writers use literary and rhetorical conventions and incorporate these conventions into their own writing.

**G 3: Students will learn to write clearly and effectively.**

Students will learn to make linguistic and rhetorical choices to produce writing that is effective in terms of tone, audience, and/or genre. They will develop an awareness of their specific audience and work towards developing an individual voice or style.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Identifies ideas (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)**

Students successfully summarize main ideas and arguments in a text. In the introductory CTW courses, English 3040 and 3050, students practice identifying the foundation of critical theory and rhetorical elements in a text and then complete a 1-2 page summary of these essential ideas. This process of thinking through how writers use language and ideas in their discipline prepares students for more complex assignments, such as applying theory to literary texts or using rhetorical techniques in their own writing. In the Senior Seminars, students refine their thinking about specific literary and rhetorical forms, such as a sonnet, a short story, a blog, a podcast, by completing assignments which ask them to summarize the key elements of these forms, thus continuing to extend the process of working with the language and ideas central to their area of study within the major.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates literary knowledge (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8)**

Students demonstrate working knowledge of literary or rhetorical language and theory. Once students have practiced taking apart a text and identifying its central ideas or arguments, they work through assignments that ask them to evaluate or apply these ideas. The introductory classes ask students to evaluate a theory's strengths or weaknesses; in the Senior Seminars, students apply a theory and use it to develop their own interpretation of a text, to inform a research project, or to produce their own creative work. CTW instructors evaluate this outcome through the rubric categories of conventions, process, and judgment.

**SLO 3: Writes effectively (G: 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9)**

Students write clearly and effectively, using language appropriate to the form or discipline. While all of the CTW assignments emphasize the process of thinking through how texts create meaning, they also require students to develop mastery in their own writing. The short assignments assessed through CTW, such as the 1-2 page reading summaries or 2-3 page analyses of a pedagogical theory or poem, are especially designed for students to practice their writing. Because we see competent writing as evidence of clear thinking, three out of nine categories of our rubric evaluate writing in terms of expression, voice and style, and contribution to the development of a writer's craft.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Rubric (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Rubric to determine strength of student critical thinking skills in English. See Repository. The rubric contains three broad skills (engagement, reflection, and communication) that English faculty agreed were fundamental for assessing critical thinking in all four English concentrations (Rhetoric & Composition, Literary Studies, Creative Writing, Secondary Education). Each skill breaks down into specific aspects of that skill. These specific skills are assessed using a four-point scale (4 being the strongest score and 1 being the weakest), and they graduate in terms of degree of difficulty. For instance, under the broad skill "Engagement," students are assessed on how well they understand concepts ("Ideas"). A solid understanding of concepts should lead to students' ability to appropriately use the conventions in their concentration ("Conventions"). Once "Ideas" and "Conventions" are mastered, students should be able to effectively evaluate textual evidence and adapt or reevaluate their ideas based on that evidence ("Testing").

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

**Target for O1: Identifies ideas**

3.5 out of 4

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

For this cycle of assessment, we have chosen to focus on four categories in our rubric which nearly all CTW instructors used in their courses. Our data from each CTW course shows that on average students scored 3.2 out of 4 in the category of
engagement with ideas, an activity essential to reading and thinking about texts. While this finding shows competence in this area, we would like to see some students exceed this measure and achieve mastery; our target of 3.5 would indicate solid competence in this area and show progress towards such mastery.

**Target for O2: Demonstrates literary knowledge**
3.2 out of 4

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
For this cycle of assessment, we have chosen to focus on four categories in our rubric which nearly all CTW instructors used in their courses. Our data from each CTW course shows that on average students scored 2.94 out of 4 in the category of engaging with literary or rhetorical conventions. We would like to see all students show competence and occasional mastery in this area because they will need to build on this knowledge as proceed through their CTW and other courses in the major.

**Target for O3: Writes effectively**
3.5 out of 4

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
Our data for this cycle shows that students showed solid competence and some mastery in their writing for CTW assignments; they scored on average 3.24 out of 4 for the rubric category for expression. In our workshops for the next cycle, we will encourage CTW instructors to develop compatible assignments that use four key categories in the rubric as they design their courses. By focusing on particular CTW activities such as expressing ideas in language appropriate to the discipline, instructors can direct students to engage effectively with ideas and convey their understanding in writing. Our target of 3.5 would show significant progress towards mastery in this area.

M 2: Rubric Data (O: 1, 2, 3)
This spreadsheet represents an average of the students' scores on the Assessment Rubric associated with the assignments below.
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

M 3: Theory Summary (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students summarize a textbook chapter on a critical theory and evaluate that theory's strengths and weaknesses.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identifies ideas**
3.5 out of 4

M 4: Reading Response (O: 1, 2)
Students respond to a reading by identifying and evaluating the rhetorical elements that students find compelling.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identifies ideas**
3.5 out of 4

M 5: Sonnet Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students analyze a sonnet by identifying the poetic techniques used and explain how they work to create meaning.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Identifies ideas**
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Target for O2: Demonstrates literary knowledge

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Target for O3: Writes effectively

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

M 6: Theory Application (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students apply a critical theory to a text (film, literary work, tv show, etc.)
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Identifies ideas

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Target for O2: Demonstrates literary knowledge

Target for O3: Writes effectively

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

M 7: Analysis of Fiction (O: 1, 3)
Students analyze a piece of published fiction by identifying elements of craft and explaining how they function to create particular effects. Students then reflect on how they might make use of the same elements.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Identifies ideas

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Target for O3: Writes effectively

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

M 8: Blog or Podcast Response (O: 1, 2)
Students respond to a blog or podcast by analyzing and evaluating its use of rhetoric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Identifies ideas

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Target for O2: Demonstrates literary knowledge

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
3.0 out of 4 (Engagement: Convention)

M 9: Article Summary (O: 1, 3)
Students research, select, and summarize an article on the use of technology in the English classroom.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Identifies ideas
3.5 out of 4

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
3.5 out of 4 (Engagement: Ideas)

Target for O3: Writes effectively
3.5 out of 4

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
3.6 out of 4 (Communication: Expression)

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 has been in use and maintained all year.

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. Last year the CTW faculty proposed several alternative rubrics, and we revised 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. While we plan a few minor revisions to the rubric for the next cycle, our focus will be on coordinating the use of the rubric across all of courses. We hope to establish three or four common measures for all the CTW courses.

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.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Audrey Goodman

Workshop Revision
In previous years, we 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. This year we focused on the faculty actively teaching each semester and worked to break down their training by concentration. For 2011-12 we plan to hold small, more personalized orientation meetings before the start of each semester to address the varying levels of familiarity with CTW requirements among our faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Workshops will be scheduled at the beginning of each semester for new faculty, with follow-up meetings of all faculty at the end of each semester.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Audrey Goodman
Additional Resources: An assistant familiar with OWE would be extremely helpful for leading these sessions and being available for consultation during the semester.

Focus on clarity of writing
Clear expression in writing demonstrates critical thinking in English. We will continue to focus on writing as a key element of thinking in our discipline through encouraging CTW instructors to develop assignments with several cycles of revision; we will then coordinate our assessment of these activities by applying consistently the rubric category of expression.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analysis of Fiction | Outcome/Objective: Writes effectively
Measure: Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Writes effectively
Focus on engagement with ideas in a text
In our workshops for the next cycle, we will encourage CTW instructors to develop compatible assignments that use four key categories in the rubric as they design their courses. By focusing on particular CTW activities such as analyzing the essential concepts in a literary or rhetorical text, the instructors can direct students to engage effectively with ideas and convey their understanding in writing.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Focus on engagement with literary and rhetorical conventions
In our workshops for the next cycle, we will encourage CTW instructors to develop compatible assignments that use four key categories in the rubric as they design their courses. By focusing on particular CTW activities such as engaging with literary or rhetorical conventions, the instructors can direct students to identify and use the tools essential to their work in the discipline.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Focus on process of reflection
In our workshops for the next cycle, we will encourage CTW instructors to develop compatible assignments that use four key categories in the rubric as they design their courses. By focusing on particular CTW activities such as cultivating awareness of the thinking process or individual biases, instructors can guide students to reflect more fully on their own positions and help them to articulate and defend their own point of view.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Our main accomplishment this year was to build consensus among CTW instructors regarding the key assessment categories for CTW assignments. While our new rubric provides the opportunity for instructors to measure a range of critical thinking skills, we agreed that focusing on a few key categories will help us to work together towards our goals of improving critical reading and writing. From there, we can develop signature CTW assignments in each CTW course to have standards to measure student progress.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Instructors report that students now do not leap to embrace their first reading of a text. They appreciate the need to re-read and to consider the lens through which they read. They also understand better that words and texts of multiple meanings, none of which is absolute. An additional benefit instructors observed was that after completing CTW assignments student engaged more productively in class discussions, and they also wrote more analytical and generative final papers. The short, focused exercises that develop critical thinking function like scaffolding for larger projects. By practicing critical thinking during the semester, students approach their final papers with a greater understanding of issues and complexities in their own final arguments. They are able to contextualize their responses or arguments more accurately in larger discussions of a topic, leading them towards more useful and engaging introductions and conclusions.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the
implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

While our CTW program has worked fairly well this year, we still face the challenge of coordinating our four concentrations. In the next year, we plan to address the assignments and assessment process for each concentration separately in order to refine the ways that we pursue our common goals. Some faculty continue to resist using the Online Writing Environment, the method we have chosen to gather data and coordinate assessment. Others use OWE but apply default rubrics. In order to address this process, we will need to hold more one-on-one training sessions.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

This year students seem to have a clearer understanding of how critical thinking works in our discipline. The faculty involved in this initiative are becoming more committed to it, as it requires additional training and modification of assignments. While we may find fewer faculty willing to teach CTW courses, those who do are likely to become increasingly able to help students develop critical thinking skills. Our major change this year was to apply a new rubric, and we expect that as we continue to use it we will be able to measure student progress more effectively.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Entrepreneurship
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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.

This will need to be revised in the 2011-2012 cycle to be more crisp and focused.

Goals
G 1: Writing Skills
Students graduating with a major in managerial sciences and a concentration in Entrepreneurship will be effective writers in their field.

G 2: Critical Thinking Skills
Students graduating with a major in managerial sciences and a concentration in Entrepreneurship will be effective critical thinkers with respect to the problems they will confront in their field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Effective Writing (G: 1) (M: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 student can effectively write a complete analysis of an entrepreneurship case.

Relevant Associations:

SLO 2: Gathering and Generating Data (G: 2) (M: 1)
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.

Relevant Associations:

SLO 3: Analysis and Interpretation (G: 2) (M: 1)
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.

Relevant Associations:

SLO 4: Recommendations for Action (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The student can reach conclusions and make defensible recommendations based on the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered and generated.

Relevant Associations:
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric. Student will re-write the CTW case following feedback and work with the writing consultant. This subsequent case write-up will be analyzed with the same MGS 4560 CTW rubric as the initial case write-up. Based on this, further feedback will be given to the student and comparative measures will be drawn on the CTW outcomes set out in the rubric.

Target for O1: Effective Writing
The targets for the first item in the rubric are to have 80% of the students scoring at "Competent" or "Excellent" with no more than 5% at the "Ineffective" level. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
In the 2010-2011 Spring Semester offering of MGS 4560 33 students were enrolled. 31 students completed the final version of the CW case analysis and were assessed on the rubric. There were in the class three students on an exchange program from the Republic of Georgia who were not in the RCBA BA degree program. Of the three was among the two who did not complete the case analysis. On the first item on the rubric the Students averaged 2.548 with a standard deviation of 0.9. Of the 31 students 25 were at the level "Competent" or higher (80.6%) and 0 were rated at the level "Ineffective."

Target for O2: Gathering and Generating Data
The targets for the second item in the rubric are to have 80% of the students scoring at "Competent" or "Excellent" with no more than 5% at the "Ineffective" level. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
In the 2010-2011 Spring Semester offering of MGS 4560 33 students were enrolled. 31 students completed the final version of the CW case analysis and were assessed on the rubric. There were in the class three students on an exchange program from the Republic of Georgia who were not in the RCBA BA degree program. One of the three was among the two who did not complete the case analysis. On the first item on the rubric the Students averaged 2.548 with a standard deviation of 0.9. Of the 31 students 13 were at the level "Competent" or higher (41.9%) and 3 were rated at the level "Ineffective."

Target for O3: Analysis and Interpretation
The targets for the third item in the rubric are to have 80% of the students scoring at "Competent" or "Excellent" with no more than 5% at the "Ineffective" level. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
In the 2010-2011 Spring Semester offering of MGS 4560 33 students were enrolled. 31 students completed the final version of the CW case analysis and were assessed on the rubric. There were in the class three students on an exchange program from the Republic of Georgia who were not in the RCBA BA degree program. One of the three was among the two who did not complete the case analysis. On the first item on the rubric the Students averaged 2.483 with a standard deviation of 0.6325. Of the 31 students 25 were at the level "Competent" or higher (80.6%) and 0 were rated at the level "Ineffective."

Target for O4: Recommendations for Action
The targets for the fourth item in the rubric are to have 80% of the students scoring at "Competent" or "Excellent" with no more than 5% at the "Ineffective" level. Critical Thinking through Writing Rubric for MGS 4560 Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
In the 2010-2011 Spring Semester offering of MGS 4560 33 students were enrolled. 31 students completed the final version of the CW case analysis and were assessed on the rubric. There were in the class three students on an exchange program from the Republic of Georgia who were not in the RCBA BA degree program. One of the three was among the two who did not complete the case analysis. On the first item on the rubric the Students averaged 2.483 with a standard deviation of 0.962 Of
the 31 students 15 were at the level "Competent" or higher (48.4%) and 5 were rated at the level “Ineffective.”

### 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 students 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 not did they 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: Following the 2010-2011 assessment using a more rigorous measure of Critical Thinking skills it is clear that we need to work harder at developing these skills in the course and in the assignment feedback on the case draft.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status**: In-Progress
- **Priority**: High
- **Projected Completion Date**: 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group**: William Bogner, Stan Little
- **Additional Resources**: None
- **Budget Amount Requested**: $0.00 (no request)

#### Increased Preparation for Initial Assignment

Student 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: A major Action Plan item for the Entrepreneurship CTW course was to increase the Critical thinking coaching in the course.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status**: In-Progress
- **Priority**: High
- **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 reassessed.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status**: Terminated
- **Priority**: High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure**: The Case Analysis
  - **Outcome/Objective**: Effective Writing
- **Responsible Person/Group**: William Bogner
- **Additional Resources**: None
- **Budget Amount Requested**: $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

A major Action Plan item for the Entrepreneurship CTW course was to increase the Critical thinking coaching in the course. To do this a new module was added early in the semester. This was accompanied by the hiring of a writing instructor who had extensive experience in assessment in education from her prior job. Working with the ambassador, William Bogner, and the instructor, Stan Little, she was able to set out some very clear guidelines and standards that were applied going forward. We also changed the way in which we evaluated student performance, and these changes are reflected in the way that the findings are reported in the 2010-2011 cycle. This also resulted in the termination of one action plan which focused on the draft stage of the CTW exercise and shifted a stronger emphasis to the CT development Action Plan just discussed.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

Used a more rigorous standard for Critical thinking this year we were able to produce some rather sobering but motivating results about student critical thinking skills. While students at the top of the class were very good, there was a very broad fall off in the skill level once the middle of the class distribution was approached. The number of students that were rather “Ineffective” was lase to the desired target on all but one measure, the the number of students falling int he “Less than Competent” category was too high, particularly for the exit class.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

The more rigorous application of the CT items n the rubric clearly show that we need to increase those three skills in students. We will need to modify the module we added to review those skills in its class, but there seems to be a need for more CT emphasis on all
classes. This is the final semester for most of these students and the number that has "Less than Competent" skills on multiple dimensions is too high. Actually we think that these results are appearing in part because we are doing a better job of requiring and being able to evaluate CT skills. This in turn is due, in part, to the ability to work with a writing consultant that has assessment experience in education. With that person working one on one with the students we can see clearly the levels that students are at on the various skills and where we need to focus efforts.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

The major change in the CTW implementation on the department level is to do a better job of channeling students into CTW classes. Because of the odd configuration of the Managerial sciences Department it was possible for a student to take all of their required courses without taking a second CTW class. This creates graduation issues. In addressing this we anticipate a significant increase in CTW enrollments in 4000-level classes in MGS.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Film
As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
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.

Goals
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.

G 3: Theoretical understanding of media
The film major should develop students' abilities to apply media theory insightfully to contemporary and historical media.

G 4: Writing effectively about media
The film major should develop students' abilities to write clear, persuasive English prose about media.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Evaluating theoretical arguments about media (G: 3) (M: 2)
At the end of this program, students should be able to identify, analyze, and evaluate theoretical arguments about media.

SLO 4: Supporting theoretical arguments about media (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)
At the end of this program, students should be able to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of their own theoretical arguments about media.

SLO 5: Writing about media (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)
At the end of this program, students should be able to write clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct English prose to make a persuasive argument about media.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
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
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.

O/O 6: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Rubric (G: 3, 4) (M: 1)

The primary CTW assignment in Film Theory and Criticism asks students to research an appropriate area in film theory and to investigate how a specific theoretical construct functions in a particular film. The skills involved in this assignment 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. The CTW faculty will develop a rubric for the assignment that lays out clear grading parameters and that allows the faculty to set measurable targets for student performance.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: CTW Faculty Discussion (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6)

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of the CTW Film faculty participating in the 2010-2011 discussion approved of the core assignment structure for the coming 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of the CTW Film faculty participating in the 2010-2011 discussion approved of the core assignment structure for the coming year.

Target for O4: Supporting theoretical arguments about media

The supporting evidence in the project proposal assignment in Senior Seminar in Film should be at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level for at least 50% of the students.

Target for O5: Writing about media

The written expression in the project proposal assignment in Senior Seminar in Film should be at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level for at least 50% of the students.

Target for O6: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Rubric

100% of the CTW faculty will agree on a standard grading rubric for Film Theory and Criticism and on achievement targets for that rubric.

M 2: Project proposal: Senior Seminar in Film (O: 3, 4, 5)

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.

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

Target for O3: Evaluating theoretical arguments about media

The integration of theoretical perspectives in the project proposal assignment in Senior Seminar in Film should be at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level for at least 50% of the students.

Target for O4: Supporting theoretical arguments about media

The supporting evidence in the project proposal assignment in Senior Seminar in Film should be at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level for at least 50% of the students.
Target for O5: Writing about media

The written expression in the project proposal assignment in Senior Seminar in Film should be at the “competent” or “sophisticated” level for at least 50% of the students.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>Implementation Status:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011

Responsible Person/Group: CTW Film Ambassador in coordination with CTW Film faculty

Grading Rubric Targets for Film Theory and Criticism
In the 2011-12 year, the CTW Film faculty will create quantitative targets for the new grading rubric in Film Theory and Criticism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>Implementation Status:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW Faculty Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Rubric

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: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

The primary accomplishments of the CTW program in film were in the development of rubrics for our two CTW classes. The Film faculty have been fairly hesitant about rubrics. However, a couple of CTW faculty have taken the lead in testing rubrics. This development process has been a “bottom-up” effort rather than a “top-down” intervention. Although the rubric development process remains slow and careful, the choice to work from best practices has helped in gaining wider faculty acceptance for rubric use. The rubric in Senior Seminar in Film was tested in both spring and fall semesters, and the CTW faculty have approved it (although it will be re-evaluated each semester). The faculty have agreed to achievement targets for this class for the coming year. The faculty have agreed to test a rubric in Film Theory and Criticism in 2011-2012 with the goal of creating measurable targets for that rubric by the end of the year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit level?

At the end of both fall and spring semesters, the CTW faculty who taught courses in those semesters (Jennifer Barker, Alessandra Raengo, Jim Roberts, and Greg Smith) met with CTW Ambassador Greg Smith to read sample papers to establish grading norms; to discuss best practices; and to determine which CTW practices should be adopted for future semesters. All faculty have found these meetings to be a very helpful exchange of pedagogical strategies, and the faculty grading norms remain consistent. Since both CTW classes in Film are at the 4000 level, there is no formal “entry/exit” class sequence, and so the discussion dealt with individual instructors’ variations on the basic teaching structures for each course. Jim Roberts organizes his Film Theory and Criticism class around 5 key words: author, spectator, realism, cinematic, and ideology. In the fall he introduced each word in the first 5 weeks, and then assigned students to be responsible for one of these concepts as they move through the readings for the rest of the class. The student was responsible for discussing how the assigned concept functions within the readings for that week. They did so on the class wiki (http://film4750.wikispaces.com), and Roberts felt that the wiki has been valuable in getting them to write more, better, and critically. In the spring Roberts further integrated his class wiki into class activities so that the wiki did not serve simply as a “hoop” that the students needed to jump through. The wiki promoted discussion outside of class. Robert intends to have students use the wiki next year to address the film screening of the week from the perspective of their assigned key word, thus further interrelating the various class components. Roberts does not assign grades to the initial paper proposal, which means that students don’t have an expectation that their final paper proposal will get a better grade. To encourage students to hand in the initial ungraded paper proposal on time, he gives a grade penalty on the final proposal if the initial proposal is late. Roberts then has them turn in the “final paper” (he doesn’t call it a “draft” because that encourages sloppier work), and he provides feedback on that without providing a grade. Students then turn in a revised paper for a grade. He uses the same grade penalty system with the final paper, which encourages them to turn in the paper on time, even though it doesn’t receive an initial grade. The rest of us marveled at Roberts’s efforts at putting both the proposal AND the paper through a revision process. Roberts said that the best thing he did in his spring Film Theory and Criticism section was spend an entire class on how writing a proposal was different from writing a paper. Most students simply begin writing papers without having to articulate their argument and structure first, and so a proposal where they have to foreground and justify their rhetorical choices is a new experience for most. Roberts particularly emphasized how a proposal differs from a paper introduction, and he discussed the importance of doing the research before writing the paper (instead of coming to a conclusion first and then looking for research to support it). This explicit focus helped improve the quality of the proposals. Other smaller pedagogical decisions made an impact for Roberts’s spring 4750 class. He taught the class in a room that made conference style seating possible, and he felt that promoted better discussion than the standard classroom seating. He also attended several workshops for CTW ambassadors/instructors, and he found the shared experiences/wisdom in those sessions to be invaluable.

Jennifer Barker felt that the student tends to be overwhelmed when she provides full comments on papers, and so in the fall she decided to make her comments for most students fit within the cells of her rubric. She offers full line comments to her students and provides them if they want, but if they don’t she provides comments within the rubric. Barker felt that the rubric helps provide clarity to the student and a justification for the paper grade if students ask. Barker’s rubric formed the basis for the rubric that the faculty will
CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

The CTW Film faculty remain pleased with the implementation of critical thinking and writing strategies in these classes. This is particularly true for Film Theory and Criticism, an established part of our curriculum. The challenge is to integrate a unified rubric into an established class, allowing us to document our impressions of CTW effectiveness. During the 2010-2011 year, the CTW faculty will more broadly test the implementation of a Film Theory and Criticism rubric and determine measurable targets. Spring 2011 was the first time that the Senior Seminar in Film was taught at full enrollment, having 25 instead of 12 students as in previous semesters. Greg Smith was the only faculty member teaching Senior Seminar during the spring, and he discussed the importance of the schedule of assignments in that class. Because there are so many sub-assignments leading to the final project, the calendar is quite sensitive to relatively small variations. The primary difficulty was that GSU classes for the first week were canceled because of weather, and so this particular class did not meet until Wednesday of the second week (because of the Martin Luther King holiday). This shortchanged the initial sessions of the class, which oriented students toward the project, the project proposal, and the CTW process. Smith moved quickly through the project description and headed for the intellectual content of the course (concerning authors, audience, and meaning-making), figuring that the seniors were relatively practiced in creating papers and videos. Also, the students needed as much time as possible to work on their projects, given the shortened semester. In retrospect, Smith thinks this was a mistake. Students were asked too quickly to begin discussing and writing about their large projects, and so the project conceptions suffered. Poor conceptions led to relatively poor projects. In a project driven class such as Senior Seminar in Film, the early project description and development must be paramount. Smith said that special attention to the schedule of assignments (particularly given the feedback circuit of the CTW portion of the course) will be needed when the class is next taught (in the 7 week summer session).

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

The primary changes to CTW within the Film major in 2010-2011 involve the development and testing of rubrics. Smith said that special attention to the schedule of assignments (particularly given the feedback circuit of the CTW portion of the course) will be needed when the class is next taught (in the 7 week summer session).
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### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: CTW Assignment 1 - Define CTW in Finance (G: 2, 3, 4, 5) (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. This second part of this writing assignment is an expansion to the first part. 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 2: CTW Assignment 2 - Writing for Business (G: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 2, 3)

The purpose of this assignment is to encourage students to contemplate the similarities and differences between business writing and academic writing. Students read a collection of articles concerning business writing techniques and then they must draft a memo summarizing what they learned. The memo must be addressed to the instructor who taught their basic English composition course at GSU (or at the school where they took a similar class).

**Standard Associations**

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

#### SLO 3: CTW Assignment 3 - Argumentative Essay (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 2, 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 data and draw a definitive conclusion. The writing assignment is only the opening paragraph to what would be their entire argument. We want students to be able to state their opinion and introduce their support in a powerful and concise manner.

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: CTW Assignment 1 - Define CTW in Finance (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The scoring 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 &quot;critical thinking through writing&quot; 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 Both assignments are scored and the scores are compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: CTW Assignment 1 - Define CTW in Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the first part of this assignment, which is an in-class assignment on the first day of class, we do not expect student single sentence definitions to be very well thought out or deep. However, since all students have taken other CTW courses in other areas as well as previous finance courses and writing courses, we expect the definitions to be well written and moderately insightful. The second part of this assignment, which is a takehome assignment, is scored using the same simple rubric that was used for Assignment 1a. The scores on the two assignments are compared with the expectation that more time, thought and research will produce a more comprehensive definition as well as a fewer spelling and grammar errors. The rubric scores for this assignment are 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4. Our target score is 2.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This assignment was refined from 2009-10 - actually this assignment is a combination of both assignments 1 and 2 from the prior year. The goal of this assignment is to show students the importance of &quot;critical&quot; thinking in this class by making them define critical thinking in their own words. The average score on the first part of the assignment (what was done in class) was 2.3, which was lower than we expected. The average score on the takehome part of the assignment was 3.3. Students exceeded our expectations on the takehome part. Many provided definitions of critical thinking through writing in finance that demonstrated advanced thought and research. Some students even cited their sources, which was not required, but was enlightening to us. We plan to require this in the future. Overall, we consider this to be a very successful assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: CTW Assignment 2 - Writing for Business (O: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this writing assignment, students are asked to summarize several articles that discuss similarities and (mainly) differences between academic writing and business writing. We ask students to write a memo, addressed to their English Composition teacher, discussing what they learned from their reading of the articles. On the day that students brought their papers to class, they were placed in groups of 3-4 where they read each others first drafts. Using the feedback they received from their peers, and learning from the first drafts of others they read, students were then asked to edit/rewrite their memos to be turned in the next class period. In general, the final papers that we received were well written and most highlighted the most salient aspects of the articles. Students followed instructions well and many incorporated the principles of good business writing, as discussed in the articles, into their memo. This assignment did not ask for any analysis, so the evaluation was based mainly on the quality of writing. Overall, the quality of these written assignments exceeded expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: CTW Assignment 2 - Writing for Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This assignment was scored using the simple rubric for Assignment 1. The rubric scores for the assignment are 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4. Our target score is 3.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The memos that were submitted for this assignment exceeded our expectations. The average score was 3.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: CTW Assignment 3 - Argumentative Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goal of this assignment was for the memos to be well written, properly addressed and formatted, and reflective of knowledge gained from the articles. Students seemed to enjoy reading each others memos, and from the volume of the ensuing discussion as reported by faculty who used this assignment, they appeared to offer each other useful suggestions for improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 3: CTW Assignment 3 - Argumentative Essay (O: 2, 3)

This assignment was scored using the General Rubric for FI 4020 Assignments. The assignment was evaluated for Items 1, 4, 6 and 7. The maximum score possible was 15 and the minimum possible score 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 O3: CTW Assignment 3 - Argumentative Essay

The target grade for this assignment was 3.0.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Our expectation was an average grade of 3.

M 4: CTW Assignment 4 - "Case Name" Business Analysis (O: 4)

Only one faculty member (Pete Eisemann) used this assignment and submitted results. Others were encouraged to use the assignment, but it is not clear if they did so or not. The assignment was graded with the Grading Rubric for Business Analysis that Pete created. Pete used this assignment and rubric for three different cases in the class. The case for this specific writing assignment was covered during the 10th week of the term.

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

Target for O4: CTW Assignment 4 - "Case Name" Business Analysis

Based on the rubric used to evaluate the papers submitted for this assignment, the maximum possible score was 20. The expected average score for this assignment was 13.5, which related to an evaluation of "fair." We expected a low score for two reasons. First, this was the first assignment in the course that used this specific set of guidelines. An assignment learning curve was expected. Second, because this assignment occurred early in the semester, we did not expect students to have yet mastered the art of business and financial analysis. Learning how to properly analyze a case is part of the instruction that takes place in the course. It is difficult for students to demonstrate critical thinking skills related to financial analysis before they learn how to properly do financial analysis.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Similar to last year, the average score on this assignment was lower than we expected. Whereas student writing was judged as being above average, students did not demonstrate sufficient critical thinking. In general, the analysis part of the papers we received was weak and few students offered suggestions for solutions to the problem of inventory fraud.

M 5: CTW Assignment 5 - "Case Name" Business Analysis (O: 5)

Only one faculty member (Pete Eisemann) used this assignment and submitted results. Others were encouraged to use the assignment, but it is not clear if they did so or not. The assignment was graded with the Grading Rubric for Business Analysis that Pete created. Pete used this assignment and rubric for three different cases in the class. The case for this specific writing assignment was covered during the 6th week of the term.

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

Target for O5: CTW Assignment 5 - "Case Name" Business Analysis

Based on the rubric used to evaluate the papers submitted for this assignment, the maximum possible score was 20. The expected average score for this assignment was 15, which related to an evaluation of "good."

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The actual average score on this assignment was 14.5, the standard deviation was 2.6, the minimum score was 9.0 and the maximum score was 19.5. We note significant improvement in the average score from the first assignment as well as a narrower deviation of scores. Overall, the writing and critical thinking components of these papers met expectations and the improvement over the prior assignment was significant.

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 class who write poorly) it is our goal to help them improve their writing skills so that they can more effectively communicate their ideas.
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 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. Finally, to increase the effectiveness of course delivery, class sizes have been reduced to 30 students.

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 2011-12 academic year (not yet decided).

Challenges and Plan for 2011-12

The finance department has supported the CTW initiative from the beginning. We are committed to make the CTW aspect of our designated course, FI 4020, which all finance students are required to take for the major, as effective as possible. As a case based course that focuses on the analysis of financial statements and financial based decisions within a firm and/or with regards to a firm, FI 4020 is a natural choice in our department for CTW. Even before CTW, one of the most significant learning objectives of the course was that students would develop the ability to critically analyze a firm's financial position and be able to develop solutions to address identified weaknesses. Although applying CTW to FI 4020 seems natural, in fact, implementing the program presents significant challenges. Prior to CTW, most instructors evaluated student progress in critical thinking through evaluation of student preparation, in-class case discussion (we cover nearly one new case per week), financial analysis problem sets and frequent exams. None who teach the class believe that CTW assignments are a substitute for our traditional manner of evaluating student critical thinking. Thus, CTW added an additional burden to instructors, specifically grading and providing significant feedback on nearly 200 student papers per semester. FI 4020 is a very full and challenging course to teach without this extra burden. The cases used in the class and case assignments are constantly being changed to remain current to shifting economic and market conditions. Thus, getting faculty to implement CTW in their courses is difficult. It also complicates recruitment of faculty to teach the course. Nonetheless, we will continue to work as best we can to make FI 4020 an effective CTW course. Our chairman is supportive of the program and he continues to work with me to address the issues noted above. We are confident that the writing assignments now developed for the course are sufficiently detailed and effective. Our major challenge moving forward is to rally new faculty to support the approach that we have developed, to develop consistent scoring guidelines and to collect and efficiently evaluate assessment data. Hopefully the data and evaluation we do next year will continue to strengthen the CTW aspect of FI 4020 as well as the overall program within our department.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Richard Fendler and the finance faculty assigned to teach FI 4020 during the 2011-12 academic year (not yet decided).

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

This was a difficult year for me relative to CTW because I did not teach any sections of FI 4020 (the finance department’s designated CTW course) this academic year. One section of the course each semester was taught by Pete Eisemann, who taught the course and been involved with both the WAC and CTW programs for many years. All other sections of the course, however, were taught by faculty new to the course and/or new to CTW. Nonetheless, I believe the finance department made significant progress in the application of our CTW goals and plans for this year. The most significant progress for this year was improved communication and coordination among faculty teaching the course. We met before, and continued to communicate throughout, each semester. We developed a common rubric for FI 4020 writing assignments, most faculty submitted scoring reports and, mainly due to the efforts of Pete Eisemann, we developed a generic template for writing the business analysis of a credit memo for cases we use in the course. Pete used this template for three of the CTW tasks that he assigned in his courses. Other faculty used some parts of the template for their assignments this year. In the future, we will make Pete’s generic business analysis writing template a central part of the CTW program for the finance department. The beauty of the template is that we can apply it to any three cases that we use in the course.

FI 4020 is a case based course and most of us use between 6 to 10 cases each semester, though not all faculty use the same cases. By developing a generic writing assignment, each instructor can choose the cases to apply the assignment to, providing individual faculty academic freedom, and each faculty member can alter the cases that we assign the project to each semester, thereby reducing the incidence of cheating. The instructions that Pete created provide students with a complete explanation of the use of credit memos by financial institutions, specific guidelines how to write the business analysis section of a credit memo, and scoring guidelines for their case write-ups. These guidelines and improved coordination among faculty concerning the implementation of CTW in FI 4020 directly relate to the Action Plan that we specified last year.

Finally, to increase the effectiveness of course delivery, class sizes have been reduced to 30 students.

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 2011-12 academic year (not yet decided).

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

It is difficult to assess the improvement in critical thinking among the students in our classes that is due to CTW for two reasons. First, FI 4020 is a course in financial statement analysis. We teach students the tools of financial analysis and then we instruct them, via cases, to put the tools of analysis into practice. Analysis involves critical thinking. In fact, improvement in critical thinking skills and appropriate application of those skills have always been key learning objectives of the course. Thus, ever prior to our incorporating CTW assignments into the course, we noted improvement in critical thinking skills of our students in the class from the beginning of the course to the end. Prior to CTW, we measured this improvement through in-class case discussion, case based problems and exams. Now we also use CTW assignments as another way to assess improvement in critical thinking. Whether or not our CTW assignments have actually made critical thinking among our students any better than what it was before is difficult, if not impossible, to directly measure. Second, although we have noticed improvements in the writing skills of our students, both prior to the course and throughout the course, we are not sure of the cause of this improvement. We are concerned that the main source of this progress is that the instructions that we use for our assignments are now better written and more complete. Also, by providing students with rubrics before they write, students write to the rubric. That is, we tell students what we want them to do and we pre-provide them with specific scoring guidelines better now than we did in the past. Because our instructions are more precise, student writing and what we
identify as critical thinking through writing appears to be improved, relative to prior years. Also, within the semester, that is, from the first assignment to the last assignment, the feedback we provide to students on early papers guides them to write better. The rubric based scores they receive on follow-up papers in the course improve, but I am not completely convinced that the improved scores are due to improvements in critical thinking. They may merely be due to improvement in following instructions.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Because the instructors who teach this class change nearly every year, we need improved faculty training concerning both the course and CTW. I most likely will not teach FI 4020 again next year (most of my teaching duties will be at the graduate level) and because Pete Eisemann is taking early retirement this summer, he will not be teaching the course next year either. This means that probably two new faculty members will be teaching FI 4020 next year and of the repeat instructors, both are still relatively new to the course. FI 4020 is a very difficult course to teach, both due to the subject matter and the fact that the course is mainly case based. Case teaching is challenging to most instructors. Teaching this course is best learned by doing, as is CTW. It can take many semesters to learn how to teach the many different cases that are used in this course and then many more semesters to learn how to effectively employ CTW assignments. With the turnover that we have in faculty who teach the course and with the challenges inherent in teaching the course without CTW, making sure that writing projects are being assigned and properly evaluated is extremely difficult. Faculty new to teaching the course resist assigning and grading numerous papers. The course is already very full and we do not have significant faculty positions open. I am still very leery of assigning numerous CTW assignments at this time without the burden of numerous CTW assignments. I am not sure what assistance could be provided to address these areas short of several new faculty members for the finance department. Writing assistants do not really help, because they change nearly every semester and most faculty find that it takes more time to train a writing assistant than the assistant saves. Our chairman has been very supportive of my efforts and of the CTW aspect of the course. He placed an enrollment cap of 30 students on all sections of the course last year, which makes grading of writing assignments at least more manageable than when the average class size was 40. However, due to growing enrollments and unfilled faculty positions in our department, seasoned faculty, such as me, are being assigned to different courses. Pete Eisemann’s retirement only exacerbates the situation for next year.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

The primary impact of CTW on our department is improved communication and support among the faculty who teach this class. Most who have taught the class over the past 3 years believe that CTW is a good idea. Also, over the years, we seem to have converged in our understanding of the program and in our ideas of how to best implement CTW in the course. Our chairman supports the program and is committed to try to keep enrollment numbers in the class as low as possible, acknowledging the extra burden created by the grading of writing assignments. As for the impact of the CTW program on our students, there is consensus among those who teach the class that student writing has improved. Because we teach students the principles of correct business writing, which differs from good writing composition, we believe that the students exiting the course writing better business text. Not only do the students writing better business text, but they also have a better understanding of the nature and principles of a credit memo and knowing the difference between good business writing and good academic writing are valuable lessons. Our department continues to assess the value of CTW and to find ways to improve the implementation of the program. I will meet with all faculty who will be teaching FI 4020 at least twice during the summer and I plan to talk with each FI 4020 instructor on a monthly basis during the fall semester. I believe frequent communication, where I stress the importance and the goals of CTW, is necessary to ensure compliance with the goals of the program within our department.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We made some changes to the assignments that we used this year. We combined the first 2 assignments into one assignment and we (thanks to Pete Eisemann) developed a generic template of instructions for writing the business analysis part of a credit memo. We used that generic template for three of the writing assignments for the course. We plan to continue using this template in future years - the only changes will be in the cases that the template is assigned to. We do not plan any other significant changes to the assessment process next year. Our main challenge will be to make sure that the current assessment process (assignments, targets, etc.) is carried out by all faculty teaching the class next year, especially the faculty who are new to teaching the course and new to CTW.

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

The data that we collected this year is both interesting and informative, however, we do not plan any changes in our degree program due to our findings. As was the case last year, we are still in the discovery stage of CTW. We are not yet convinced that we have figured out the best way to implement CTW into this course and we are still struggling to get all faculty who teach the course to completely buy into CTW. In our meetings, faculty support the CTW initiative. Getting them to use common assignments, scoring the assignment with rubrics and submitting individual assignment rubric based scores to me each year is still a challenge. Thus, at this point, the data that we are collecting is mainly being used to support that notion that the CTW initiative is working and that we need to continue to refine the implementation of CTW into our degree program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Last year’s CTW report was used by those who taught the department’s CTW course this year as a guide to better understanding CTW and for improving the implementation of CTW in the course. Outside of this group, last year’s results were not used to make any specific changes within the department.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

The main lesson we learned from our assessment of CTW in FI 4020 for this year is that overall students seem to display improvement in their ability to express critical thinking through writing as the semester progresses. However, we cannot say for certain that this progression is due to CTW. Because an objective of the course has always been to develop the ability to critically think, we may merely be observing additional evidence of what we were already evaluating through different means (i.e., in-class case discussion, problem sets and frequent exams). In addition, we are not completely certain that our assessment of improved critical thinking through writing is correct. Specifically, we are not sure if we are observing improvement in critical thinking or if we are merely observing improvements in following our writing instructions. As we continue to develop more precise instructions for writing
administrations and more precise rubrics for evaluation of these assignments, we are concerned that students are merely writing the way that we are telling them to write and we are accessing this as improvement in critical thinking. I would like to see this issue more adequately addressed and explored in our next CTW workshop in August.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

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

I have spoken with our department chair about the need to have all members of the faculty support CTW. We plan to get more faculty involved with the CTW course and through this means to achieve greater support for the CTW program overall. One concern we have with this idea concerns that extra amount of work that CTW imposes on those of us who teach the course. Our CTW course, FI 4020, is a very difficult course to teach. It is a case based course that requires constant research to make sure that the cases used in the class are up to date and pertinent to market and economic conditions. Our department chair lowered the enrollment cap on the class to 30 this year, which is lower than the average of 40 for the past several years, but still presents a very large number of papers to grade in a writing intensive course. Also, we have experienced difficulty maintaining consistency in the faculty who teach this course each year. For example, due to needs in other teaching areas, I did not teach any sections of FI 4020 last year and will probably not teach any next year either. Likewise, another key faculty member and department supporter of CTW (Pete Eisemann) will not be teaching any sections of FI 4020 next year because he is taking early retirement. Due to budget and personnel restrictions coupled with growing enrollments, there is not a lot that we can do this coming year to improve the implementation of CTW in our department. I will work as hard as possible to teach the new instructors about CTW and to encourage all to use the common CTW assignments that we have developed. I believe that our assignments and grading rubrics are very good and I perceive that students are becoming increasingly supportive of CTW in general. 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. *I am teaching a summer section of FI 4020 and from discussions with my class as well as the results of the first 2 assignments in the class, I notice significant changes in student attitudes towards CTW. Students are more aware of the program and its goals, they better understand the difference between business writing and academic writing and they complain less about being asked to write than they did several years ago.*

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW French**

As of: 12/15/2016 04:10 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

In accordance with the University's regulations regarding the Critical Thinking through Writing component of courses, the French faculty has defined critical thinking in French as follows: students who demonstrate their commitment to critical thinking through writing analyses, and who improve the quality of their work through the rewriting of successive drafts, gain a better understanding of the intellectual production that has taken place among French-language writers over the past several hundred years. They learn more about French thinking processes and are better equipped to find and express their own voices in the target language.

**Goals**

G 1: Goal for French

French majors in CTW courses are able to apply their critical judgment by writing commentaries on literary texts and answering critical questions on literary and civilization topics. More specifically, students who think critically about French culture and literature can: 1. Interpret (categorize, decide significance, clarify meaning), 2. Analyze (examine ideas, identify arguments, analyze arguments), 3. Evaluate (assess claims, assess arguments), 4. Infer (query evidence, conjecture alternatives, draw conclusions), 5. Explain (state results, justify procedures, present arguments), 6. Self-reflect (self-examine, self-correct according to the advice and comments that were given for the first phase of the assignment and then for the second phase).

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Objective (G: 1) (M: 1)

The objective in French courses is to have an amount of 80% enrolled students reaching a CTW rating of 4 on a scale going from 1 to 6.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M 1: Assignments descriptions (O: 1)

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 (usually on a text in prose), the second is a text analysis (usually a poem). In the civilization courses (FREN4103 and FREN4123), the two assignments are essays related to civilization topics; in the FREN4103 course the topics are more historical than in the FREN4123 course, where they are more related to contemporary civilization issues.

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

**Target for O1: Objective**

The target is a rating of 4 (on a scale going from 1 to 6) for 80% of the students enrolled in the course.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2010-2011, the target was reached for two courses (FREN3033 and FREN4103) but was not reached for one course.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action plan
This past year was the second year for teaching CTW courses in French. There were three faculty members involved but among those three, one was new for CTW and was trained. We need to have one workshop in August to discuss the "data analysis" (attached), as one course did not meet the goal of 4 for 80% defined for the French major so the goal was only partially met. We need to understand why this is so and also answer the following questions: 1) Is this goal realistic? 2) Are there discrepancies among the faculty rating students' work (the exercise done last year to have the same piece of work rated by three different faculty members did not show big discrepancies but maybe this is only because the work rated was too obvious)? 3) Should we lower the number of students to 75% instead?

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Workshop in August
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Eric Le Calvez
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increase the courses meeting the target
Need to determine if the high figures for the two courses reaching the target are because of too generous ratings; on the other hand, the ratings for FREN4123 need to be improved. Will have to analyze if the average result is due to the student body or to the way the assignments are being rated. That should not be the case as they are being rated according to the rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assignments descriptions | Outcome/Objective: Objective
Implementation Description: Will reflect on the issue in Fall 2011 when the course is given again.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Eric Le Calvez
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
- We were not able to determine any discrepancies among faculty members rating students' work, this will be another challenge this year. Maybe this is too early to be certain of what is going on (why the Contemporary France course did not meet the goal) as this can be completely related to the quality of the students involved in the course (in particular, this year the faculty member who taught Contemporary France found out that a big number of students were poor in the target language, which certainly was a disadvantage as the linguistic component in the target language is an important one for the CTW). - We were able to refine and simplify the rubric.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
What is very interesting when looking at the Data Analysis 2010-2011 is to see the differences between FREN4123, FREN3033 and FREN4103. FREN4123 is the only course that did not reach the target of 4 for 80% students; and yet, this is the course where students get better results throughout the semester (78% versus 26% and 45% respectively). In the same way, FREN3033 and FREN4103 see students obtaining lower ratings throughout the semester (24% and 28%) whereas in FREN4123, only 1% obtain lower levels. In the FREN4123 course, students were able to better structure their second assignment from their self-reflection after the first assignment (the first phase of the CTW in each course is a detailed outline of 2 pages) and to have (in general) more logical thoughts in their argumentation.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
- The most problematic (all faculty members agree about this) is the amount of quite required to do the exercise well. The students agree too; even if they feel in general that they improve and that the exercise helps them, they think it is too time-consuming (one student had, in fall 2010, four CTW courses at once!). - Development needed (see action plan): we need to reflect on the target for the French major and on the way students are rated by faculty members.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
Changes: FREN4103 has been taught as a CTW course for the first time and was quite successful; one faculty member has been trained to teach a CTW course for the first time. As all spring 2011, the three courses that have been designed as CTW courses have now been taught. Although they complain in general, students seem to realize that they actually benefit from the CTW exercise.
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) (M: 2)
Geology of Georgia project. The purpose of this project is to analyze, synthesize, interpret, and communicate the state of knowledge regarding the sedimentary environments and stratigraphy represented by the rocks and sediment of Georgia. Each student will go through a semester-long process of building an individual paper, and then synthesizing his or her paper with those of his or her classmates.

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 element of the rubric, with a total of 24 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
Of the 18 undergraduates in the course, 16 completed both assignments. Of these, 11, or 73% improved from the first paper to the last. This is slightly below achievement targets. Of those who turned in the final paper, 8 of the 16, or 50% achieved an average score of 24 or better. This is well below the achievement target.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 17 students who completed the two paragraph assignments, 65% improved from the first assignment to the third, 11% stayed the same, and 23% did not improve. This achievement target was not met. Of the 17 students who completed the two paragraphs, 100% achieved a 26 or better on the second paragraph submission.
M 2: Term Paper Rubric (O: 3, 4)

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 would 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 would improve from draft 1 to draft 2.

Target for O4: Group Research Project

80% of students’ assessment scores should equal or exceed 20, which represents working understanding of the rubric elements. 80% of students should improve from the first draft of the assignment to the final draft.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of the 33 students enrolled in the course achieved at least a score of 20 on the assessment score for both the first and second drafts. All students improved between the first draft and the final draft.

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

All students should improve from draft 1 to the final draft. 80% of students should achieve a score of 20 or better on the final assessment score.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All students improved from draft 1 to the final draft of the final project. All students achieved at least a 20 on the final paper, with the lowest score a 22 and the highest a 33.

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
**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

The Department of Geosciences successfully offered four unique CTW courses and had a productive year. From the 2009-2010 academic year to the 2010-2011 academic year, several improvements were implemented, which seemed to improve the process. First, the rubric was streamlined in the Urban Geography course, which was a necessary change. The assignment for the Climatic Change course was also revised, and students seemed to do well, in general. What has been useful across the course offerings is the explicit attention to CTW assignments and the assessment process. While still not yet perfect, the conscious attention to this process has, on the whole, yielded positive results for the CTW faculty and students. For two of the courses (Sed-Strat and Senior Seminar), the instructors reported very successful assignments and student achievement.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

As a faculty group teaching CTW courses, we have not had conversations about this question. Given the uniqueness of the department offering two separate majors and yet a single Senior Seminar, we are still working on what critical thinking might look like from earlier courses to the capstone across two distinct disciplines.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

The unwillingness of some faculty members to participate in the reporting process has been problematic for the effective implementation of the CTW initiative in Geosciences. Some clear incentive for CTW instructors may assist in this problem.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

The impact has been modest, but nonetheless, merely having conversations about critical thinking, developing assignments and corresponding rubrics has required a rethinking of our department's curriculum and how it serves both critical thinking and our respective disciplines (geography and geology). To that end, it has initiated helpful conversations which should be ongoing.

**Academic Program Question 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

For Urban Geography: revised rubric. For Climatic Change: revised assignment. For Senior Seminar: revised assignment, revised rubric. The targets have remained the same; however, there is unevenness across the reported outcomes (with two courses reporting achievement well below the 80% target and two courses reporting 100% achievement). This should be addressed with more careful conversations and training with CTW instructors.

**Academic Program Question 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Department of Geosciences is in the process of developing new B.S./B.A. degrees, and the CTW initiative has shaped how that process is unfolding in terms of requiring an articulation of specific learning objectives, measurable outcomes, and the inclusion of critical thinking (and other skills) in the curriculum.

**Administrative Dept Question 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Changes took place among the practices of CTW instructors, their assignments, and rubrics.

**Administrative Dept Question 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

That there is unevenness across our CTW courses, and that the capstone course (Senior Seminar), where we include a portfolio in the overall assessment of our majors, has yielded a rethinking of the learning objectives and outcomes for our students.

**Administrative Department Question 3:**

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

A modest improvement in the CTW assignments and assessment is anticipated, although as the department works through a restructuring of its BA/BS program, the lessons learned from the CTW process will be invaluable.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW German**

(As of: 12/13/2016 04:10 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 closely whether it is completely accurate • 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 for critical thinking = Auseinandersetzungsvermögen (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 their intellectual and personal 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. The challenge unique to CTW in a foreign language is the rigorous task of interpretation and evaluation in a non-native context of imperfectly mastered grammar and syntax and a lexicon with sub textual subtleties.

**Goals**

**G 2: Reflections on the Morality of Neutrality - The Case of Switzerland**

Students were assigned the same topic in the entry level (German 3301) and capstone courses (German 4402) to experiment with tracking improvement in critical thinking. The test group was possible due to the size of the program. The students were asked to write in German and in English so that the Weave report would have a record of the students work. The theme developed out of the discussion of Switzerland’s neutrality and its implications during the second world war and the subsequent scandals with Nazi gold reserves. From the Rubric the CTW goals were limited to "fair-mindedly following where evidence and reasons lead" and "makes judgments based on the evaluation of the evidence." The hope was that the students would have developed a higher skill set and cultural knowledge over the year to identify the salient arguments and communicate them with refinement.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 5: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology (G: 2) (M: 3)**

Essay of 350-400 words on the morality of neutrality, the case of Switzerland. The objective was to track development of CTW skills from the entry level course to the capstone course in a year where there was an overlap of students taking both in the same reporting year. This was the only assignment that was not lost in the improper handling of student samples documented elsewhere. From the current rubric, where a goal of 4 is preferred, the skills set focus was whether the student could fair-mindedly follow where evidence and reason lead and make judgments based on an evaluation of all the evidence. The assignment only required secondary sources where the student wanted to integrate more historical data on Switzerland’s perceived culpability (through inaction or furtiveness) in World War II and after. The moral implications of neutrality could also be presented independent of research as long as the student’s views were justified drawing support from experience (personal and from the lectures), yet also integrating contrary interpretations.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.
M 3: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology (O: 5)

Outcome: Student should demonstrate critical thinking through writing skills by supporting the main idea of the assignment and showing proficiency in fair-mindedly following where evidence and reasons lead. Measure: Student shall write a 350-400 word essay in German and in English which focuses on a moral concept based on a German speaking country's political and cultural philosophy of neutrality (Switzerland). Assessment of the assignment (how it is measured) is based on the ability of the student to distinguish between fact and opinion, explore relevant historical and cultural contexts and achieve a clear organization of ideas with concrete conclusions in the limited framework of a shorter essay. Of the four student essays reviewed by the assigning faculty, 100% showed an improvement in critical thinking skills of at least one point on the 1-6 scale (see graph in repository). Student 1: a growth from a superficial and terse statement on war and taking sides to a more focused essay on the assigned topic of Switzerland, albeit with flaws in structure in integration of ideas. Student 2: a growth from a single somewhat ego-centric perspective to a more thorough examination of historical evidence and global implications. Student 3: a growth from a limited exposed that failed to recognize context and ethical implications to an essay that at least succinctly addresses the ethical dimensions of the issue. Student 4: a growth from a rather unfocused essay on the advantages of neutrality with no clear definition of the morale issue to one with historical perspective and a respectful analysis of other positions. The goal was a 4 on all assignments and the students achieved that score in the capstone course. Our goal is to work on the assignment structure at the entry level course to effect better results at an earlier level of study. This will be facilitated with an e-platform that allows for self-reflection and enables the student to see their growth during the semester.

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

M 3: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology

Target for OS: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology

Based on data from last and this year’s assessment, we feel that common assignments between CTW classes should be explored further in order to track statistically improvement in critical thinking with individual students in the program, at least as far as the skill sets we measure in the rubric. We plan to continue our action plan from 2010-2011 as regards our commitment to develop a body of written assignments i.e. thematic exercises as a whole section which are available before the class begins and are stored in our MCL German folder on a drive accessible to all faculty. This will eliminate the problem of papers being lost and incomplete data. With new faculty coming in the fall we can revise the type of assignments we know from experience most fairly assess student learning and achievement and brainstorm other, newer assignments that should lead to more reasonable and thus measurable outcomes from the rubric. The other changes in the rubric and curriculum have been documented elsewhere. The goal was a 4 on all assignments and the students achieved that score in the capstone course. Our goal is to work on the assignment structure at the entry level course to effect better results at an earlier level of study. This will be facilitated with an e-platform that allows for self-reflection and enables the student to see their growth during the semester.

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Of the four student essays reviewed by the assigning faculty, 100% showed an improvement in critical thinking skills of at least one point on the 1-6 scale (see graph in repository). These findings are from an assignment given to students who were enrolled in both our entry level course (German 3301) in fall of 2010 and our capstone course (German 4402) in spring of 2011. The assignment was standardized in order to begin tracking CTW development over a 2 semester/1 year period. Student 1: a growth from a superficial and terse statement on war and taking sides to a more focused essay on the assigned topic of Switzerland, albeit with flaws in structure in integration of ideas. Growth of CTW skills based on rubric from 2 - 3 (goal is 4) Student 2: a growth from a single somewhat ego-centric perspective to a more thorough examination of historical evidence and global implications. Growth of CTW skills from 2 - 4 which meets goal of department. Student 3: a growth from a limited exposed that failed to recognize context and ethical implications to an essay that at least succinctly addresses the ethical dimensions of the issue. Growth of CTW skills from 4 - 5 which exceeds departmental goal of 4. Student 4: a growth from a rather unfocused essay on the advantages of neutrality with no clear definition of the morale issue to one with historical perspective and a respectful analysis of other positions. Growth of CTW skills from 2 - 5 which is the most conspicuous improvement and exceeds departmental goal of 4. The above finding can be found in graph form in the repository. These findings summarize our report for both German 3302 and 4402 based on the goal and achievement target. The sample was small due to the definition of the goal, to measure the same student over time. The other CTW assignments as reported earlier were lost which resulted in our action plan of a portfolio based repository for 2011-2012.

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 "spiced" 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 and/or reaction to a class discussion point is "tested" immediately and then used to further enlighten the topic being examined.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Implementation Description: Action Plan implemented through German section meetings

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Robin Y. Huff

Additional Resources: None

Action Plan for 2011-2012

Our major goals are revision of the rubric, a central repository for CTW assignments and CTW graded assignments used for measures and the switching of the CTW required course to a more appropriate one based on content. The revision of the rubric is intended to effect improved student response to the CTW component of the course by making the rating scale more user friendly and the rating criteria more explicit as to what is needed for improvement. The central repository will make it easier for faculty (continuing and new) to standardize assignments deemed to be most conducive to the goals of CTW and not be continually forced to
draft new ideas for each semester/syllabus. The other faculty will also be aware of what is happening in that course and because many students are shared among courses, support can be given in non CTW courses in a subtle interdisciplinary way if core topics are mirrored in multiple courses. This will also prevent loss of data and student samples as occurred this past year. - The grammar capstone course has proven to be a stumbling block to CTW assignments which are perceived as onerous and contrary to the goals of mastering German grammar and syntax. The goal is to change the grammar course to a 3000 level course to ensure mastery at an earlier level, change the capstone course to a culture based interdisciplinary context course such as Literature and Film and add an advanced conversation and composition course to the entry level curriculum to facilitate the integration of CTW assignments into that more thematically based course. We anticipate a better student response to the CTW component, a clearer understanding of the goals of the initiative and subsequently better student performance. We plan to document the progress of the student for their and our edification in a portfolio format perhaps with "digication."

Rubric Revision and Thematic Assignment Bank/Portfolios

Our major goals are revision of the rubric, a central repository for CTW assignments and CTW graded assignments used for measures and the switching of the CTW required course to a more appropriate one based on content. - The revision of the rubric is intended to effect improved student response to the CTW component of the course by making the rating scale more user friendly and the rating criteria more explicit as to what is needed for improvement. - The central repository will make it easier for faculty (controlling and new) to standardize assignments deemed to be most conducive to the goals of CTW and not be continually forced to draft new ideas for each semester/syllabus. The other faculty will also be aware of what is happening in that course and because many students are shared among courses, support can be given in non CTW courses in a subtle interdisciplinary way if core topics are mirrored in multiple courses. This will also prevent loss of data and student samples as occurred this past year. - The grammar capstone course has proven to be a stumbling block to CTW assignments which are perceived as onerous and contrary to the goals of mastering German grammar and syntax. The goal is to change the grammar course to a 3000 level course to ensure mastery at an earlier level, change the capstone course to a culture based interdisciplinary context course such as Literature and Film and add an advanced conversation and composition course to the entry level curriculum to facilitate the integration of CTW assignments into that more thematically based course. We anticipate a better student response to the CTW component, a clearer understanding of the goals of the initiative and subsequently better student performance. We plan to document the progress of the student for their and our edification in a portfolio format perhaps with "digication."

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection Questions 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

One of the goals we specified last year has been initiated with some success. Course and catalog change takes some time, but we have begun the transition of traditional survey courses like Introduction to Literature to more vital culture based courses under the rubric of German Studies whose content is more relevant to our goals of cultural analysis and reflection on values. What has worked especially well from our Action Plan last year are the speed assignments with limited learning outcome goals. That would include in class, non-revised, mini commentaries on topics covered in class and still fresh in the students' mind. We have expanded this exercise to peer review with commentary and assessment. That has seemed to make the more comprehensive and systematic CTW assessments we do for larger assignments less inscrutable to the students because they see it in action and have some degree of ownership of its process and intent. One goal that was not met for which I must take full responsibility was my intent for the German Section to meet more regularly to discuss and develop a body of thematic exercises that could be used for critical thinking writing assignments in upcoming classes. The faculty was not able to come together as a whole to discuss and compare evaluations and brainstorm broad discrepancies or variables in assessment as much as I had hoped. As we are losing and gaining a faculty in German, I will remedy this lack of planning with August training sessions. From previous CTW classes and pilots, we had discovered as well that the type of assignments we previously used to evaluate critical thinking were very limited (traditional essays with "controversial topics"). I am proud to say we were able to experiment with a single essay topic given to the same students taking the entry level (German 3301) and the capstone course (German 4402) in the same academic/reporting year. Those essays and rubric scores enabled us to track the development of critical thinking in a very rudimentary fashion, although the time frame of two semesters is not ideal. The size of our department made the comparison possible with the overlap of some cultural themes in the two courses. The findings and measures of that study are displayed in that section of this report. In addition, a curriculum change throughout the entire major has been drafted and will focus on German Studies rather than on traditional language and literature. We plan to add a course on Advanced Conversation and Composition that is much more adaptable to the writing component than Advanced Grammar, which is currently the capstone course. Writing assignments became onerous to the students who have sufficient difficulty with grammar and syntax.

CTW Reflection Questions 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Despite last year's reflections/action plan we were not able to initiate the outline/subject header assignments originally intended for both entry level and capstone courses. Nor did we meet as scheduled to develop more standard assignments so that the CTW instructor would not have to start from scratch when developing a syllabus. Part of this problem was due to my lack of supervision of the courses I did not teach. We did, however, see improvement in the skills we did measure for a majority of students, even over one semester. For this reason we plan to do standardized assignments, some with outlines and a final product without major revisions, others with revisions based on peer review before the instructor has read the assignment. We also plan to continue with "speed" assignments where a fresh topic is addressed within minutes of its introduction in class. An example from this past year would be the demonstrations at the Vienna Opera Ball (protesting vulgar materialism, etc.). The students had to take a pro/con stance and address their reaction to the non-violent disruption of this long standing cultural highlight of Viennese society. The maximum time allowed was 5 minutes. The results were informative in addressing the ability of the students to take ownership quickly of their
position and draw support from experience and information not copied or reworked from assigned sources. Unfortunately as I did not teach any CTW courses this past year, there was little development in assignments, although we did initiate a new experimental cross-course assignment where we could try and track critical thinking development (at least based on score) for the same student over a one year (i.e., 2 semester) sequence. We limited the assignment to 350 words and had it written in English and in German to make sure there were no flaws based on language inadequacy. As a result of this experiment, or perhaps because of the nature of the assignment, our section is beginning to see the development of analytical skills in students over the course of the major, a finding we did not see last year. The teaching of language has long been perceived as a linguistic exercise but we have known all along that there is no language teaching apart from culture. By focusing on many cultural differences in our CTW assignments, this truth has had more credibility and the integrity of our program has been strengthened in the way that it fits into the university's strategic plan of globalization. By reviewing the egocentric and socio-centric approaches to issues of global significance displayed by some students, we have been able to adapt our teaching strategies and learning outcome goals to focus on the scope and context of issues. Our fervent hope is that the evaluation skills of our students will be sharpened and we can document more tangible evidence of the actual acquisition of critical thinking in our courses. The positive results we have already seen are documented in the measures and findings section.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

In looking back over the last year, I again feel that the basic definition and core goals of critical thinking have not changed, although we have been putting less focus on accuracy in the target language and more on analysis, structure and integrated conclusions. Through our original definition we had hoped to equip students with the tools necessary to query their intellectual and personal 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. This has proven to be somewhat daunting and we are continually rethinking the nature of the assignments as they relate to our definition of critical thinking. The challenge unique to CTW in a foreign language is the rigorous task of interpretation and evaluation within a non-native writing context of imperfectly mastered grammar and syntax, further complicated by the use of lexis with textual subtleties. The rubric has been somewhat of a hindrance in guiding students, especially in the type of revision needed. That is why we are considering revising the rubric and simplifying the language but at the same time giving more detailed feedback (see repository). The scale itself will be more descriptive and motivational by rating a student with more than numbers, yet retaining the six point scale needed to integrate with our learning outcomes. By focusing on merging and developing skills with concrete critiques of the strengths and weaknesses in issue identification, contextual analysis, successful ownership of the writer’s position and supporting data, we hope to track more positive development of the desired skill set. The assessment process had major flaws in 2010-2011 that need to be addressed by the faculty, i.e., German Section in the coming semester. The rubric is being redesigned as discussed above and I will also have new faculty to train in CTW. The assessment process will be redesigned to be more student friendly in the descriptors and the type and quantity of CTW assignments will be standardized. The most significant change that must be made is the process of collecting and storing data. In the past two years the instructor of the CTW class had simply collected the assignments and returned them to the students with the scores, often for revision, depending on the nature of the task. At the end of the semester I would ask for samples of student work with the attached score to make my analysis. When I had the foresight, I would ask the instructor to make sure the students submitted their work on line so I could have a word copy rather than having to scan them. As it turned out this past year, both CTW courses were taught by one faculty and I did not supervise the course, its assignments or how they were collected. Having waited until the end of the semester proved disastrous when a cleaning person at the instructor’s home discarded most of the unfiled assignments which were stacked near a table of items to be taken to the recycling. Luckily a key assignment common to both courses was salvaged. It was a sobering moment that will lead to a central method to store all student work in portfolio format in upcoming semesters for both CTW courses. The assistance we need may include the use of the WAC portfolio.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

I think the primary impact on the German degree is the need to overhaul the curriculum. This has been a challenge because we have only one entry level course (and one section of that) offered every year and only one 4000 level (capstone) course offered every year. We have initiated the paperwork to rename some courses, add others, and extend the CTW initiative to other courses in order to maximize efficiency and reduce the burden on one instructor who has often had back to back CTW courses. We are also taking student comments into consideration, clarifying our goals for each assignment and integrating the assignments into the expectations of the course in a more unified manner so that they are not perceived as an added "burden" or course work. I must admit that there is little communication between the languages as to what changes they are initiating and this should be a goal in our action plan for the coming year.
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Historical Mindedness (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate facility in historical thinking. See &quot;CTW Assessment Instrument&quot; in the Document Repository for more information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will become adept at historical analysis. See &quot;CTW Assessment Instrument&quot; in the Document Repository for more information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Historical Communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to communicate findings effectively. See &quot;CTW Assessment Instrument&quot; in the Document Repository for more information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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).

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
Students should achieve scores of 1 or better on the Assessment Instrument (see document 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.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**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 scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
<th>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</th>
<th>Target for O3: Historical Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>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 the effects of these differences on the ways in which the writers convey the past? Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood) (O: 1, 2, 3) Using Historical Abstracts, America: History &amp; 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</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**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.

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**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.

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**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?

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.

**M 12: Annotated Bibliography (History 4990; Grubbs) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
See "Grubbs annotated bibliography assignment.pdf" in the document repository.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
We expect students to achieve scores in the 2-3 range on the assessment instrument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Historical Communication</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 13: Prospectus (History 4990; Grubbs) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
See document "Grubbs prospectus assignment" in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Historical Communication</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 14: Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Historical Communication</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 15: Draft (History 4990; Skwiot) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Historical Communication</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 16: Paper (History 4990; Skwiot) (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
<th>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Historical Communication</td>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 17: Reading Response (History 4990; Poley) (O: 1, 2, 3)**

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Historical Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Historical Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Historical Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect students to achieve scores in the 3-4 range on the assessment instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 20: Concept Interpretation and Analysis/Concept Pairs (O: 1, 2, 3)**

See linked file from History 3000/Carolyn Biltoft

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Student scores averaged 3.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Historical Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Student scores averaged 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Historical Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Student scores averaged 3.7

**M 21: Film Review (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Historian’s Review of Inherit the Wind

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Historical Mindedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Student scores averaged 3.7
Students scored 3.7 on average.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 3.7 on average.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 3.7 on average.

**M 22: Research Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3)**

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 3.9 on average.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 3.9 on average.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 3.9 on average.

**M 23: Research Project (O: 1, 2, 3)**

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 2.5 on average.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 2.5 on average.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students scored 2.5 on average.

**M 24: Primary Source Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3)**

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

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**

Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 3.3 on average.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 3.3 on average.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 3.3 on average.

**M 25: Reading Response/Synthesis (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Reading Response/Synthesis
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 3.75 on average.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 3.75 on average.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
Student scores should average 2.5 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 3.75 on average.

**M 26: Research Paper (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Research Paper
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
Student scores should average 4.0 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 4.3 on average.

**Target for O2: Historical Interpretation**
Student scores should average 4.0 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 4.3 on average.

**Target for O3: Historical Communication**
Student scores should average 4.0 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students scored 4.3 on average.

**M 27: Peer Review (O: 1, 2, 3)**
Peer Review
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Historical Mindedness**
Student scores should average 4.0 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
Students scored 3.75 on average.
Students scored 3.75 on average.

### Target for O2: Historical Interpretation

Student scores should average 4.0 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Students scored 3.75 on average.

### Target for O3: Historical Communication

Student scores should average 4.0 as measured by instructor on the CTW Assessment Instrument

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Students scored 3.75 on average.

---

#### 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  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Assignment 3 (History 3000; Selwood)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** My Lai (History 3000; Davidson)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** My Lai (History 3000; Poley)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Peer Review (History 4990; Grubbs)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Prospectus (History 3000; Reid)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Reading Response (History 4990; Poley)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Response Paper (History 3000; Reid)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness

**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  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Assignment 2 (History 3000; Selwood)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Assignment 3 (History 3000; Selwood)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** My Lai (History 3000; Davidson)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** My Lai (History 3000; Poley)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Peer Review (History 4990; Grubbs)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Project Proposal (History 4990; Skwiot)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Prospectus (History 3000; Reid)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Reading Response (History 4990; Poley)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness  
- **Measure:** Response Paper (History 3000; Reid)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Historical Communication  
  - History Interpretation  
  - Historical Mindedness
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: Peer Review (History 4990; Skwo) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Project Proposal (History 4990; Selwood) | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
- Historical Interpretation | Historical Mindedness
- Measure: Prospectus (History 3000; Reid) | 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: Self-evaluation of the rubric to see if it continues to hold meaning as an assessment instrument.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We continued to train and certify new colleagues through a set of workshops. We also refined our collection of data – using fewer samples and having the instructors produce assessments of student work using the CTW assessment instrument. While we have kept the rubric unchanged, we have changed the way we report data, using averages rather than ranges.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit level? If you look at the file titled “Rubric Data Chart” in the Document Repository, you’ll see the raw data from all of the rubrics we collected during the 2010-2011 AY. While this is hugely unscientific (the same students aren’t being assessed, and the assessors are different too) it is interesting to notice that there is a perceived change in terms of critical thinking skills in our students when History 3000 students are compared to History 4990 ones. In other words, the capstone students seemingly are able to do critical thinking within the discipline of history more effectively than the gateway students are. In each category, history students seemed to improve, and they improved by a range of .4 to .7 (on a 5-point scale). We’ll continue to monitor this, but if these numbers hold up over time, it indicates that the CT skills taught in History 3000 are retained and then retrained over the course of the upper division coursework and the capstone course.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
I hate weave online. It is the worst and most tedious aspect of CTW.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
I think the initiative has forced a deeper reflection on the part of faculty teaching history 3000 and 4990 in the sense that we continue to see history as a discipline inherently in tune with CTW – and the reflection has allowed us to recognize those harmonies more clearly. Our major changes center mainly on how we use the larger mechanisms of assessment and reporting, and focus specifically on determining ways to generate data that will be useful to us in the long term.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Since the 2009-2010 assessment, faculty teaching resulted in improvements in achieving targeted goals in four of the five Learning Outcomes evaluated. While in 2009-2010 the Learning Outcomes for "Professional Skills" was only "partially met," by 2010-2011, the goal was "met." In 2009-2010 the Learning Outcome for all three, "Historiography," "Interdisciplinary Awareness," and "Professional Values" were "not met," but in 2010-2011 these goals were all "met." It was in the fourth Learning Outcome, "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective" that the assessment suggested slippage between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 when the evaluation fell from "partially met" to "not met." It appears the department's teaching just fell short a few percentage points in 2009-2010 from having "partially met" or "met" the department goals while in 2010-2011, the evaluations suggest just scoring over the required percentages. Consequently the suggestion of failure or improvement could be skewed depending on the sample papers. While it would be nice to find an improvement in instruction which very well might be the case, the evaluation also suggests variables in the assessment process that need to be considered. Indeed in the coming year the Undergraduate Studies Committee will evaluate
its process of evaluation to determine if this is the best way to assess student achievement. It is possible the department will want to revise its Learning Outcomes or alter its method of measuring success.

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

When in 2011-2012 the Undergraduate Studies Committee takes up the question of annual assessment in order to evaluate the method of measuring success in the major, it will also relate its assessment tool, that of using Hist 4990, to the other courses offered in the curriculum in order to determine the best form of analysis. It might be that another course such as Hist 3000 would provide clearer answers to some of the questions being asked in the Learning Outcomes. Then again it might be that the department needs to restructure Hist 4990 to engage these potential shortcomings in student achievement. Currently the changes to the curriculum in the Fall 2011 cycle are routine adjustments and not related to the goals of overall instruction. During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Undergraduate Studies Committee considered its current mission statement with an eye towards revising the explanation of what the department hopes students will gain as history majors in order to more clearly express the department's desired Learning Outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW Hospitality Administration**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:10 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 in Hospitality Strategic Management will be expected to apply the principles of strategic management in the identification and analysis of real-life business issues and problems. Students will be able to comprehensively evaluate available options and resources that would be appropriate for the involved stakeholders including guests/customers, owners/stockholders, employees and involved communities. Students will be expected to formulate and clearly communicate recommendations and implementation plans keeping in mind that the form of communication and content of the communication can vary with the involved audience/stakeholders involved. Differentiation will be made between short-term and long-term planning. Ethical considerations including social responsibility and environmental sustainability will be emphasized in the process of managing strategically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **G 1: Analytical Decision-Making**  
Students will demonstrate analytical skills in identifying problem situations, options in maximizing business results, and the ability to delineate possible results depending on identified factors. |
| **G 2: Clear Communication**  
Students will demonstrate the ability to clearly explain, in written form and in verbal presentations, the analyses of business problems and challenges, business operational options, anticipated results and action plans for implementation. |
| **G 3: Multi-functional Perspectives**  
Students will demonstrate an understanding of multi-functional areas (financial, human resources, marketing, operations, legal, physical facilities, environmental) in analyzing business situations and will demonstrate an understanding of how the functional areas impact one another and do not operation in isolation. |
| **G 5: Understanding of internal/external business environment**  
The application of analytical skills will reflect understanding of current relevant economic issues, business cycles, political/governmental issues and societal trends and issues as well as internal organizational behavior. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SLO 1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 1, 2, 3)**  
In working on a consultative project with an actual business, students will demonstrate the effective identification of business factors that can impact the achievement of the organization's goals. The identification of these factors will entail prioritizing which factors are most important to the business' success. This analysis will incorporate a comprehensive view of the internal and external environment of the organization. |

<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>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcomes of administrative support services (3.3.1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SLO 2: Prioritization of operational practices (M: 1)** |
| The industry project on trends and issues and the case studies required an understanding of how operational practices are prioritized. |
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Unknown (O: 1)

Students were assigned two case studies. The first assignment consisted of writing a one-page letter to an unspecified legislator taking a stand on a governmental or legislative issue impacting the industry segment. The requirements included the letter being no more than one page, professional written (no grammatical or spelling errors as well as proper and respectful in tone) and supported by facts. The second case, to be written by the student, was to be a description of a managerial problem that would be realistic for an entry-level manager to experience. The scoring criteria included the relevancy of the problem, identification of involved stakeholders, a delineation of options for resolving the issue and the description of the optimal solution along with justification for this choice.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

#### Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors

The target 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Both cases had possible point values of 50 each. With the first case, 72% received perfect scores of 50. The average score on the assignment was 49. The second case, in comparison, had a lower range of scores and a lower average score. The scores ranged from 35 to 50 with the average score being 44.4. The predominate problems were lack of clarity in describing the problem, not providing a comprehensive list of stakeholders, providing an insufficient list of options which, therefore, impacted the quality of the selected solution. While the target was met in terms of a combined effort on the two cases, the second case definitely reflected the propensity of students to rush into problem-solving without considering all of their options.

### M 2: Career Strategic Plan (O: 1)

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: 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 successful maintenance of a business operation and the successful maintenance of it.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Ninety-two percent of the students were able to clearly describe current, relevant issues and trends for the segment of the industry they identified as the focus of this written project.

### M 3: Information Interview (O: 1)

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: Project, either individual or group

#### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Grades for the informational interviews ranged from 85 to 100. The students selected appropriate individuals to interview and the questions, for the most part, were relevant and probing. The average score on this assignment was 93.9. Points, where lost, were due to interview questions being superficial and not career-specific.

### 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

#### 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** A list of resources will be provided for summer semester to see which ones will be most useful to the students. Based on this feedback, a revised list will be used for fall 2010.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Debby Cannon

#### Provide list of industry resources by specialization

In analyzing student performance, research related to environmental scanning (Career Strategic Plan) and identification of industry business factors (Written Industry Trends and Issues Project) were most problematic. Research focused on generic sources that are easily available on the Internet. Starting fall 2011, a comprehensive resource list will be compiled and provided to the students as expanding sources to references through professional associations (American Hotel & Lodging Association, National Restaurant Association, for example) or other trade/professional research journals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Develop and provide list of specialized, in-depth industry resources for students to use in two or more assignments.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Debby Cannon

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

Overall, the students performed at a higher level regarding achieving objectives. All of the target achievements were met. Assignments continue to be refined and, in my opinion, reflect critical thinking at higher levels. The written project requires a significant amount of information evaluation and synthesis. The cases have been improved by requiring the students to research a legislative issue and by requiring the students to develop and write one of the two cases.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

Improvements in critical thinking were evident when there were guest lecturers in class. The questions asked showed a higher level of analytical thinking and many of the guest speakers commented on the depth of the questions asked by students. I always ask guest speakers to present one or two of their most demanding business challenges to get student input and this structure has provided a good forum for students to demonstrate critical thinking abilities.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

Although the written project was effective, I am going to change the structure of the assignment for fall semester 2011. Instead of a final paper, it will be segmented including submission of an outline, annotated bibliography and an editorial section in which students will have to insert their own opinions. The biggest problem with the writing assignments has to do with writing basics. The international students struggle particularly but the problems are not limited to international students. The biggest complaint that I hear from faculty, overall, is that students are sometimes resistant to think on their own - particularly the younger college students. They want outlines, study guides and clear parameters of what the resulting project/paper should contain. To a certain degree, because the business world is not this defined, students have to be able to use their own creativity and judgement. Our faculty, as a whole, are trying to encourage students to not just meet the standards but exceed them.
Even though Hospitality Strategic Management (HADM 4800) is the designated CTW course, a number of other hospitality courses support the CTW philosophy. We hear regularly from our industry recruiters that critical thinking is key to the success of our graduates. Most of the hospitality courses include some type of applied project or simulation. The faculty want more teaching techniques that support critical thinking development. Several of us will attend this summer a conference which will include a day-long session on the case method of teaching. I see this as very positive in supporting the CTW initiatives.
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### Mission / Purpose

Critical thinking has four components: identifying consequential issues, generating alternatives, anticipating outcomes, and drawing correct conclusions. When making HR decisions that have a legal component, managers need knowledge of the law, HR practices, and strategy. 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: Knowledge of HR Law and Practices**

Students will become knowledgeable about the legal implications of HR policies and programs.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills and Processes**

Students will learn specific techniques for analyzing situations, diagnosing problems, and developing solutions.

**G 3: Organizationally-sensible Decision-Making**

Students will be better 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 (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to distinguish relevant from trivial or unrelated facts. The target for this objective is that 75% of my students score at least satisfactory and 50% score outstanding on the rubric.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Specify Legal Issues (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to specify the legal issues related to the situation. The target for this objective is that 75% of my students score at least satisfactory and 50% score outstanding on the rubric.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

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

SLO 3: Discuss Legal Principles (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to discuss relevant cases, statutes, and regulations related to the situation and explain what is required of employees and employers. The target for this objective is that 75% of my students score at least satisfactory and 50% score outstanding on the rubric.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

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

SLO 4: Draw Reasonable Conclusions (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to make conclusions based on pertinent legal and HRM principles. The target for this objective is that 75% of my students score at least satisfactory and 50% score outstanding on the rubric.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

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

SLO 5: Write Clearly and Organize Logically (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Students will be able to write clearly and present ideas logically. The target for this objective is that 75% of my students score at least satisfactory and 50% score outstanding on the rubric.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Vignette (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Students analyzed “in-class” and on-line critical incident vignettes. These “minicases” were based on actual legal findings, but written from the perspective of the management professional rather than an attorney. They helped students gain experience so that once they are working in organizations, their “past experiences and solution activities comes quick to mind when new situations are encountered (Smith, G. F. 2003. Beyond CT and decision making: Teaching business students how to think. Journal of Management Education, 27: 24-51). Over the course of the semester, by comparing their first few and last few assignments, I found substantial improvement using the five rubric criteria (outcomes). Moreover, most students gained confidence in their reasoning skills and ability to write clearly and organize logically. The following comment I received from a student (after the end of the semester) who struggled early is typical: “I just have not had one [course] challenge me quite like yours. When you said that our critical writing and thinking skills would improve because of this course, I thought that was a rather bold statement to make. Having endured and enjoyed this class, I'm happy to say I was wrong.”

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

M 2: Situational Judgment Test (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

I added several situational judgment test items. I used these early in the semester to “ease” students into writing critically. Writing short (50 to 100 words) justifications still required critical thinking and knowledge of employment law but less writing. Because SJTs demand less grading time, I could offer more student assessments early in the semester. Generally, I returned assignments by the next class allowing the students to quickly build CTW abilities. Students perceived SJTs are the typical multiple-choice test. This reduced their anxiety to writing, although justifying a response required complex thinking. Based on student comments, I found SJTs fostered more positive attitudes toward performing meaningful CTW tasks and improved self-efficacy about CTW performance. Because it was possible to have more than one right answer based on the student’s reasonable interpretation, it was relatively easy to evaluate students’ ability to apply domain knowledge to realistic situations. Memorizing a few key cases and reciting regulations and statutes have little value in the real world where HR situations are intricate and context-bound. For instance, context is a key factor in sexual harassment cases. An identical behavior could be illegal in a law office but legal in an automobile repair shop.

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

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

Develop New Assignments Based on Situational Judgment Test Methodology

Over the past year, I experimented with various forms of SJT items. The items are based on actual legal findings but written from the perspective of the management professional rather than an attorney. This is the same process I use to develop the in-class and on-line vignettes. I asked students to provide a written justification for their answers. A review of the literature indicates this format can be effective in assessing domain knowledge (Bailin, S., Case, R., Coombs, J. R., & Daniels, L. B. 1999. Common misconceptions of SJTs in the workplace and their implications for the development of a scoring rubric. Journal of Management Education, 14, 269-283) as well as critical thinking (Ennis, R. H. 1993. Critical thinking assessment. Theory into Practice, 32, 179-186).

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Resistance to CTW

Until the summer 2011 semester, most students selected this course as an elective. Many students are initially concerned about the demands of the course, and a few students struggle throughout the semester contending that the assignments are arduous, time-consuming, or unfair. Research suggests that it is likely that the percentage of poor performing students will increase when the course is a requirement for graduation [see Darby, J. (2006). The effects of the elective or required status of courses on student achievement. Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 58, 19-29]. The objective of this plan is to develop strategies to recognize sources of resistance and generate strategies to reduce resistance.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 1. Review literature related to student resistance, self-regulation, and critical thinking pedagogy with the goal of understanding the causes of and interventions to address the various causes of student resistance. 2. Collect quantitative and qualitative data related to students’ self-regulation, beliefs about writing, course expectations, and attitudes toward various CTW learning and assessment activities. 3. Develop learning and assessment techniques that reduce resistance to CTW.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

1. Because written assignments are returned to students with feedback, vignettes cannot be "recycled." Consequently, I created dozens of new vignettes based on legal rulings. 2. I conducted an extensive review of the literature related to three topics: student resistance to CTW assignments, situational judgment tests, and inadequacy of management education. 3. Currently, I have a manuscript under review titled “Is Management Education Academically Adrift?” The purpose of this paper is to discuss factors that may contribute to the inadequacy of management education and describe how incorporating critical thinking through writing into the program of study can address current weaknesses in the curriculum. 4. I collected quantitative and qualitative data related to student self-regulation, beliefs about writing, course expectations, and attitudes toward various CTW learning and assessment activities. I developed and piloted a scale to measure student attitudes. 5. I supervised a directed reading on training and development for a graduate student serving as my CTW writing consultant. One outcome of the course was a proposal for training writing consultants to cope with student resistance to CTW.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Over the course of the semester, by comparing their first few and last few assignments, I found substantial improvement using the five rubric criteria (outcomes). Moreover, most students gained confidence in their reasoning skills and ability to write clearly and organize logically. As they were exposed to more "real-world" situations, students became more mentally agile. There was an

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
The changes for me, over the years, have been enormous. I know that I am a better teacher, and I believe that my students are better prepared for the “real world” where critical thinking is essential.

CTW Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
1. Because written assignments are returned to students with feedback, vignettes cannot be “recycled.” Consequently, I created dozens of new vignettes based on legal rulings. 2. I conducted an extensive review of the literature related to three topics: student resistance to CTW assignments, situational judgment tests, and inadequacy of management education. 3. Currently, I have a manuscript under review titled “Is Management Education Academically Adrift?” The purpose of this paper is to discuss factors that may contribute to the inadequacy of management education and describe how incorporating critical thinking through writing into the curriculum can address the challenges of globalization, and involving corporate international business analysis and international data gathering.

Challenges for Next Year
Beginning in the fall, the majority of students will be taking this course as a requirement. Studies show that college students taking a course as an elective have a significantly more positive perception of the course and the instructor. This is especially true for more rigorous courses. The second challenge will be time-management. I will be teaching seven sections (25 students per section) compared to three sections in previous years.

 Modifications in Intended Outcomes
I will not change my expectations for the coming year.

 Modifications in Measurement Methods
I will replace a few of the in-class vignettes with SJT items.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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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, 2)
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.

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 measurement strategy. For 2010-2011, the rubrics have been modified to better capture the nature of the writing assignment. For example, we realized that the assignment as indicated in the Syllabus and on the rubrics referred to "thesis and proposition." Further discussion among the faculty lead to the conclusion that "thesis" does not capture our purpose well. Since we are focusing on business writing, it was decided that "business proposition" best captures our intent. We will need to refine the rubric changes in consultation with the faculty and then apply the new criteria to grading the papers. Once the changes are approved, we will aim for a target a score of 70% for the average rubric scores across sections.

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

**M 2: Rubric application (O: 1)**

Faculty approved the change in rubrics. The new definitions of the categories now better reflect the substance of the assignment. However, it remains difficulty to apply the rubric scoring to comparative analysis across sections. This is especially true due to the large number of instructors, including several PTIs, which results in a lack of consensus on using the scoring in a uniform way. Therefore, in 2011-2012 the focus will be more on the substantive aspects of the assignment rather than the scoring by rubrics.

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

---

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

### Action Plan 2010-2011, International Business

**Action Plan: 2010-2011**

The student response rates to the official CTW evaluations have been uneven. Thus, we intend to conduct in-class evaluations in all the sections of BUSA 3000 Evaluation across the multiple sections of the course has been difficult. Efforts will be made to ensure that all instructors use the rubric scoring system to provide more comparable data. The instructors need to reach consensus on the proposed changes to the rubrics. We will continue to urge instructors to use standard headings for the written assignment. Each semester training session will be conducted for faculty and GRAs (both continuing and new). Training sessions will include a focus faculty and GRA use of the WAC on-line evaluation system.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011

### Action Plan 2011-2012

1. As in the past, we will conduct workshops at the beginning of each semester involving faculty and CTW GRAs, including training on the use of on-line WAC.
2. Response rates to the on-line evaluations have been low. We believe that an In-class evaluation process should be used a couple of weeks before the end of the term.
3. Rubric scoring has not been embraced by the faculty. Therefore, we propose an evaluation session with faculty/GRAs after the end of each term.
4. The sample papers will be merged into test case papers to be made available to faculty to share with students in discussions of "best practices."
5. We will continue to stress the role of standard headings on the papers.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

---
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### 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 correctness (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 16 or higher on the 20-point Critical Thinking rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
76.6% of the students in the senior capstone courses scored 16 or higher on the Critical Thinking rubric. 75% of the Jour 4040 students; 77.8% of the Jour 4800 students.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**  
Jour 3010: Average score was 14.75 on the rubric item. Jour 4040: Average score was 17.6. Jour 4800: Average score was 16.8.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**  
Jour 3010: Average score of 29.9 on the combined rubric of Writing Competency (13.9) and Research Competency (16). Jour 4040: Average score of 35.9 on the combined rubric of Writing Competency (17.5) and Research Competency (18.4). Jour 4800: Average score of 35.1 on the combined rubric of Writing Competency (17.8) and Research Competency (17.3).

**M 2: Critical Thinking (O: 1)**  
assessment 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**  
Jour 3010: Average score of 14.75 on 20-point rubric. Jour 4040: Average score of 17.6 on 20-point rubric. Jour 4800: Average score of 16.8 on 20-point rubric.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Jour 3010: Average score of 16 on 20-point rubric. Jour 4040: Average score of 18.4 on 20-point rubric. Jour 4800: Average score of 17.3 on 20-point rubric.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Jour 3010: Average score of 8 on 10-point rubric. Jour 4040: Average score of 9.4 on 10-point rubric. Jour 4800: Average score of 8.1 on 10-point rubric.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Jour 3010: Average score of 13.4 on 20-point rubric. Jour 4040: Average score of 17.9 on 20-point rubric. Jour 4800: Average score of 16.9 on 20-point rubric.

**Target for O5: Apply appropriate tools and technologies**
average combined score of Content + Logic/reasoning of 24 out of 30 or 80%

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Jour 3010: Average combined score of 21.4 [Content (13.4 of 20) and Logic/reasoning (8 of 10)]. Jour 4040: Average combined score of 27.3 [Content (17.9 of 20) and Logic/reasoning (9.4 of 10)]. Jour 4800: Average combined score of 25 [Content 16.9 of 20] and Logic/reasoning (8.1 of 10)].

**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
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 3010 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 among the different viewpoints that should be included in their 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
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Content | Outcome/Objective: - Apply appropriate tools and technologies
  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)

Research Competency
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 15.7 out of 20 or 78.5%. 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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Writing Competency | Outcome/Objective: - Understand concepts and apply theories
  Implementation Description: CTW Ambassador meeting with Jour 4800 instructors
  Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
  Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador and Jour 4800 instructors
  Additional Resources: none
**Research for Jour 3010**
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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Research Competency | Outcome/Objective: Understand concepts and apply theories

**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)

**Jour 3010 Content**
Discuss how to improve the quality of information included in writing assignments and the journalistic standards to assess news worthy details.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Content | Outcome/Objective: Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate

**Implementation Description:** Meet with Jour 3010 instructors.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Jour 3010 instructors and CTW Ambassador

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Jour 3010 Content**
Discuss improving quality of information provided in written assignments and using journalistic standards to determine news worthy details.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Content | Outcome/Objective: Apply appropriate tools and technologies

**Implementation Description:** Meet with Jour 3010 instructors.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Jour 3010 instructors and CTW Ambassador

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Jour 3010 Critical Thinking**
Assess measure of critical thinking. Discuss how critical thinking is taught.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Writing Competency | Outcome/Objective: Critically evaluate their own work and that of others

**Implementation Description:** Meet with Jour 3010 instructors.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Jour 3010 instructors and CTW Ambassador

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Jour 3010 Critical Thinking**
Assess measure. Discuss how critical thinking is taught.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Think critically, creatively and independently

**Implementation Description:** Meet with Jour 3010 instructors.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Jour 3010 instructors and CTW Ambassador

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Jour 3010 Writing Competency**
Assess measure to determine if the rubric or other assessment measures can better detect problems with student writing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
Jour 3010 Writing Competency

The writing competency of Jour 3010 was below the target. Improving the writing mechanics (grammar, spelling, punctuation, etc.) of students has been a long time struggle for instructors. The Dept. has a new ad hoc committee of Journalism faculty to improve students' writing, and its recommendations will be implemented for the fall semester.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

AY 2010-11 was somewhat of a holding pattern for Journalism CTW as the revised curriculum was not approved. This did not substantially affect the CTW courses because they remain the same, but the critical thinking aspects are not emphasized throughout the current curriculum as they will be in the revised curriculum which has more writing-intensive courses. The most significant accomplishment was a revised definition of critical thinking. This was a collaborative effort among the faculty at a meeting held by the CTW Ambassador. The faculty member who has taught Jour 4800, one of the senior CTW capstone courses, initiated the revised definition, and at the meeting several other faculty members suggested minor revisions. A consensus was then reached on the final wording. The meeting also allowed for a meaningful discussion about the importance of critical thinking for Journalism majors, and how the aspects of the critical thinking process can be incorporated into other courses. My sense is that regular meetings about the Journalism curriculum and CTW will help improve the senior capstone assessment results, especially when the revised curriculum is implemented. Another achievement was a change in the sampling students' works for the assessment. Last year the CTW Ambassador asked instructors to select writings in three levels: excellent, average and below average. This year the instructors selected randomly to provide the best chance to have a representative sample of work by Journalism students. The results from last year could be described as skewed because a deliberate selection of weak writings was submitted for assessment. This year's sample is more likely to include a cross-section of students' writings.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

The results of this year's assessment clearly show that there is improvement regarding CTW from the junior-level course to the senior-level course. The learning outcome #2, critically evaluate own work and that of others, had one of the lowest average rubric scores for the entire assessment by this year's Jour 3010 students. But the target was exceeded by students in both senior capstone courses. There was also an improvement in the Jour 4800 students from last year's assessment, but as noted in Reflection #1, the 2009-10 results were not from a random selection and possibly skewed to a lower result than if a random selection were employed.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

The greatest need for Journalism CTW is improvement in the junior-level course for both critical thinking and writing. The Dept. Chair has formed an ad hoc Journalism writing committee to provide suggestions on how to improve students' writing. The first suggestions from this committee, which the CTW Ambassador is a member, will be implemented in the next academic year beginning with Jour 1010. It will likely be at least two years before improvement can be detected in the junior-level CTW course. One aspect of implementing CTW has been inconsistently publicizing critical thinking in the course syllabi. Without the definition of critical thinking on the syllabi, the CTW Ambassador is concerned that it is not emphasized from the first day and may then become an afterthought as the semester continues. This implementation may become more difficult as more faculty are assigned to teach CTW courses in the future as more sections will have to be scheduled to accommodate the growing number of Journalism majors who are progressing to graduation. The CTW Ambassador intends to hold regular meetings of the faculty assigned to teach CTW courses and to meet individually, if necessary, with faculty who will be teaching the CTW courses for the first time to ensure that critical thinking is emphasized initially and throughout the semester.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

There were two primary changes from last year. This year the selection of the sample of writings was improved by using random selection rather than the instructor selecting writings in three performance categories. This year's results should be more representative of Journalism majors. The other change was the definition of critical thinking arrived by consensus among the faculty. There must be consistent publicity of the definition in all sections of CTW courses. There is now an ad hoc Journalism writing committee which will be making recommendations on how to improve students' writing, and once implemented with a revised curriculum, should result in better performance by Journalism majors.
**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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Student Laboratory Assignments (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 3, 4)**

Students will collect, analyze and synthesize data from the laboratory and use this information to solve complex problems.

**SLO 3: Structured academic controversy (G: 1, 3, 6) (M: 1)**

Students will present review relevant information and present written and oral arguments arguments for and against an academic controversy (Abstinence Education vs. Comprehensive Human Sexuality Education). Overview Structured academic controversy requires students to use high level reasoning and critical thinking. At the end of this experience students will experience the following benefits: • Increased understanding of both sides of the controversy • More insight into ways to formulate an argument • Greater mastery and retention of material • Ability to generalize concepts to a wider variety of situations and contexts • Opportunity to reach a consensus from different points of view • Higher academic self-esteem • Higher levels of reasoning and different levels of critical thinking skills

**Standard Associations**

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

**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, judgements, and conclusions. The paper is limited to no fewer than three and no more than five pages single spaced.

**Standard Associations**

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

**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.

**Standard Associations**

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Structured Academic Controversy (O: 3, 4)
Total number of students who successfully completed the structured academic controversy assignment.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Structured academic controversy**
Achievement target was set at a minimum of 73%

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students either met or exceeded the achievement target.

**Target for O4: Reflection papers**
Achievement Target was set at 83%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceed the achievement target for the the reflection paper assignments.

### M 2: Fitness Facility Evaluation (O: 5)
Percentage of students who successfully complete the fitness facility evaluation assignment.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O5: Fitness facility evaluation**
Achievement target was set at 73%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
Data not currently available.

### M 3: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments (O: 1, 2)
Percentage of students who successfully complete the journal assignments.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
87% of students met or exceeded the target for the journal assignments.

**Target for O2: Student Laboratory Assignments**
Achievement target was set at 83%

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
95% of students met or exceeded the achievement target.

### M 4: Laboratory assignments (O: 2)
Students will collect, analyze, and synthesize data and apply this information to a laboratory problem.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

### 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
Raise target

Based on student performance it appears that 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: 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 that the assessment target was set too low. Target will be raised to 83% 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: 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: Student Laboratory Assignments

Implementation Description: Raise target.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.
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 at 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

Journal assignments

No anticipated changes for next year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Exercise physiology journal summaries

Journal assignments

No anticipated changes for next year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Exercise physiology journal summaries

Journal assignments

No anticipated changes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Exercise physiology journal summaries

Laboratory Assignments

Consider raising achievement targets.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Outcome/Objective: Student Laboratory Assignments

Implementation Description: Fall faculty meeting.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW coordinator and course instructor.

Reflection Papers

Consider raising the achievement target for the reflection papers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Structured Academic Controversy | Outcome/Objective: Reflection papers

Implementation Description: Fall faculty retreat
Structured Academic Controversy

Consider raising achievement target for next year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Structured Academic Controversy
- Outcome/Objective: Structured academic controversy

Implementation Description: Review targets with relevant faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Coordinator and course instructor.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

CTW assignments were refined in several areas. Strong consideration is being given to changing the CTW course in the physical education program.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

No majors improvements from last year.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Faculty in the HPE program are expressing dissatisfaction with the CTW course in their area and are proposing a different course as a replacement.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

No major changes except as noted previously in the HPE program.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Faculty in the HPE program are proposing a different CTW course which should better meet the needs of their students and the CTW effort in general.

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

Minor curriculum changes were made in the exercise science program as a result of the CTW results. Faculty in the HPE program have determined that the required CTW course is not meeting the intent of the CTW effort and are proposing an alternative course.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Proposed a new CTW course in the HPE program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Nothing new compared to last year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Increased achievement targets in several areas and a new CTW course in the HPE program.
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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**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

**Standard Associations**

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

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 3: Alternative Evaluation (M: 3)**

Students will first identify all 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

**Standard Associations**

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

**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

**Standard Associations**

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

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for the situation analysis objective in 2010-2011 was 78%. This number is based on five sections of the course taught during the period and represents the scores of a total of 117 students. It exceeds the target of 75%.

**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%.
The average score for Problem Definition for 2010-2011 was 75.2% which barely exceeds the target. One hundred and seventeen students in five sections of MK4900, Marketing Problems, were assessed.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Students scored an average of 72.5% during 2010-2011 in five sections of the course. This result is slightly less than the target score of 75%.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The average score on the recommendation dimension during 2010-2011 was 74.1%. This is slightly below the target score of 75%. The score is based on data from 117 students in five sections of Marketing Problems, MK4900.

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

**Alternative Evaluation**

Student scores averaged 72.5% which is below the 75% target. The problem is believed to reside in the depth of evaluation of the alternatives and not in the initial step of identifying the relevant alternatives. Greater attention to describing the evaluation process including enhanced examples of excellent evaluations will be provided.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Alternative Identification and Evaluation
Outcome/Objective: Alternative Evaluation

Implementation Description: Starting Summer Semester 2011 more time will be devoted to describing the case analysis process with particular attention given to the alternative evaluation portion of that discussion.

Responsible Person/Group: Hiram Barksdale
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Recommendation Depth and Detail**

Students scored 74.1% on the Recommendation which is below the target score of 75%. It is believed that the issue results from failing to provide sufficient detail and explanation to sufficiently justify their recommendation rather than recommending an irrelevant course of action. The case analysis pedagogy, may not be familiar to the students. To address inadequate depth and detail given to support their recommendation, an example case will be assigned and discussed prior to assigning a case to be written up for a grade.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Recommendation
Outcome/Objective: Recommended Action

Implementation Description: To address inadequate depth and detail, an example case will be assigned and discussed prior to assigning a case to be written up for a grade.

Responsible Person/Group: Hiram Barksdale
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

The key achievement is the change that has begun in all courses in the undergraduate marketing major. One which is key to the action plans for MK4900, Marketing Problems, is that at least one, in-depth case analysis, is to be used in every class at some point during the semester. Students typically indicate that they have done no case work prior to MK4900. The addition of at least one case
to every section of every course in the major will eventually mean that students will have at least had some exposure to the case analysis process prior to entering MK4900.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

The College of Business handles the gateway course differently by requiring all business majors to take the same gateway class rather than each major or department offering a gateway CTW course. As a result, I cannot give an informed answer to this question.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

The first and foremost answer to this question is that now that two instructors teach the capstone CTW course, MK4900, greater coordination between them would help. Attempts at this have met with little success as it is difficult to “require” colleagues to do something in a particular way. How do you make someone conform and do things in a particular way? I wish I knew.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

Although it would be overarching to claim that CTW has resulted in significant alterations to the department’s undergraduate curriculum, CTW has certainly played a role. The students, however, seem largely oblivious as do most of the faculty who agree with it so long as they don’t have to do anything differently. The addition of a required case in every section of every course caused a lot of complaining but eventually when the department chair added it to the annual review/evaluation of every faculty member people got in line. Our department has capped the class sizes in the course at 25 students. This is both a blessing and a curse. We are offering more sections and we cannot obtain assistance with evaluating the written work from CTW.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Assessment remains the concern of only a few people—those responsible in the undergraduate CTW course and the department’s Masters program coordinator. Most faculty think that assessment is just something that they colleagues at other schools are worried about. They don’t see that their courses will soon be impacted. Trying to encourage colleagues to be proactive and begin to use rubrics has not met with success. People focus on what they have in front of them right now.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

One can argue that the assessment has been instrumental in causing a significant overhaul in the undergraduate curriculum. However, I believe that assessment is one small part of the significant changes that are underway in the department. The data is not well known outside of 3 or 4 people. Curriculum changes including the addition of new courses and overhauling others, requiring at least one case in every course taught and having a significant hands-on project in every class are all changes that have been in process for several years and really predate the assessment process.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Again, the results of the assessment were one small part of a much greater set of causal factors which have combined to lead to a significant change in the undergraduate curriculum—the most significant change in at least 30 years. New course have been created, new pedagogies required, etc.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

I have learned that we seem to have slipped slightly going from results that all exceeded the target in 2009-2010 to results that are slightly below the target for two out of the four dimensions. Whether this slip is statistically significant is not clear. It is troubling whether statistically significant or not. Although it may be obfuscation, the students seem to have been less engaged and less interested. It is hard to claim it changed significantly in just one year but students don’t want to invest the time and energy that the analysis of the cases demands. They do a cursory job, in part because they have not been held to a very high standard in other classes and have gotten used to submitting mediocre work and being awarded good grades for it. As our department ratchets up the demands particularly with respect to quantitative analysis, it will be interesting to see what happens to our enrollments. I suspect that our major has been one of last resort for students in the College of Business. I suspect that we will be perceived as less desirable as we implement the changes we have agreed to make. Assessment has helped to focus me and a few others in this department on revising our standards to make them more rigorous.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

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

While part of the problems that the data identify can be attributed to the students, some are the result of the tyranny of freedom. Some instructors have extremely low standards and others have high standards even though they may teach the same course. Strategies we will implement over the coming year include course coordinators in every course where we offer more than one section in an effort to standardize the experience from the students’ perspective. We will require more quantitative analysis through the addition of a new metrics course will help alert students to the fact that marketing demands quantitative analysis along with subjective judgement. And we will also require case analysis in every course to help give students greater ability to apply their knowledge to real problems. I believe that all the changes we are making will help to better balance rigor and relevance. Students will be better prepared for their careers because of these changes. However, I do not believe that these changes will radically change anything. As long as many faculty remain in their comfort zone and avoid change until it forced upon them, assessment will remain the job of a few committed people who care more about the quality of their teaching than their colleagues who gravitate towards a different set of rewards.
Challenges for Next Year
Changing a culture costs a fortune and it takes forever. That is the objective, however.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Mathematics
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
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.

Goals

G 1: Analysis
Students will be able to analyze and evaluate mathematical arguments.

G 2: Deductive reasoning
Students will be able to formulate and present a proof or a counterexample in support of conclusions.

G 3: Problem solving
Students will be able to derive an abstract claim from examples and solve a problem by applying known results.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Giving proofs (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
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.

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

O/O 2: Solving problems by math softwares (G: 1, 3)
In math 4991, students need to solve a computation problem by using math softwares, e.g. Maple.

O/O 3: Reviewing papers (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)
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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubric for simple assignments (O: 1)
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. Correct notation is used throughout the majority of 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.

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

Target for O1: Giving proofs
60% of students score at least satisfactory based on our rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
In fall 2010, among 15 students taking Math 3000, there are 4 excellent, 4 satisfactory, 3 marginal, and 4 poor. In spring 2011, among 17 students taking Math 3000, there are 5 excellent, 7 satisfactory, 4 marginal, and 1 poor. Considering two semester together, there are total 32 students in Math 3000, 9 excellent, 11 satisfactory, 7 marginal, and 5 poor. This means that more than 60% student scored at least satisfactory.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In fall 2010, 16 students took Math 4991, all finished the project on paper review. There are 6 excellent, 6 satisfactory, 3 marginal, and 1 poor. In spring 2011, 17 students took Math 4991, 16 of them finished the project on paper review, There are 10 excellent, 2 satisfactory, 3 marginal, and 1 poor. Overall, among total 33 students in Math 4991, there are 16 excellent, 8 satisfactory, 6 marginal, 3 poor (including the one who did not attempt).

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: In-Progress
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

Interest of writing proofs

It is difficult but necessary for a math major to write a rigorous proof. In the recent years, we have seen the improvement from our Math 3000 students on writing proofs. We need to continue working with Math 3000 instructors such that they can help to build students' interests of writing proofs. For example, instead of proving simple but tedious algebra equalities, they may assign more interesting practical problems, e.g. those related to games and sports.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

1. Math 3000: we see the improvement of student performance on writing proofs: last year less than 60% students received excellent or satisfactory this year slightly more than 60% students achieved this. 2. Math 4991: we have adjusted the amount of writing, especially in spring 2011, so that students have more time working on (fewer) projects. It seems that students were happy with this change. 3. Math 4991: in spring 2011 students are allowed to use the computer lab in our department to work on their projects, In the past many students have to use their own computer to do projects. This saved students' time and gave them convenience.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Not yet.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

On one hand, Math 4991 is a developing course -- it is not clear what are best way of teaching students to conduct research. On the other hand, to many students and faculty members, senior seminar may not be a proper title for Math 4991. They overlooked this course and regarded it as a seminar course. To solve this problem, we will continue working closely with instructors of 4991 to see if any adjustment is necessary. With the assistant of department chair, I will make sure that every faculty (even those who do not teach 4991) knows the importance of 4991. We may let more faculty members to teach this course. We also consider changing the title of 4991 to reflect its content better.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

Students now have to write intensively in two CTW courses. This helps students to become better math majors because a good writing in math reflects (and also requires) a good understanding of math. Faculty members who taught these CTW courses became
more aware of the relation between critical thinking and writing.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Middle Level Education
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### 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 various educational practices and strategies that affect learners in metropolitan contexts, and (3) the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning."

### Goals

**G 1: Candidates are Experts in Recursive Data Analysis**
Candidates are able to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing, and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

**G 2: Candidates are Experts at Critical Written Reflection**
Candidates are able to identify and critically analyze various educational practices and strategies that affect learners in metropolitan contexts.

**G 3: Candidates are Experts at Argument Development**
Candidates are able to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Students demonstrate the ability to collect and critically analyze data (G: 1)**
Students are able to collect and analyze data. They are able to provide an in-depth explanation of their data collection process, followed by a detailed description and analysis of their findings. They give detailed explanations with examples cited to support conclusions and connections. They critically reflect upon the data collection and analysis process, and talk specifically about how this process informs their teaching practices.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**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**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

**SLO 2: Students demonstrate the ability to think critically through written reflection (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students demonstrate critical thinking processes through written reflection. Student reflections include (1) discussions of how they make decisions about teaching and learning, (2) how they challenge assumptions and bias they come across with group members, fellow teachers or professional readings, (3) analysis of critical events that led to changes in thinking about teaching and learning, and (4) a description of what was learned (or yet to be learned) related to the teaching and how that effects their professional development.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 3: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments (G: 3) (M: 3, 4)**

Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning. Students demonstrate the ability to communicate their opinions and uses of teaching and learning strategies presented in professional texts and journals. Students demonstrate the ability to use data to support or refute specific teaching and learning strategies for specific students, and write about those data findings with a critical lens. Students demonstrate an ability to analyze their own teaching as it relates to major theories of teaching and learning.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 2: Critical Incident Video Rubric (O: 2)**

Critical Incident Video Rubric from EDCI 4640:

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

**Target for O2: Students demonstrate the ability to think critically through written reflection**

90% of students will score at the "proficient" level or higher.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

90% of students did score at the "proficient" level or higher on all components of the critical incident video rubric.

**M 3: Professional Book Group Discussion Reflection Rubric (O: 3)**

From EDRD 4600: Professional Book Group Discussion Reflection Rubric

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

**Target for O3: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments**

100% of students will score at the "proficient" level or better.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students scored at the "exemplary" level, which exceeds our achievement target. See report here: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73745?key=de7b8dd7d4e38a5ae135fc07231f53f1

**M 4: Professional Book Group Discussion Paper Rubric (O: 3)**

From EDRD 4600: Professional Book Group Discussion Paper Rubric

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

**Target for O3: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments**

100% of students will score at the "proficient" level or higher.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

While 100% of the students scored at the "exemplary" level in their reactions to the book and citations, only 60% of the students were able to articulate the reasons behind why certain aspects of the book were useful or not useful in their professional development as teachers at the "exemplary" level. 40% of the students scored either "proficient" or "partially proficient." See report here: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73744?key=6b1af9a16dec877376b439351702a6b8

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

**Assignment Outcomes**
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.

During Fall 2010, Dr. Yarbrough and Dr. Cross will work on fleshing out rubric descriptions and determining appropriate assignment outcomes and target goals.

| Established in Cycle: | 2009-2010 |
| Implementation Status: | Finished |
| Priority: | High |
| Projected Completion Date: | 05/2011 |
| Responsible Person/Group: | Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and Course 2 instructor) |

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

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.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

Students in the first CTW course appeared to have difficulty articulating their stance on varying topics in the teaching and learning of young adolescents. For example, not all students were proficient at defending topics and content in professional books and journals, and also had a hard time articulating why they wanted to implement certain strategies and action research plans in their classrooms. At the end of the second CTW course, however, all but one student was proficient at articulating their stance on specific strategies in teaching and learning with specific groups of students. We are pleased with this progression.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**
Because different instructors teach the CTW courses, it is hard to make sense of students’ progression to becoming more critical thinkers. It has also been hard to maintain a focus on critical thinking throughout both courses, as there are so many other skills and topics to discuss. One fear of the faculty is that students really don’t leave the courses with the ability to articulate what it means to be critical thinkers through their writing, and why this is important to them as professional educators. We hope to make this more of a focus of the courses in the future.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?**

Because we are at the beginning phase of CTW for our program (first course offered in Fall 2010), the greatest impact we have seen so far has been on faculty. This initiative has pushed us to come together and really think about what critical thinking means for our students, and how to best measure their critical thinking progress through the program. These conversations have allowed us all to think more carefully about our course assignments, readings, and in-class activities, in CTW and in other required program courses.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This year’s assessment report is much different from last year’s report. We made changes in our learning outcomes, measures, and targets. This is most likely due to the fact that our outcomes, measures, and targets were simply projections last year, as we did not start teaching the CTW courses until Fall 2010. We needed to more carefully and specifically align our outcomes and measures in particular, so that our findings and action plans for next year will make more sense and better inform our CTW courses.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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

**2010-2011 CTW Music**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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)**

Course: World Music MUS 4820 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. Course: Music History - MUS 4810 Music History, MUS 4810 (1750 to the Present), has been designated a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course by the School of Music in compliance with Georgia State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). This means that specific writing assignments will be used to assess the progress and quality of critical thinking as demonstrated through writing. The required research paper should be based on some aspect (style, composer, composition, etc.) of Western European or American art music. The first part of the three-part assignment is to write a proposal for a research paper, an outline, and an annotated bibliography.

**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)**
In World Music, the final part of this three-part assignment is to revise the draft of the research paper. The final paper should also include a one-page transcription (word-for-word) or a synopsis of an interview with a person (musician, music historian, etc) knowledgeable of the music of the culture about which the paper is written. The transcription or synopsis of the interview should contain at least 5 interview questions pertinent to the research topic. Students must make the recommended changes to the graded research proposal draft that is returned to them. Next, students should revise the draft and amend it to reflect a development, analysis, and application of some element of the music of a culture of choice that demonstrates the use 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. In Music History, 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 some element of Western European or American art music that demonstrates the use of "critical thinking." No in-class presentation is required of students in Music History. The same rubric for the revised final research paper is used in World Music and Music History.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Draft of Research Paper (G: 1)**
In World Music the second part of this three-part assignment is to draft a 7 to 10-page research paper about the music of a culture of interest. In Music History the second part of this three-part assignment is to write a draft of a 7 to 10-page research paper about some aspect of Western European or American art music. The same rubric for the draft of the research paper was used in World Music and Music History.

**O/O 4: CTW Objectives in Music**
An analysis of findings from the Summer CTW World Music class is based on papers submitted by 15 students. Assessment with the rubric is based on eight categories with a range of 0 to 12, with 12 being the highest. The average score for the entire class was 9.7. This shows an increase in the average assessment student score of 0.55 from the Fall World Music course. I attribute this to 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 Summer10, and Comparison Fall 2009 & Summer 2010. (I decided to omit findings from the Spring 2010 World Music course from this report because it was taught as a Special Topic course and contained an enrollment of 3 students). Though the rubrics were not used in assessing student papers in Music History, the instructor did include comments on the student drafts and the final revised papers to justify grades given. Comments on the final papers specifically addressed areas where students were lacking, for example: little to no critical thinking, a weak central position, poor organization, insufficient scholarly support, little analysis of data, and a conclusion that was merely a summary of the paper and/or did not raise potential topics or questions for further inquiry.

**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**
In World Music the objective is for students to earn an 85 on the final revised paper, that is an average of 9 out of a possible 12 in each of the 8 categories on the rubric for the final revised research paper. Points in each category range from 0 to 12, with 12 being the highest. In Music History no achievement target was set for 2010 - 2011 since this was the first time an attempt was made to use the rubrics for the Music History CTW course.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
The attachment, “World Music Mus 4820 CTW Final Rubric Finding Summer 2010,” contains the student assessment scores in each of the eight categories on the rubric for the final revised research paper. The available points in each category ranges from 0 to 12, with 12 being the highest. Students scores ranged from 3 to 12, with the majority being between 8 and 12. The table also contains an average of student scores in each of the eight categories. Based on the target of 85 percent of student scores between 9 and 12, this class did not meet the target. However, the attachment World Music Fall 2009 and Summer 2010 Score Comparison, reveals that the Summer 2010 scores showed an increase of .55 in the overall average score when compared to the Fall 2009: 9.15 for Fall 2009 to 9.7 for Summer 2010. Therefore improvement was made. I should state that the Summer 2010 course was taught during Maymester. Though I knew the research paper assignment would be challenging...
for a Maymester course, I did not think that it would be too demanding on the students since most students take 1 Maymester class and the required length of the paper was only 7 pages. However, I realized that though the course met daily, the three-week tenure of the class was not enough time for me to read the drafts and provide helpful comments without suffering eye strain. I do think that more time is needed for the students to write a draft and make the suggested corrections. If the course is taught again during the summer, it should be taught during the regular 7-week summer semester. Additional information about enrollment, the number of proposals, drafts, and final papers submitted—including average scores (e.g. 88.6 points out of 100)—is also provided. Total Student Enrollment - 21 Number of students who submitted the Proposals-Outline-Annotated Bibliography assignment – 19. The average score was 18 out of a possible 25 points. Number of students who submitted Research Paper Drafts – 17. The average score was 33.8 out of a possible 50 points. Number of students who submitted Revised Research Papers – 15. The average score 88.6 out of a possible 100 points. In Music History 34 students submitted papers with the following break down based on letter grades: 16 received an A, 7 received a B, 9 received a C and 2 received a D.

**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.

**Continued Use or Rubrics and More Departmental CTW Meetings**
The plan for 2011 - 2012 will be to continue using the current rubrics (draft and final revised rubrics) for the course. As the ambassador, I will continue to monitor the progress of students from one semester of one year to a semester of the previous year. I think comparisons of classes of similar sizes during the regular academic year will yield the most usable data. Plans are also to continue to discuss the assignments and rubrics with instructors teaching the same CTW world music course as well as the other CTW course in music history.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Meetings with CTW instructors and rubric data tabulation
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Oliver Greene
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**
The major CTW accomplishments the Music Department for 2010 to 2011 was an overall improvement (though slight) in the student assessment scores based on the rubric for the final revised research paper. The quality of writing and the expression of ideas and the analysis of data in the form of critical thinking has improved noticeably. There was also greater participation on the part of faculty and the department in the CTW initiative. Other CTW instructors are beginning to realize the value of this initiative and have also seen improvement in student paper writing and critical thinking.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**
Improvements have been made in the areas of paper structure or organization and in an analysis and synthesis of data and ideas that reflect some level of critical thinking. The attachment World Music Fall 2009 and Summer 2010 Score Comparisons shows that improvements were made in the following areas as listed on the rubric: Central Position and Primary Objective, Methodology, Concepts, and/or Theories of Inquiry, Relevance of Implications in Concluding Thoughts, and Writing style and Quality of Communication.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**
The areas of the CTW program in music that still need improvement are instructor participation and better use of the rubrics. Plans are also to continue discussing the assignments and rubrics with instructors teaching the same CTW world music course as well as the other CTW course in music history.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?**
The emphasis on the significance of written research displaying critical thinking in music has finally seemed to register as a skill of importance to many of the music students, most of whom major in some area of performance. I have also stressed the importance of the CTW research project because it may be a value when applying to graduate school and in obtaining fellowships and/or financial assistance beyond that which may be based solely on performance. (In previous years, when I taught Writing Across the Curriculum...
The School of Music has made no changes to the department's CTW initiative since last year's report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 to the assessment process. No changes will be made to the assessment process in the upcoming academic year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The CTW report in Music was served as an important and positive component of the School of Music's report to the National Association of Schools of Music. Due to the scarcity of music courses that lend themselves critical thinking through writing, no additional courses are targeted to become CTW courses in music in the near future.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

The CTW Report that I completed for the School of Music included the definition for CTW in Music, an explanation of the three-part CTW assignment, the list of CTW courses in music, a syllabus from one of the courses, rubrics for the draft and final revised research paper, the rubric showing the assessment findings of two semesters of World Music courses, and a table comparing the composite scores of these two classes. This information was included in the School of Music's report that was given to members of the visiting committee for our 10-year review by the National Association of Schools of Music. No major changes or recommendations have been made from the department concerning the CTW courses in music. As a result of last year's report, emphasis has been placed on getting fellow CTW course instructors more involved in the use of rubrics in the assessment component of the CTW assignment.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

I have learned the following concerning the CTW assessment this year: 1) The results of assessment scores based on the rubrics are of the most use to the department when assessment results compare classes that are similar in enrollment size and are offered primarily during semesters of equal length, e.g., two 15 week semesters, as opposed to comparing findings from one 15 week semester course and one 3-week Maymester course. 2) More emphasis needs to be placed on explaining the eight individual components listed on the final revised rubric.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

More time will be spent explaining the three-part research assignment and reviewing each component on the rubrics for the draft and the final revised research paper.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Nursing

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.
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. Positively integrates thinking. Comments: 3. Presents clearly developed. Demonstrates integrative thinking; identifies treatment options. 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. Accurate interpretation of data. Assessments complete and demonstrate overall analysis of 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's 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 Decision making process is not clearly evident. Thinking is basic and without thought. Does not make accurate inferences, defend an interpretation or explain cause of problem. Contributes only marginally to the decision-making process.
making process. Thinking is in-depth but may lack creativeness. Inferences are marginally accurate. Some interpretations are defended. Cause of problems may be identified but not in entirety. 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 are explained thoroughly and accurately. Comments: 7. Communicates effectively. Emerging Developing Mastering 1 2 3 4 5 6 Language obscures meaning and thought. Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connectedness. No proofreading. Little evidence of grammar; sentence structure and spelling 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. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. Errors are minimal. No evidence of grammar, spelling or sentence structure errors. APA Comments: [Headings, Font, Size, Spacing, References, Margins, Use of abbreviations, etc] Overall Rating Assignment Completeness a. Which questions were unanswered?

Target for O1: Written Clinical Narratives

We anticipate that 50% of the students will show an improvement in total score [#1-5 on the rubric] and improvement in the critical thinking ability score [#6 on the rubric] by the 4th clinical narrative CTW assignment.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

1. Total Score: For Fall 2010 - We found that 64 of 76 students (84%) had an improvement in their total score by the last clinical narrative assignment; 8 of 76 (10%) total scores decreased; 4 of 76 (5%) total scores remained the same. For Spring 2011 - We found that 63 of 67 students (94%) had an improvement in their total score by the last clinical narrative assignment; 3 of 67 (4%) had a decrease in their total score; 1 of 67 (1%) total score stayed the same. 2. Critical Thinking Ability Score: For Fall 2010 - We found that 54 of 76 (71%) had an increase in their critical thinking score; 10 of 76 (13%) had a decrease in score. For Spring 2011 - 61 of 67 (91%) had an improvement in their critical thinking scores; 4 of 67 (5.9%) scores remained the same; 2 of 67 (2%) had a decrease in score.

M2: 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, summarizes (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, failing 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, coherent, objective analysis and intuition. Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support from experience, 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 and 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. Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and analytic assertions out of sequence or sources, inaccurate, inappropriate, and unrelated 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 influential and relevant views. 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 question. If more than one idea is presented, alternatives are not integrated. Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Averts 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, but In clear or a way that overstates or misrepresents them. Engages ideas tentatively or superficially. Engages ideas superficially and tentatively. 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 views drawn from outside information to qualify analysis. Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogues 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 ways of knowing. Connects to career and civic responsibilities. Evidence of reflection 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. Consistent 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

- 50 of 76 students (65%) of students in NURS 4600 achieved the target of over 29 points on the overall rating (rubric 1-6) by the last graded assignment. 26 of the 76 students (34%) in NURS 4600 did not achieve the target. 93% of students' scores improved.

**M 3: 2080 & 4600 Rubric Description**

The NURS 2080 "Critical Thinking in Patient Care" Rubric is divided into 7 criteria sections that assesses the clinical narrative student assignment. Sections 1 - 5 are directly related to each of the five questions the student writes about in the clinical narrative based on a clinical patient. The 2080 rubric adds in Question 6 specifically addresses Critical Thinking & Question 7 reflects Communication of the written word. The NURS 4600 rubric is similar to the 2080 rubric and adds in Question 6 specifically for Communication. This rubric was adopted from Washington State University with permission and adapted to Patient Care and the Leadership assignment. The rubric is a reflection of the 5 stage model of adult skill acquisition by Dreyfus.

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

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

**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.

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

**Implementation Description:**
Both CTW Consultants attended 3 class periods each semester after class was concluded to meet with students to discuss their previously critiqued CTW assignments. Consultants also made contact with students via email to discuss their assignments.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011

**Improvement in Rubric Scores**

For 2080 course, improvements in the CTW assignments will be conducted with a revision for enhanced critically thinking. This will hopefully result in a direct improvement in the critical thinking scores of the students as measured on the rubric.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

Major Accomplishments: 1. I oriented a new nursing faculty, Ms. Karis Casseus to the NURS 2080 course and trained her on the CTW initiative for the school of nursing. 2. I trained 4 new CTW consultants for the academic year, 2 for NURS 2080 and 2 for NURS 4600 courses, that was on-going throughout the academic year. 3. Conducted an annual CTW meeting for all involved consultants, faculty and course coordinators in August. 4. Presented to the School of Nursing faculty progress and updates to our CTW initiative for the nursing program. With the addition of another faculty member in NURS 2080, and sharing the workload of grading the CTW assignments, along with meeting with individual students to help them improve their critical thinking and writing abilities, I believe this was a major factor in the increase of rubric scores and critical thinking scores over the previous academic year as set forth in the action plan.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

In the NURS 2080 course, their CTW assignments were linked to their clinical patients they took care of at a hospital for the course 2160. We found that students who had indeed improved in the abilities to critically think at the bedside with their assigned patients. This was acknowledged by several of the 2160 faculty throughout the academic year.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

The area that needs to be redeveloped and will be revised this next academic year in NURS 2080 is the actual CTW assignment and the questions involved that students have to reflect on for their assignment. Both faculty for this course have already discussed the issue and have made plans to revise the assignment questions.
CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

No major changes were made in the CTW initiative since 2009-2010 assessment year. We did expand the time frame for assignment submissions. What continues to be apparent is the improvement of the student's ability to critically think in the clinical setting as detected by other faculty. However, we still get some feedback from the students that the CTW assignments are time consuming, unnecessary, among other things. On the other hand, many students feel that the CTW assignments have helped them look at the bigger picture of their clinical patients.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Nutrition
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

G 3: Evaluation
Students will be able to integrate ideas, context, assumptions, and evidence when reaching conclusions.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Interpretation (M: 3)
Assignment: Research Papers for NUTR 3010 and 4950 Students write a research paper in both CTW courses. Both assignments meet the goal since each student translates information from research articles for the paper with the intent of interpreting the source without altering the intended meaning. NUTR 3010: Each student writes a "mini-review" of a stated problem, which is derived from information ascertained from 10 peer reviewed journal articles selected earlier in the semester. 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.

O/O 2: Analysis (M: 1)
Assignments: Presenting Research (NUTR 3010) and Annotated Bibliography (NUTR 4950) The Presenting Research (NUTR 3010) assignment requires students to analyze data and the Annotated Bibliography (NUTR 4950) assignment requires students to analyze scholarly nutrition work. Presenting Research (NUTR 3010) Each student completes a food frequency questionnaire. The class is divided into groups of three; each group analyzes select food items assigned food frequency questionnaires. Analysis involves calculations of means, standard deviations, and confidence intervals use Microsoft Excel. Each group develops graphs on the data and presents results to class. Annotated Bibliography (NUTR 4950): Assignment Description: Each student selects at least 15 articles addressing her/his research question using evidence-based guidelines to reach logical and justifiable conclusions. Students critically examine the evidence and sources of such evidence, questioning accuracy, relevance and completeness. At least 75% of the articles must be original research, meta-analyses and/or systematic reviews.

O/O 3: Evaluation (M: 3)
NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 Research Papers Students evaluate evidence (research articles) to reach conclusions and recommendations. Assignment: NUTR 3010: Each student writes a "mini-review" of a stated problem, which is derived from information ascertained from 10 peer reviewed journal articles selected earlier in the semester. Each student demonstrates ability to evaluate evidence-based references and to integrate information into a research paper. 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: Annotated Bibliography (O: 2)
Grading Rubric for Annotations Identifies and summarizes the scope and main purpose Limited proficiency 0 - 1 Some proficiency 2 Proficiency 3 High proficiency 4 Fails to identify the main purpose of the articles Does not address the argument, and fails to
Grading Rubric for Research Paper (O: 1, 3)

Correctly identifies the main purpose of the articles but summarizes it in an ambiguous fashion. Addresses the argument but simplistically, and only basically differentiates position from own view. Successfully identifies and summarizes the main purpose of the articles in a clear manner. Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistent with differentiation/comparison. The main purpose of the articles is summarized in a succinct manner; along with identifying other peripheral issues and their impact Appropriately addresses the argument and differentiates/compares established position and own view. Presents and analyzes the major findings by using supportive evidence. Limited proficiency 0 -1

Some proficiency 2 Proficiency 3 High proficiency 4 Dismisses evidence without adequate justification. Confuses cause and correlation. Treats the findings as absolute. Does not identify any biases or does so superficially. Use of evidence is appropriate. Able to distinguish between cause and correlation. At a minimal level. Explores findings in a limited context. Is able to recognize bias in sampling and results and any conflict of interest. But reports them in a routine manner. Examines evidence and its sources. Distinguishes between cause and correlation. Explores findings in the context of the real world. Is able to differentiate fact from opinion and addresses bias in a thoughtful manner. Examines evidence and its source; questions its relevance and accuracy. Able to distinguish causality from correlation by providing evidence. Major findings are presented in the context of subordination and impact. Identifies the different types of biases. Offers explanation of how to overcome bias. Points:

1. Evaluation includes and assesses conclusions, implications and consequences. Limited proficiency 0 -1
Some proficiency 2 Proficiency 3 High proficiency 4 Evaluation/conclusion is simplistic. Does not raise any additional questions. Does not adopt a clear idea. Does not question Assesses conclusion appropriately and begins to see a connection between conclusions and implications. Adopts limited ideas with little questioning. Does not integrate ideas. Considers context, assumptions and evidence in reaching conclusions. Asserts own conclusions by providing evidence. Ideas are integrated, but in a rudimentary manner. Questions Implications are clearly developed and consider ambiguity. Clear integration of conclusions and implications. Fully integrates ideas and positions and clearly justifies viewpoints. Points:

2. Organization is clear and transitions between the ideas enhances the presentation. Limited proficiency 0 -1
Some proficiency 2 Proficiency 3 High proficiency 4 Fails to include ≥ 3 of the required components. Fails to include ≤ 2 of the required components. No integration between the various components. Includes all the required components. Some integration between the various components. All required components are included in clear manner. Integration and transition between the various components is smooth. Points:

3. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Errors are minimal. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas in an eloquent manner. Organization is clear and transitions between the ideas enhances the presentation. Points:

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

Target for O2: Analysis

We expect 85% of the students to receive at least 50 total points on the assignment.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

There were 19 students in the class. Seventeen of the 19 students successfully completed the assignment and received 50 points.

M 3: Grading Rubric for Research Paper (O: 1, 3)

NUTR 4950 Grading Rubric for Paper (Final Copy) Developing 1 Goal-oriented 2 Mastery 3 Introduction Identifies the issue, though some aspects are incorrect, incomplete, or confusing. Clearly identifies the issue and key details are included in a comprehensive manner. Analyzes the issue and presents in a comprehensive and scholarly manner. Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need. Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills. Identifies and selects information directly related to paper topic. Organization Basic organization is apparent; evidence of logical organization of various topics within the paper. Organization is clear; consistent use of appropriate format with key components are being discussed. Organization is clear; consistent use of appropriate format; transitions between ideas are present. Content/Body of Paper Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed. Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided. Relates alternative views to qualify analysis. Integrates multiple viewpoint, comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated but in a limited way. Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single issue. Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. Analysis of positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate. Clearly justifies own view while respecting others. Presents conclusions as relative and loosely related to consequences. Includes connections to conclusions. Content of the paper reflects originality, evidence of synthesis and analytical discussion of results with appropriate conclusions. Position or hypothesis (research question) demonstrates sophisticated, integrated thought. Clearly justifies own view while respecting others; qualifies contrary views or interpretations. Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence; implications are developed and ambiguities are considered. Writing Mechanics In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors are not distracting or frequent. Some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice. Most sources are cited and used correctly. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience. Consistent use of sources with appropriate format. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas, often eloquent. Errors are barely present. Consistent use of sources with appropriate format. All sources are cited and used correctly. Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery.

Target for O1: Interpretation

All of the students at the emerging and developing stages on the rubric in NUTR 3010 will progress to the goal-oriented level on the rubric for NUTR 4950. At least 50% of the class will advance one performance level from NUTR 3010 to NUTR 4950.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All of the students in NUTR 4950 performed at or exceeded the goal-oriented level. Seventy-five percent of the students advanced one performance level.

Target for O3: Evaluation

All of the students at the emerging or developing stage on the rubric in NUTR 3010 will progress to the goal-oriented level on the rubric for NUTR 4950. At least 50% of the class will advance one performance level from NUTR 3010 to NUTR 4950.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All of the students in NUTR 4950 performed at or exceeded the goal-oriented level. Seventy-five percent of the students advanced one performance level.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Revision of Rubrics for Grading Papers
The rubric for NUTR 4950 was revised to better evaluate student progress in CTW from the introductory course (NUTR 3010) to the capstone course (NUTR 4950). The grading rubric for 3010 has 3 levels of performance: Emerging, Developing, and Goal Oriented. The rubric for NUTR 4950 was changed to include performance levels: Developing, Goal-Oriented, and Mastery. Each student's performance in NUTR 4950 (paper) is compared to his/her performance in NUTR 3010 (mini-review paper). Students are expected to improve their performance level in NUTR 4950 from NUTR 3010 (e.g., Developing to Goal Oriented or Goal Oriented to Mastery).

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors for NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
The definition for critical thinking has remained the same, however critical thinking assignments have been added to other courses in the curriculum. In order for students to achieve a high level of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information, the faculty believe that students require many opportunities to develop and practice the skills. This means that all courses serve as building blocks to mastery achievement.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Through revision of the rubric for NUTR 4950, we have been able to compare performance in the entry CTW course to performance in the capstone course (NUTR 4950). All students reached or surpassed goal oriented. At least 75% of the students reached mastery level. Students are able to review evidence-based articles, extract key findings, and report these findings in a research style paper.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Continuous improvement of the assignments and rubric will always be goals for the program. The time involved in teaching a CTW course is problematic, especially with course load. CTW courses in our department often do not meet the required number for graduate student assistance.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
Faculty are committed to CTW and have been working towards incorporating critical thinking activities/assignments in their respective courses. The major change occurred in the capstone course NUTR 4950: rubric change and comparison of student performance as they progressed from NUTR 3010 to NUTR 4950.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The undergraduate program adopted new standards with new learning outcomes established by the Commission on Accreditation of Dietetics Education (CADE). Each learning outcome was connected to assessment strategies within the curriculum. Data will be collected and evaluated to assess outcome achievement. Performance achievement is reported every 5 years to CADE.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
Based on data from program and student assessment, the curriculum was revised. New courses (three) were added and course sequence was changed.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
Revision of the rubric for the capstone project provided a better picture about improvement in critical thinking skills from entrance into the dietetics program to completion of the program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Operations Management
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Managerial Sciences adapts 1987 definition of the National Council on Excellence in Critical Thinking for the Department’s different
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". This component of the eight page paper consist of two pages, states the value discipline, service concept and target market and acts as the guide for the balance of the paper.

**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. The final paper contains the completed Executive Summary, as well, a discussion of the other seven components of the paper.

**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 context, content and grammar.

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

**Target for O1: Executive Summary**
60% of student population will score in a range of "2" or better out of a "4" point rubric. This scoring is based on the four categories of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
67% of the students scored in a range of 2 to 3 on the syllabus rubric. Specifically, 1 student scored a 3 and 9 students scored a 2 out of 15 students. 5 students scored outside the range at a score of 1. There were no scores of 4.

**Target for O2: Execution of First Draft - Business Plan**
80% of student population will score in a "2 or better out of a "4" on the rubric. This scoring is based on the four categories of the syllabus rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
93 percent of the students who did submit their first draft achieved a score in a "2 or better out of a 4 on the rubric. One student scored a '1' on the rubric, because of a lack of understanding of the eight section business plan provided. There were no '4's scored.

**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. Additionally, 20% will score a "4" out of a "4". The final paper scoring will use these two criteria to measure success on the CTW experience in this course. This scoring is based on the four categories of the syllabus rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The third component of the CTW assignment is the final paper containing the executive summary and the seven additional components of the business plan paper. 93 percent of the students scored a "3" or better out of a "4" on the rubric. Additionally, 67 percent of the students scored a "4" out of a "4". A score of "4" reflects a sophisticated level of relevant facts and details on the assignment. In both measurements, the instructor was pleasantly surprised with the results, based on the earlier scores of the Executive Summary component. There, 14 of 15 students were at a "not yet competent regarding relevant facts and details".

**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

CTW Business Plan
On-going review of the Service Management, CTW Business Plan for MGS 4770 to ensure students understand the key components of the paper and instructions for developing the paper are clear and concise.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Review continues after review and changes made during the Spring 2011 semester.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Walter L. Wallace

CTW Paper Topics
Prior to the Spring semester, 2011, I completed a review of the required ten components of the CTW Business Plan and shortened the outline to eight components. I changed the length of the paper from ten pages to eight full pages. I changed the Achievement Targets for 1) Executive Summary 2) Execution of the First Draft and 3) Development of the Final Paper.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Implementation Description: The intent in making these changes was to allow for a better understanding of the objectives of the CTW Business Plan by the students and to ensure more practical measurement targets for the development of the paper by the students.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Walter L. Wallace

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
The major CTW accomplishment for my Spring 2011 Service Management course was the student results. The business plan developed by each of the students is an eight page paper with supplemental attachments, e.g., process flow chart, service quality attributes. Based on the development of the Executive Summary (one component of eight components), my expectations were set low: 93% of the students scored at a level of "Not yet competent regarding relevant facts and details" or less. Based on the final paper submitted on April 12, 2011, 93% of the students had scored at a level of "Competent relative to relevant facts and details" or "Sophisticated level of relevant facts and details". I found that comments on the Executive Summary and the First Draft were of great value to the students as they worked toward the completion of the CTW assignment.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Developing an understanding with my students of the value of being able to write in their discipline. On every occasion in class and in my office, one-on-one with students, I shared how important it is to the business community that business school graduates be able to communicate within their discipline verbally and in writing. Having a competitive advantage in writing and speaking can separate a good employee and the one that gets the next advancement.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Perhaps the design of the "Rubric". It appears to be adequate, but I'm not sure how revealing it is for the students. I have changed the length of the CTW, Business Plan paper several times. I have now settled on 8 pages, with previous assignments being as much as 12 pages. Grading of the papers is an interesting exercise. With a small class size of 15 to 25, I have been able to read all three assignments and score them. I do not know what would happen if I went over 25 students.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
I am not aware of what changes have been made from a departmental standpoint. I have continued to make minor changes in the assignment, refining the content requirements and deliverables. I feel these changes make for a better assignment in CTW. I'm convinced that the length of the paper is less important than the assignment of writing in the discipline. There are three other individuals in my department offering CTW classes, but I am not aware of changes each has made in their particular discipline.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Philosophy
As of: 12/13/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Philosophy has developed this policy to set out its student learning outcomes and assessment procedures. Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as 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 history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. 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, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

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)
New policy, as of 2010-2011 cycle. Every Fall, instructors of all Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 classes include on their syllabi the requirement that final papers be submitted electronically to the professor. The instructors of these classes will send these to the Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Coordinator will use a random number generator (such as that found at www.random.org) to select 15 papers total from all Phil 3000 classes and 10 (current policy says 15; we will adjust) papers total from all Phil 4990 classes. (These should come equally from each of the classes. Example, if there are 3 Phil 3000 classes, 5 papers should be chosen from each class; if there are 2 Phil 4990 classes, 7 papers should be chosen from each class and a 15th paper should be chosen at random from the combined set of papers from both.) Every Spring, the Assessment Coordinator distributes the selected papers to the other three members of the Assessment Committee. Those three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) assign each paper a letter score (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on critical thinking. When the scoring is complete, the Assessment Coordinator calculates the average score of the Phil 3000 papers and the average score of the Phil 4990 papers.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Writing Skills (G: 2) (M: 2)
New Policy as of 2010-2011 cycle: Every Fall, instructors of all Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 classes include on their syllabi the requirement that final papers be submitted electronically to the professor. The instructors of these classes will send these to the Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Coordinator will use a random number generator (such as that found at www.random.org) to select 15 papers total from all Phil 3000 classes and 10 (current policy says 15; we will adjust) papers total from all Phil 4990 classes. (These should come equally from each of the classes. Example, if there are 3 Phil 3000 classes, 5 papers should be chosen from each class; if there are 2 Phil 4990 classes, 7 papers should be chosen from each class and a 15th paper should be chosen at random from the combined set of papers from both.) Every Spring, the Assessment Coordinator distributes the selected papers to the other three members of the Assessment Committee. Those three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) assign each paper a letter score (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on written communication skills. When the scoring is complete, the Assessment Coordinator calculates the average score of the Phil 3000 papers and the average score of the Phil 4990 papers.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical Thinking (Q: 1)

Three tenured or tenure track members of the Assessment Committee score student's final papers 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.49 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.68. In the Fall of 2009 the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.89; in the Spring of 2010 it was 3.12. Part of the lower assessment in this new cycle is likely explained by increased emphasis on the fact that we are seeking to compare 3000 level students to where we believe our BA graduates should be. We believe this is the appropriate standard and will have to determine if we should lower our target or alter Phil 3000 in some way to improve the students' performance. (This is the first cycle with 4990 students.)

**M 2: Writing Skills (O: 2)**
Three tenured or tenure track members of the Assessment Committee score student's final papers on 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 has a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis. It has varied sentence structure and no significant grammar 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 pleasurable to read. B: A B paper has a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis. It has varied sentence structure and very few grammar and spelling mistakes. It has been self-edited and does not read like a first draft. C: A C paper has a thesis statement and some organization of paragraphs, but overall the paper but does not flow. It contains a significant number of grammar or spelling errors. It reads like a first draft. D: A D paper is poorly organized, and its paragraphs do not have a coherent structure. It contains numerous grammar and/or spelling errors. It reads like a first draft that has not been proofread. F: An F paper is similar to a D paper, but 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 3000 student's written communication ability is assessed a 2.62 and the average 4990 student's written communication ability is assessed a 2.88. In the Fall of 2009 the average 3000 student's written communication ability was assessed a 2.8; in the Spring of 2010 it was 3.12. Part of the lower assessment in this new cycle is likely explained by increased emphasis on the fact that we are seeking to compare 3000 level students to where we believe our BA graduates should be. We believe this is the appropriate standard and will have to determine if we should lower our target or alter Phil 3000 in some way to improve the students' performance. (This is the first cycle with 4990 students.)

**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 already central to the philosophy curriculum, we don't anticipate problems, but if we are not happy with the progress of the students, we will make changes as necessary. The Department is and has long been committed to responding to empirical evidence regarding teaching methods.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We will continue to discuss the program as needed.
Responsible Person/Group: Andrew Jason Cohen
Additional Resources: none

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**
It has not. In a field that is more than 2000 years old, it would be surprising if it changed in a 2 year period.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**
We have now offered Phil 4990 for a full year, very successfully.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**
Attendance at these workshops inevitably results in the learning (or sparking) of a few small tips to improve our processes.
CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

See the answer to CTW Reflection 1 above.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Beginning in this cycle, we have moved to using the Department Assessment Committee to assess our CTW program. We believe this will improve the value of the data we collect.

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

See the answer to CTW Reflection 1 above.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

We sought to improve our assessment process. See the answer to academic question #1 above.
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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 questions.

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.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Phys3300 was taught in the Fall 2010 semester with 15 students enrolled. Due to the larger number of students (five groups of three students), each student completed 5 laboratory experiments and 5 lab reports instead of 3 as in the previous year. Twelve students successfully completed the course. Twelve students (all physics majors) completed Phys3300 in the Fall of 2010. They achieved scores for the initial version of their first lab report averaging 2.8, 2.8, 2.7, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8 out of possible 4.0 for the seven criteria in the rubric, respectively. Most of the students revised the first report and students achieved scores averaging 3.5, 3.4, 3.7, 3.5, 3.1, 3.5, and 3.5 for the seven criteria in the rubric, respectively. Scores for all twelve students were either 3 or 4 on all criteria for the final versions of the first report except for one student receiving a 2 on one criterion and another student receiving a 2 on each of 3 criteria. On the final version of each lab report, 50% of the scores on the seven criteria were 4 out 4.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No findings were obtained for 2010-2011. This course was offered for the second time in Spring 2011. However, there were not any students under the CTW requirement taking the course. The two students who completed the course performed their research outside of the department. Both wrote long form research reports over the semester. One of these was overseen in the Math department as part of its existing RIMMES program. We expect a sufficient number of students to take this class in Spring 2012 to run the class as designed with formal class meetings.

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

#### Adding Electronics training into Phys3300

In Phys3300 in the Fall of 2010, an activity was added to the course prior to the laboratory experiments to refresh and supplement the students electronics knowledge and skills. In addition, one laboratory experiment was added dealing specifically with measuring properties of electronic devices (Transistor Lab).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Add content in electronic circuits to Phys3300.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

#### 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. In Fall 2010 the amount of time spent in before the first lab on data analysis and graphing was increased with an experimental design and analysis activity added to the course. This resulted in significantly higher scores on the rubric criterion for graphing and data analysis in Fall 2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Phys3300 Physics Rubric
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Laboratory Experiment Reports
- **Implementation Description:** Syllabus and schedule changes to add additional content on data analysis and graphing.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

#### 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 was changed so that the performance of the labs (five labs were performed this year) were more spread out giving time for writing and revising the first lab report before the subsequent labs were performed.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

When Phys3300, Advanced Physics Lab - CTW, was created the department took the opportunity to create a course that would explicitly seek to prepare the students in all areas needed to perform high quality research for their required Research Project. This preparation included scientific writing in the style of physics and astronomy journal articles but also included many other research skills. Over the last two years a large number of students after completing the first CTW course were able to perform research at a level high enough to lead to publications and conference presentations. So the major accomplishment was the high level of performance of the students in the subsequent research projects. Last year’s action plan responded to the areas of low performance in the experimental skills, data analysis skills or writing skills of the students. Those changes are directly connected to improvements in students ability to perform high quality research. Note: Most of the research projects are being completed under the old research course and not the new CTW research course. That should change this year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Since the exit class has not yet been successfully populated, we don’t have clear data on the improvement. However, we have seen improved research skills resulting in higher quality research in the student projects. More students have performed research of high enough quality to result in journal papers or conference presentations. However, most of these have been performed under the old research class and not the new CTW research class, so our evidence is only anecdotal at this point.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Since the second of the two CTW courses has not been taught yet, that course will undoubtedly need some work after its first offering. In the first CTW course (Phys3300), we are still working on the balance between the amount of lab reports to write and the amount of time left for revisions. The first year, there were only 3 lab reports while in the second year there were 5 lab reports. More revisions were performed the first year. However, we also made improvements in the preparation work leading up to the lab reports. In the end the performance on the final reports was about the same in both years, in each case quite good. The course seems to be working well and only minor tweaking of the preparation exercises, the number of lab reports, and the timing of the reports is needed.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

The impact of the first CTW course (Phys3300 - Advanced Physics Lab) has been an obvious improvement in the skills and preparation of the students for performing high quality research and in their ability to present that research. However, that data is mostly anecdotal since the second CTW course (Phys4900 - Research Project) has not had enough students yet and most of this research has been completed under the old research course (Phys4950) without the coordination or assessment from the CTW Ambassador. There are beginning to be impacts seen in the faculty as they adapt to having more undergraduates performing larger projects and coming equipped with better skills. Those impacts will be seen more clearly this year in the second CTW course, Phys4900. There have been no major changes to the CTW Initiative in the department.
## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1: Identifying the Issue</th>
<th>Students will be able to identify a question or issue to investigate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2: Consideration of assumptions and context</td>
<td>Students will be able to consider assumptions and/or context of the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3: Formulation of testable hypothesis</td>
<td>Students will be able to formulate a testable hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4: Collection and presentation of data</td>
<td>Students will be able to collect and present of facts/data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5: Analysis of Data</td>
<td>Students will be able to analyse facts/data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6: Integration of perspectives</td>
<td>Students will be able to integrate and synthesize of other perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7: Presentation of Conclusions</td>
<td>Students will be able to effectively present conclusions of their research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Effective Formulation of Research Question (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Effective collection and use of data (G: 4, 5) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper and/or 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1: Rubric for Political Science 3800 (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**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), 40.6% scored 4 (higher end of Competent) and 21.9% scored 3 (lower end of Competent). 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

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

The CTW program continued to expand and develop in the department. More sections of the CTW courses were offered this year than last year. In addition several changes were made to the implementation of the program as well as the assessment of student learning to make the CTW reports more accurate. The following were the major changes: 1. The rubric for POLS 4900 was modified to more readily accommodate assessment of development of testable hypothesis for non-quantitative research. This modified version of the rubric will be used to assess students starting the fall of 2011. 2. Faculty training was enhanced to hold assessment scores of 5 to a higher standard than last year. In addition several changes were made to the implementation of the program as well as the assessment of student learning to make the CTW reports more accurate. The following were the major changes:

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Rubric for Political Science 3800 | **Outcome/Objective:** Effective Formulation of Research Question
- **Measure:** Rubric for Political Science 4900 | **Outcome/Objective:** Effective Formulation of Research Question

**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:** 05/2012

**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). Faculty teaching the course noted that this was a major weakness of students coming into the course. The plan is to give added stress to developing this skill in POLS 4900.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Rubric for Political Science 4900 | **Outcome/Objective:** Effective Communication of results

**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:** 05/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and Faculty teaching POLS 4900 in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Improvements in all areas of critical thinking have been recorded in both POLS 3800 and POLS 4900. However, only in the coming year or two will it be possible to compare across courses as the students taking POLS 4900 will have also taken POLS 3800 as a CTW course. Even so the comparison will be of a cohort rather than individual students as the department is not tracking assessment of each student from one course to another.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We anticipate a major shortage of faculty resources to teach POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 as the number of political science majors required to take these courses are now increasing rapidly. In the Fall Spring and Summer semesters of 2010-2011 the department offered 15 sections of POLS 3800 and 4 sections of POLS 4900. There is already pressure on faculty who are unable to offer other upper division courses in which they have expertise in order to staff all sections of POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 that our major's will require.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

The CTW program has had some change in the courses in the department. In both POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 there is greater emphasis on identified critical thinking skills. The ability to frame testable hypotheses and integrating other points of view into writing assignments have been identified as areas needing improvement among our students. The changes in assignments and teaching in CTW courses reflects this need. The plan is to devote some time at the annual departmental faculty retreat to discussion on incorporating assignments into other upper division courses to improve CT skills. In terms of the changes to the CTW plan the rubric for POLS 4900 has been adjusted to be able to assess non-quantitative research question formulation.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process have you made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Three important changes were made to the assessment process for this year. First, some additional training on the use of the rubrics for POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 was given to ensure greater consistency in assessment scores. Second, faculty were trained to be critical when assigning scores of 5 on the POLS 4900 rubric. Third the rubric for POLS 4900 was modified to accommodate non-quantitative research projects (This last change will be in effect for the following year.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
Please see details of the action plans in the section above and the report on their impact on CT assessments

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
The CTW program seems to be going well. Some minor adjustments, already discussed, have been and will be made to the program to improve CT skills among our majors and to better assess these skills

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The two action plans already in place will be implemented this year. We anticipate that student learning outcome assessments will continue to improve.

---
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**2010-2011 CTW Psychology**

*(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 (APA 3.1-3.4)**
Respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.

**G 2: Integrative writing (APA 7.1)**
Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats (e.g., essays, correspondence, technical papers, note taking) and for various purposes (e.g., informing, defending, explaining, persuading, arguing, teaching).

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1) (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
- 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: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (APA 7.1) (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**
- a. Demonstrate professional writing conventions (e.g., grammar, audience awareness, formality) appropriate to purpose and context
- b. Use APA style effectively in empirical reports, literature reviews, and theoretical papers

### 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, 2)**
- 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, 2)**

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: 3530 Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

PSYC 3530 provides psychology majors with experience in research design, data analysis, and scientific communication needed for higher-level understanding in 4000-level courses, the development and writing of senior-year theses, and graduate study. Topics include the structure and style of scientific writing in psychology, experimental design, statistical techniques, and the preparation of a formal research paper in APA style. The form of the final paper varied across terms: Students who took the course in Fall 2010 completed an APA-style research project proposal, including Introduction, Method, and Projected Results sections, with 10 recent peer-reviewed articles as primary sources; students who took the course in Spring 2011 completed an APA-style literature review based on 4-10 recent peer-reviewed articles as primary sources. Note: We were not able to include data from one PSYC 3530 instructor, because he/she used the 2008 CTW rubric, rather than the updated 2010 version, for rating assignments.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric in instructor, because he/she used the 2008 CTW rubric, rather than the updated 2010 version, for rating assignments.

**Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)**

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student’s submission for Organization and Logic on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims 1. Is skeptical, but is unable to explain why or support claims with evidence 2. Supports claims with evidence, but this evidence is usually inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant 3. Supports most claims with evidence that is appropriate, accurate, and relevant 4. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. However, some important evidence is missing. 5. Consistently and thoroughly supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. For PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Use of Evidence on this assignment.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The median score for Organization and Logic was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 93% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 98% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category is summarized in Figure 1.

**Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)**

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student’s submission for Position and Balance on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims 1. Is skeptical, but is unable to explain why or support claims with evidence 2. Supports claims with evidence, but this evidence is usually inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant 3. Supports most claims with evidence that is appropriate, accurate, and relevant 4. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. However, some important evidence is missing. 5. Consistently and thoroughly supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. For PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Use of Evidence on this assignment.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The median score for Position and Balance was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 95% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category is summarized in Figure 2.

**Target for O3: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4)**

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student’s submission for Use of Evidence on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims 1. Is skeptical, but is unable to explain why or support claims with evidence 2. Supports claims with evidence, but this evidence is usually inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant 3. Supports most claims with evidence that is appropriate, accurate, and relevant 4. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. However, some important evidence is missing. 5. Consistently and thoroughly supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. For PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Use of Evidence on this assignment.
Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (APA 7.1)

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Grammar and Mechanics on the scale below. A score of 3 or 4 is considered Developing and meets advanced expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. A score of 0-4 is considered Emerging and is below expectations.

M 2: 4800 Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

PSYC 4800 is a senior seminar; each section focuses on a different topic. As such, the types and topics of the CTW posttest writing assignments vary across sections. Below is a brief description of the different assignments for which student samples have been provided, organized by section. PSYC 4800, Section 2 (4800-2) The Case: In 1996 Oprah Winfrey had a guest on her show from the Human Society who discussed the practice of feeding cows ground-up meat from dead livestock. This practice, now banned by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States, is believed to have contributed to the spread of bovine spongiform encephalopathy, commonly known as "mad cow disease". Oprah, after hearing of the risks associated with this practice, pronounced her intentions clearly expressed. For PSYC 3530, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Content and Development on this assignment. "*** In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Citation and Use of Sources on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. A score of 0-4 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Action Plan 2010**

"revise rubric" action plan) so that the goals and objectives better align with the measures.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

---

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The median score for Organization and Logic was 5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 96% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence was 5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 78% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category is summarized in Figure 1.

Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals (APA 3.3)

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student’s submission for Use of Evidence on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. 0. Does not take any position on the issue. Does not take a consistent position on the issue 1. Takes a consistent position on the issue, but ignores relevant counterevidence and alternate points of view 2. Takes a consistent position on the issue and attempts to address some relevant counterevidence and/or alternate points of view 3. Takes a consistent position on the issue and addresses the relevant counterevidence and/or alternate points of view 4. Takes a consistent position on the issue and addresses the relevant counterevidence and/or alternate points of view

---

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The median score for Position and Balance was 5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 100% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category is summarized in Figure 2.

Target for O3: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4)

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student’s submission for Use of Evidence on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. 0. The frequency and variety of errors obscures the writer’s intentions completely. 1. The frequency and variety of errors is disruptive to the reader. 2. The frequency and/or variety of errors is somewhat disruptive to the reader. 3. Errors are infrequent and inconsequential to the reader. 4. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 5. The reader’s intentions are clearly expressed. For PSYC 4800, our senior/exit CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Use of Evidence on this assignment.

---

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The median score for Use of Evidence was 5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 78% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category is summarized in Figure 3.

Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (APA 7.1)

In the 2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student’s submission for Grammar and Mechanics on the scale below. A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. 0. The frequency and variety of errors is disruptive to the reader. 1. The frequency and variety of errors is somewhat disruptive to the reader. 2. Errors are infrequent and inconsequential to the reader. 3. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 4. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 5. The reader’s intentions are clearly expressed. For PSYC 4800, our senior/exit CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Mastering (4-5) range for Grammar and Mechanics on this assignment.

---

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 68% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development was 5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 76% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Citation and Use of Sources was 5, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 82% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The proportions of students in each performance category is summarized in Figure 4.

---

**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.
CTW Instructor Workshops

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: Finished
Priority: High

Plagiarism Materials and Policy

Faculty who teach CTW courses -- as well as other courses with substantive writing assignments -- report an increased number of students who are plagiarizing content in the work they submit. This form of academic dishonesty is occurring despite a specific focus in the entry level CTW course on how to recognize plagiarism, how to avoid it, and why plagiarism is unethical and inappropriate in an academic environment. To address this problem, beginning Fall 2011 a department approved policy will appear in all undergraduate course syllabi describing what constitutes plagiarism in APA style writing and the consequences of engaging in this sort of unethical conduct in any psychology course. The goal of this policy is to present a consistent message to students that plagiarism is never acceptable and that all cases of plagiarism will be reported to authorities at the Department, College, and University levels. In addition to the policy, members of the Undergraduate Program Committee developed materials that faculty can use in any undergraduate course to teach students about what constitutes plagiarism in our discipline, and why we as academic professionals care about preventing it. The CTW Ambassadors will gather data about the frequency and severity of plagiarism cases during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years and compare them to determine if this change in policy has resulted in a decrease in the number of plagiarism cases observed by faculty. It is our hope that by expanding the discussion about plagiarism and students' awareness of this problem to all undergraduate courses in Psychology, administrators at the College and University levels will recognize our discipline-specific definition of plagiarism and will support our faculty when they report violations of the Student Code of Conduct in this regard.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Budget Amount Requested: $2,000.00 (recurring)

CTW Instructor Workshops

As the number of faculty who are teaching CTW courses within the Psychology department increases, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the CTW Ambassadors to provide one-on-one training to faculty regarding assignment design, feedback, and assessment.

To address this concern, Dr. Darnell will be offering a CTW instructor training workshop before the beginning of the Fall and Spring terms, with a specific focus on the entry level CTW course, PSYC 3530. Dr. Tusher will conduct a needs assessment of faculty who have taught PSYC 4800 and work with Dr. Darnell to prepare the appropriate materials and training to respond to faculty requests regarding instructional support for the exit level CTW course.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassadors
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

The Psychology department accomplished several things with regard to CTW this year. First, in response to feedback from our previous annual report, we revised the CTW Writing Assessment Rubric to more effectively measure the learning outcomes related to critical thinking; these revisions were described in detail under Academic Program Question 1. Second, we increased the number of sections of both our entry level course (PSYC 3530) and our exit level course (PSYC 4800) that are offered each semester. PSYC 3530 is now offered in six versions/sections each semester, putting us on target toward our ultimate goal of 6 sections per semester in Fall 2012. Third, the College approved our request to limit retakes in PSYC 3530 to one per student. As such, all students must successfully complete this course with a grade of C or better in two attempts (not including withdrawals) to continue in the Psychology major.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit level?**

From the entry level CTW course to the exit level CTW course, students are improving in their critical thinking skills. Specifically, the vast majority of students’ median scores on all measures (i.e., Organization & Logic, Use of Evidence, and Position & Balance) were in the Developing category at the end of the entry level CTW course (PSYC 3530) and in the Mastering category at the end of the exit level CTW course (PSYC 4800). Students’ writing skills – which we consider fundamental to their development and expression of critical thinking skills – also appear to improve between the entry level to the exit level CTW course; students are showing improved attention to detail, thoughtfulness about organization of ideas, and awareness of stylistic issues as they advance through the CTW sequence. Specifically, the vast majority of students’ median scores on all measures (i.e., Grammar & Mechanics, Content & Development, and Citation & Use of Sources) were in the Developing category at the end of the entry level CTW course (PSYC 3530) and in the Mastering category at the end of the exit level CTW course (PSYC 4800).

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

We need more faculty to submit proposals for the senior/exit level CTW course to accommodate the number of students who will need the course to fulfill the college requirement in the coming years. We have nine versions of the course (e.g., Forensic Psychology, Psychology of War, Primate Models of Human Behavior) that have been approved, six of which have been taught one or more times. Four of these faculty have taught in various stages of revision and approval. By Fall 2012, we hope to regularly offer a minimum of six versions of the course each fall and spring semester. To facilitate the number of faculty who are teaching sections of this course, the chair of the department is not permitting any faculty member to teach PSYC 4800 for more than three consecutive semesters. We plan to continue work on the CTW Writing Assessment Rubric and possibly modify it better assess and allow faculty to assess a broader range of dimensions in writing assignments in the senior/exit level CTW course. Faculty are hesitant to teach the entry level CTW course because of their concerns about the quality of student writing at the junior level and their own lack of formal training to provide students with useful guidance and feedback on the writing process. Although the ambassadors and the department chair have been successful in encouraging several faculty to teach the course who have not taught it before, there have been several requests that the ambassadors provide workshops and/or materials and additional support to help faculty help students write better. As ambassadors, we request that the CTW program provide in-house workshops (e.g., before or after a department faculty meeting) for faculty who will be teaching CTW courses, but are not CTW ambassadors. Because of the specific requirements of scientific writing, specifically APA style, and how the style may differ to the style students may have learned in English composition, we would like to work closely with the representatives of the CTW program to make sure that the workshop materials reflect the values and expectations of psychology as a discipline. There is debate in the department about whether any CTW courses should be offered in summer semester because to the limited amount of time students have to absorb and reflect on material and faculty have to provide sufficient, meaningful feedback on written assignments. The focus on academic writing brought about by the CTW initiative has increased opportunities for instructors to provide students with prompt and useful feedback on these assignments. For example, there has been at least one documented case of plagiarism during each semester of PSYC 3530, and in some cases many more. This issue is particularly concerning as students receive specific instruction about what constitutes plagiarism in APA style and how to avoid it as part of the PSYC 3530 curriculum. To address this problem, beginning Fall 2011 a department approved policy will appear in all undergraduate course syllabi describing what constitutes plagiarism in APA style and the consequences of engaging in this sort of unethical conduct. The psychology course is not a consistent measure of this policy, but all students that plagiarize will be reported to authorities at the department, college, and university levels. In addition to the policy, members of the Undergraduate Program Committee developed materials that faculty can use in any undergraduate course to teach students about what constitutes plagiarism in our discipline, and why we as academic professionals care about whether or not students plagiarize on assignments. We recognize that CTW courses place an increased demand on students to read and write at a sophisticated level and the desire to meet these demands may encourage some students to plagiarize. However, we believe that with sufficient preparation and feedback, any student has the ability to write at an appropriate level without plagiarism. That being said, some students arrive in PSYC 3530 with such limited skills in reading and writing at the college level that they are not able to take advantage of the opportunities offered by CTW courses. It is simply not possible for the PSYC 3530 instructor to provide them with the support they need to develop their academic literacy to an appropriate level to succeed in a CTW environment. We would like to request that the CTW program design a screening tool for incoming students that is low cost and easy to administer. We recommend including such a tool at the time of admission to our university.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?**

Anecdotally, faculty who teach in the junior/entry level CTW course is a prerequisite suggest that students’ writing and thinking skills are better than those demonstrated by students who took PSYC 3030, the non-CTW research methods course that PSYC 3530 replaced. Additionally, faculty who teach 4000-level courses for which PSYC 3530 is not a prerequisite note that those students who have taken 3530 perform more thoughtfully and effectively on written assignments than students who have not taken PSYC3530; for this reason, some faculty are considering making PSYC 3530 a prerequisite for those courses in the future. The opportunity to teach CTW courses is used as a reward for incoming faculty and a recruitment tool for potential incoming faculty. One of our CTW ambassadors was inspired to teach CTW courses because the undergraduate level was a positive and contributing factor in his/her decision to accept a position at GSU for Fall 2011. There is increasing awareness among the department’s administration that the demanding nature of teaching CTW courses well places faculty who regularly do so at increased risk for burn out. The Undergraduate Program Committee recommended to the chair that no faculty member be asked to teach more than one CTW section per semester and that faculty who have taught CTW courses for three
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

One criticism of our 2009-2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric was that it did not independently measure each of our stated learning outcomes. To address this concern, we revised the rubric, making changes to some measures and adding others. The original measures, the revised/added measures, and the relevant changes are described below.

OUTCOME 1: Use critical thinking effectively.

2009-2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Organization: Elements are thoughtfully and effectively arranged in a manner appropriate to the purpose and audience, including consistent and appropriate evidence to support the argument.

2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Organization and Logic: Ideas are arranged in a logical, coherent, and effective way – a somewhat more obvious and direct application of the skills and concepts they learn in PSYC 1101/1102.

As a result, they are often ill-prepared to organize and express their ideas in writing, even when they are not being required to use the scientific writing style of the discipline (i.e., APA style). This basic lack of comfort and familiarity with writing at the college level makes writing in a scientific style even more difficult. Students also appear to have limited exposure to scientific writing beyond what they have seen in textbooks or sources, much less the ability to draw on scientific sources as models in their own writing. For them, this is challenging. Collectively, these issues suggest that we need to think about adding training in scientific literacy to the curriculum before the freshman and junior year to make it possible for students to receive the maximum benefit of the CTW sequence.

OUTCOME 2: Use reasoning to recognize, develop, and argue for position(s) on an issue.

The new measures, Position and Balance and Use of Evidence, address these concerns.

Critical Thinking: Understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the argument 0.

The changes are discussed after both new measures are presented.

Critical Thinking: Understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the argument with original ideas or evidence NOTE: This measure was replaced with two new measures: Position and Balance and Use of Evidence, each of which relates to a separate outcome. The changes are discussed after both new measures are presented. 2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Position and Balance 0. Does not take any position on the issue 1. Does not take a consistent position on the issue 2. Takes a consistent position on the issue, but ignores relevant counter-evidence and alternate points of view 3. Takes a consistent position on the issue and attempts to address some relevant counter-evidence and/or alternate points of view 4. Takes a consistent position on the issue and addresses the relevant counter-evidence and/or alternate points of view. However, claims and/or evidence could be presented more clearly and/or objectively. 5. Takes a clear and balanced position on the issue, though claims and/or evidence relevant to the argument may not be presented adequately or objectively.

Use of Evidence 0.

2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Use of Evidence 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims 1. Is skeptical, but unable to explain why or support claims with evidence 2. Supports claims with evidence, but this evidence is usually inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant 3. Supports most claims with evidence that is appropriate, accurate, and relevant 4. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. However, some important evidence is missing 5. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence.

CHANGES: The original measure, Critical Thinking: understands thoroughly the scientific/logical arguments made by others, which is not as relevant to the PSYC 3530 research project assignment as the students’ ability to form a cohesive, meaningful argument of their own when making a case for a proposed research study. Students simply don’t have enough time or skill to read enough of the relevant scientific literature to understand and evaluate the full discourse that the scientific community is having on any given issue in psychology. It is also seen to some extent to which the original measure was not always meaningful. For example, “understanding original” to the scientific dialogue they are joining in on through their research project. Although the APA does want undergraduate students in the junior/entry level CTW course report that understanding the scientific writing style of the discipline (i.e., APA style), this basic lack of comfort and familiarity with writing at the college level makes writing in a scientific style even more difficult. Students also appear to have limited exposure to scientific writing beyond what they have seen in textbooks or sources, much less the ability to draw on scientific sources as models in their own writing. For them, this is challenging. Collectively, these issues suggest that we need to think about adding training in scientific literacy to the curriculum before the freshman and junior year to make it possible for students to receive the maximum benefit of the CTW sequence.

OUTCOME 3: Approach problems creatively and use reasoning to generate creative solutions.

This measure was replaced with two new measures: Position and Balance and Use of Evidence, each of which relates to a separate outcome. The changes are discussed after both new measures are presented.

Critical Thinking: Understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the argument 0.

The changes are discussed after both new measures are presented.

Critical Thinking: Understands thoroughly and contributes usefully to the argument with original ideas or evidence NOTE: This measure was replaced with two new measures: Position and Balance and Use of Evidence, each of which relates to a separate outcome. The changes are discussed after both new measures are presented. 2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Position and Balance 0. Does not take any position on the issue 1. Does not take a consistent position on the issue 2. Takes a consistent position on the issue, but ignores relevant counter-evidence and alternate points of view 3. Takes a consistent position on the issue and attempts to address some relevant counter-evidence and/or alternate points of view 4. Takes a consistent position on the issue and addresses the relevant counter-evidence and/or alternate points of view. However, claims and/or evidence could be presented more clearly and/or objectively. 5. Takes a clear and balanced position on the issue, though claims and/or evidence relevant to the argument may not be presented adequately or objectively.

Use of Evidence 0.

2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Use of Evidence 0. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims 1. Is skeptical, but unable to explain why or support claims with evidence 2. Supports claims with evidence, but this evidence is usually inappropriate, inaccurate, or irrelevant 3. Supports most claims with evidence that is appropriate, accurate, and relevant 4. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence. However, some important evidence is missing 5. Consistently supports claims with appropriate, accurate, and relevant evidence.

CHANGES: The original measure, Critical Thinking: understands thoroughly the scientific/logical arguments made by others, which is not as relevant to the PSYC 3530 research project assignment as the students’ ability to form a cohesive, meaningful argument of their own when making a case for a proposed research study. Students simply don’t have enough time or skill to read enough of the relevant scientific literature to understand and evaluate the full discourse that the scientific community is having on any given issue in psychology. It is also seen to some extent to which the original measure was not always meaningful. For example, “understanding original” to the scientific dialogue they are joining in on through their research project. Although the APA does want undergraduate students in the junior/entry level CTW course report that understanding the scientific writing style of the discipline (i.e., APA style), this basic lack of comfort and familiarity with writing at the college level makes writing in a scientific style even more difficult. Students also appear to have limited exposure to scientific writing beyond what they have seen in textbooks or sources, much less the ability to draw on scientific sources as models in their own writing. For them, this is challenging. Collectively, these issues suggest that we need to think about adding training in scientific literacy to the curriculum before the freshman and junior year to make it possible for students to receive the maximum benefit of the CTW sequence.

OUTCOME 4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes.

2009-2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Grammar and Mechanics: The language clearly communicates the author’s intentions 0.

Frequency and/or variety of errors obscures the writer’s intentions completely 1. Frequency and variety of errors is somewhat disruptive 2. Errors are few and generally not disruptive 3. Errors are rare and
inconsequential. 5. The language clearly communicates the writer's intentions 2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Grammar and Mechanics 0. The frequency and variety of errors obscures the writer's intentions completely. 1. The frequency and variety of errors is disruptive to the reader. 2. The frequency and/or variety of errors are somewhat disruptive to the reader. 3. Errors are few and generally not disruptive to the reader. 4. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 5. The language clearly expresses the writer's intentions to the reader. CHANGES: Some minor changes in wording only. Specifically, the phrase "to the reader" has been added to options 1-4. In option 5, we have restated the phrase to "the writer", which is more grammatically correct. It is not the writer's responsibility to "mine" a piece of writing for the writer's intended meaning. 2009-2010 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Development: the author offers complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner 0. No details 1. Offers few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant 2. Offers a variety of relevant and accurate details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant 3. Offers a variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing 4. Offers thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise 5. Offers complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner 2010-2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric element Development: the author offers complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner 0. No details 1. Offers few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant 2. Offers a variety of relevant and accurate details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant 3. Offers a variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing 4. Offers thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise 5. Offers complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner **CHANGES:** Some minor changes in wording only. Specifically, the phrase "to the reader" has been added to options 1-4. In option 5, we have restated the phrase to "the writer", which is more grammatically correct. It is not the writer's responsibility to "mine" a piece of writing for the writer's intended meaning.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The vast majority of students in our program are meeting the learning goals related to critical thinking. We are happy with the various versions of our CTW courses that the faculty have created and believe that the activities, assignments, and topics are successfully fostering critical thinking skills in psychology majors. However, we believe that many students are not able to take full advantage of the opportunities afforded by our CTW courses because of their limited writing skills. To address this problem, one of our PSYC 3530 instructors, Dr. Marika Lamoreaux, has created a learning support center for psychology students where they can receive individual help from a tutor on all major writing assignments. At least one instructor goes so far as to pair each of her students who is struggling with a specific writing tutor. Student response to the tutoring provided at the learning support center has been extremely positive.

CTW program administrators have met repeatedly with Dr. Lamoreaux and have recruited her to help faculty in other departments with a specific writing tutor. Her responsibilities include tutoring in writing and APA style, as well as in the content areas of statistics and research methods. The tutoring center is staffed entirely by volunteer undergraduates who have been recommended by faculty for their demonstrated skills in the various tutoring areas. Students in PSYC 3530 who are identified as needing substantial help with writing via the learning assessment pretest (i.e., a writing sample that is the first three pages of a rough draft of their course notes on a regular basis and get help from a tutor on all major writing assignments. At least one instructor goes so far as to pair each of her students who is struggling with a specific writing tutor. Student response to the tutoring provided at the learning support center has been extremely positive.

CTW program administrators have met repeatedly with Dr. Lamoreaux and have recruited her to help faculty in other departments with a specific writing tutor. Her responsibilities include tutoring in writing and APA style, as well as in the content areas of statistics and research methods. The tutoring center is staffed entirely by volunteer undergraduates who have been recommended by faculty for their demonstrated skills in the various tutoring areas. Students in PSYC 3530 who are identified as needing substantial help with writing via the learning assessment pretest (i.e., a writing sample that is the first three pages of a rough draft of their course notes on a regular basis and get help from a tutor on all major writing assignments. At least one instructor goes so far as to pair each of her students who is struggling with a specific writing tutor. Student response to the tutoring provided at the learning support center has been extremely positive.

Administrative DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how the department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Data from the CTW Writing Assessment Rubric was included in the general report regarding learning outcomes for the department. Because of the positive results, the department decided to continue using the CTW Writing Assessment Rubric. The CTW Ambassadors continue to encourage interest and enthusiasm about the CTW initiative as a whole and about teaching CTW courses in Psychology.

Administrative DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

With regard to the reporting process, the organization of information in WEAVE is unintuitive and unhelpful. The terms used for various categories and subcategories (e.g., Goal, Outcome, Measure) are inconsistent with how the same terms are used in our discipline. For individuals who are new to the WEAVE program, determining where information and documents should be included is
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Public Management and Policy
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Critical thinking in Public Management and Policy involves evaluating arguments and making and justifying claims based on theoretical understandings and/or empirical assessment.

The Department of Public Management and Policy is committed to community service with the goal of improving government, society, and quality of life in the Atlanta area, the Southeast region, and throughout the United States and other countries.

Goals
G 1: Reflection
Students will be able to reflect on their experiences in public and non-profit organizations and think critically about how they relate to readings and class discussions.

G 2: Critically analyze scholarly readings
Students will be able to express their critical analysis and thoughts orally in class and through written 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 a policy assessment design. Options might include interviews, experiments, survey research, qualitative research, and document reviews.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Discussion of assignment (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
P/MAP 3021 Citizenship, the Community, and the Public Sector O 1, 2, 3: Discussion of Final Project Assignment For sections taught by Harvey Newman, Professor - For a term project, students will be required to write a report on how citizens can engage the public often confusing and time consuming. There also appear to be problems in the editing feature that result in errors being introduced into proper HTML code when information is saved. It is also frustrating that the same (kind of) information is asked for in multiple places. However, after working through these challenges, we successfully completed the report and the process did prompt us to reflect on the progress of the CTW initiative in Psychology. With regard to our data outcomes, we were surprised that the scores on both critical thinking and writing related outcomes were as high as they were, given the consistency of faculty's verbal reports that students' thinking, reasoning, and writing skills are often below their expectations. We have several thoughts on why this disconnect may be taking place. If the ratings are inaccurate and the "faculty talk" is accurate, it may be that faculty are grading writing assignments more generously than students' performance actually warrants. This is of particular concern in PSYC 3530, because students must pass the research writing portion of the course with a grade of C or better to pass the course as a whole, and must pass the course as a whole in no more than two attempts to stay in the major. Faculty don't want to be "the one" who gives a student a grade that keeps him/her from staying in the major or graduating with a college degree. Also, faculty who share the results of the CTW rubric with students may be concerned that students will respond with poor Student Evaluation of Instruction if they receive feedback on their written work that suggests it is less than satisfactory. PSYC 3530 papers are also submitted at the very end of the term, when faculty have the least time and energy to deal with student complaints regarding grading; as such, some faculty may give students higher grades than warranted on the final paper to avoid conflicts with students that arise when final course grades are lower than expected. If the ratings are accurate and the "faculty talk" is not, this may be an example of the availability heuristic in action. Cases of particularly bad thinking/writing may stand out to faculty more than those that meet their expectations, thereby seeming more common than they actually are. The fact that the PSYC 4800 scores are so high (mostly 5s) is less of a concern than the scores for PSYC 3530. The topic of the PSYC 4800 courses (and, correspondingly, the assignments) is more focused and the students have had the opportunity to write several essays of the same type and receive feedback on those essays prior to submitting the one on which they are rated for CTW learning outcome assessment. All Psychology majors have to take PSYC 3530, but PSYC 4800 still has a large proportion of students who are taking it as an elective. PSYC 4800 students also get to choose the topic of the course they take (and thus the topic of the assignments they must complete), whereas PSYC 3530 students all cover the same content and have their final paper topics selected for them, at least in general, by the course instructor. We also note that the post-test assignments for PSYC 4800 (e.g., a critique of a single article) are not as extensive and do not seem as rigorous as those for PSYC 3530 (e.g., a literature review incorporating information from 10 peer-reviewed sources). It seems that one solution to the concerns about inaccurate ratings in PSYC 3530 is to discourage faculty from sharing the scores from the CTW rubric with students, thereby avoiding some negative student response to low ratings. However, it is important that there be good consistency between students' ratings on the assessment rubric and their grades in the course; we do not want faculty to give lower "private" ratings (i.e., those not seen by students) and higher "public" ratings (i.e., those seen by students). It may be that the CTW Ambassadors for Psychology simply need to have more open dialogue with instructors about inter-rater reliability on the various rubric measures and discuss formalizing the operational definitions that faculty are using to complete the rubric. We will continue to brainstorm on this issue.

Administrative Department Question 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We are satisfied with the current level of progress demonstrated by our students across the two-course CTW sequence, and hope that they will continue on this trajectory. We do not plan to implement any new strategies beyond those described in the action plans.
sector around an issue. The report will be based on the student's theoretical understanding of citizenship as well as personal involvement in a community or public organization. For sections taught by Deon Locklin, Instructor - Service Learning Essay: Each student will prepare an essay that reflects the student's conceptual understanding of citizenship as a result of his/her participation in the course and involvement in the community service learning activity over the semester. The final paper will be approximately 1,500 words, plus cover sheet and reference list.

### O/O 2: Preparation of a research proposal (G: 3, 4) (M: 3)
PMAP 4051 Evaluating Public Policy O 3, 4: Discussion of Final Project Assignment Students will write an evaluation research proposal integrating research methods and evaluation theory into a real problem. Students will draw on information and analytical skills obtained during the course including knowledge on how to pose research questions, form hypotheses, measure concepts, and take appropriate samples and how to analyze various modes of observation: experiments, surveys, field research and unobtrusive research. Students will also draw on their learned ability to critically analyze evaluation designs and alternative approaches to evaluations.

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
86.02% of students at least partially met objective. 45.1% Exceeded objective/skill 35.5% Fully demonstrated 5.4% Partially demonstrated 1.08% Barely demonstrated 12.9% Did not demonstrate Measurement: Final course project.

#### M 3: Prepare proposal for evaluation project (O: 2)
Students will prepare a proposal to conduct an evaluation of a policy issue. There is also an oral presentation of the research design.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Preparation of a research proposal**
70% of students will at least partially demonstrate adequate preparation of a research proposal.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
64.52% of students at least partially demonstrated adequate preparation of a research proposal. 16.1% Exceeded objective/skill 16.1% Fully demonstrated 32.3% Partially demonstrated 12.9% Barely demonstrated 22.6% Did not demonstrate

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

#### Designate new course as initial CTW course
Replace PMAP 3021, Citizenship, the Community and the Public Service as the initial designated CTW course. The new course will be PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues.
- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The change in designation must be approved by the faculty of the PMAP Department and the AYSPS faculty as a whole during the fall semester 2010 and slowly phased in over the following years.
- Responsible Person/Group: Janelle Kerlin and Harvey Newman

#### Evaluation research proposal
Improve student outcomes on evaluation research proposal.
- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

#### Rubric
Better use of rubric(s) in scoring assignments.
- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We have started the process of changing one of our designated CTW courses from the Citizenship course to the Critical Policy
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
CTW instructors did not provide this information.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
We need to develop more and improved rubrics for scoring CTW assignments. Implementation of CTW has been problematic due to high turn over of instructors teaching the courses. More assistance on rubric development may be helpful.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
I have only been a CTW ambassador for the PMAP department for one year thus it is difficult to discern the impact of CTW at this time. It may have helped some faculty to focus more on improving student writing. Our department has begun switching one of the CTW designated courses to another more appropriate course. Some of the CTW assessment assignments have been changed.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW Real Estate**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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 students in developing the ability to apply problem-solving skills to formulate and communicate convincing solutions to real estate business problems.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Problem solving**
Students will become more adept at solving real estate business problems.

**G 2: Clear communication of real problem solutions**
Students will demonstrate their ability to communicate solutions to real estate business challenges clearly

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Data Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to organize and evaluate data and information in a real estate business context by analyzing the Pilgram Assurance Case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item "Gather, organize, and classify data" in the grading rubric (attached).

**SLO 2: Analytical skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will become better analysts of verbal and mathematical data by analyzing the Pilgram Assurance case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item in the rubric "Analyze information."

**SLO 3: Evaluation of evidence (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate assumptions, evidence, ideas, and information from a variety of sources by analyzing the Pilgram Assurance case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item in the rubric "Analyze information."

**SLO 4: Integration of materials (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate ability to compare and integrate conflicting and competing ideas and information by analyzing the Pilgram Assurance case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item in the rubric "Integration of materials."

**SLO 5: Conclusions (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate ability to write rational, reasonable, and informed conclusions by analyzing the Pilgram Assurance case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item in the rubric "Develop rational, reasonable, logical conclusions."

**SLO 6: Communication (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate ability to present a clear written expression of derived conclusions, judgments, and solutions by analyzing the Pilgram Assurance case (attached) as evaluated by the corresponding item in the rubric "Clearly communicate conclusions, judgments, solutions."

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
See connected rubric. Rubric will be used to score responses on questions to each case. A score on each objective 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 and make adjustments as necessary.

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

### Target for O1: Data Evaluation
75% of students achieve score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Gather, organize, and classify data" element of the rubric evaluating the written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case.

### Target for O2: Analytical skills
75% of students achieve score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Analyze information" element of the rubric evaluating the written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case.

### Target for O3: Evaluation of evidence
75% of students achieve score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Evaluate assumptions, ideas, evidence and information" element of the rubric evaluating the written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case.

### Target for O4: Integration of materials
75% of students achieve score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Synthesize information" element of the rubric evaluating the written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case.

### Target for O5: Conclusions
75% of students achieve score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Develop rational, reasonable, logical conclusions" element of the rubric evaluating the written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case.

### Target for O6: Communication
75% of students achieve score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
71% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Clearly communicate conclusions, judgments, solutions" element of the rubric evaluating the final written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case. 100% of the Real Estate majors achieved a score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on the "Clearly communicate conclusions, judgments, solutions" element of the rubric evaluating the final written analysis of the Pilgram Assurance case.

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

**CTW in Real Estate review and improvement**
Continue with development of RE4700 course and materials. Conduct workshop with current and future instructors of course to review CTW requirements and resources annually. Review offering of course and results. Report assessment.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status**: In-Progress
- **Priority**: Medium
- **Projected Completion Date**: 06/2011

**Change Achievement Targets to similar criteria as program targets**
Currently the CTW Achievement Targets are a minimum percentage of students attaining a "Satisfactory" score of 2.0 on each element of the grading rubric. The faculty want to change the Achievement Targets to be similar to overall program Targets for next year, setting a minimum 2.0 overall class average as the target.

- **Established in Cycle**: 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status**: Planned
- **Priority**: Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Continued instructor training
In order to ensure consistency and that the rubric scoring is consistent, the Ambassador will hold 1 workshop at end of each semester with the assigned instructor for the upcoming semester to review the previous semester’s experience along with the planned syllabus, CTW assignment, grading, and assessment for the upcoming semester. This will be the time to review any questions and direct instructor to CTW materials.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Analytical skills
| Communication | Conclusions | Data Evaluation | Evaluation of evidence | Integration of materials

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Ambassador

Verify and clarify level of student performance
The instructor indicates that the only area in which any real estate majors were below a satisfactory level on their draft reports was in the area of clear communication. Then all the students achieved satisfactory level on their final report. It appears that in revising and resubmitting the paper that all students were able to meet a satisfactory level of problem solving and communication. The faculty want to ensure that this is a result of the process working and not using a rubric that sets standards too low.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Analytical skills
| Communication | Conclusions | Data Evaluation | Evaluation of evidence | Integration of materials

Implementation Description: Faculty will review examples of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior reports and examine the student performance relative to the scores. The ambassador will meet with the instructor to communicate the faculty’s findings and recommendations.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Department faculty and then Ambassador

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We made changes to the CTW goals and objectives as recommended by the review last year. We finished development of the RE4700 course and materials. The CTW ambassador met with the current/planned instructor to review CTW requirements and resources Spring 2011. The faculty reviewed the first offering and results. The faculty made suggestions for the Ambassador to talk with the instructor about minimum standards. The faculty recommended changing the Achievement Targets for next year. We reported our findings through the assessment process. These are all the actions we had specified in the Action Plan.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
We are unable to discern improvement from the entry level to the exit level class because we do not teach the entry level course. During this course, the students’ work improved as they became familiar with expectations and standards. The majority of the students improved in their ability to synthesize information and draw logical conclusions from the case material provided. They improved in their ability to analyze and focus attention on the key points relevant to central issue in the cases instead of being distracted by minor details. The instructor thought all the real estate majors were satisfactory at written communication upon entry to the course.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
We still need to more clearly delineate the CTW learning objectives from the other course learning objectives to reduce instructor confusion about evaluation of overall assignment and the CTW component. We also need to review the grading/scoring scale and the minimum standards the instructor is using. The largest problems we have encountered have been with coordinating multiple people involved with course development, CTW assignments and rubrics, teaching, and assessment. Each new person involved in the process has to learn about the CTW purpose, requirements, assignments, and assessments. Our faculty members are stretched thin with keeping their course content fresh and current, incorporating technology into the classroom, developing case and project assignments, conducting research, participating in professional organizations, and maintaining essential alumni and business relationships. Developing, using, and reporting on CTW assignments as well as tracking students through the advisement process to ensure they enroll in the proper CTW courses is additional work. The most needed assistance is more formalized centralized training and materials for instructors.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
The primary change in our academic program was to create a case study course that would provide assignments that fit the CTW initiative while giving our students experience solving business cases. The primary impact on the students is that they are writing in their two CTW courses in addition to the writing intensive course that we already had in the major. The primary impact on faculty involved in the initiative is the creation of additional work in the form of formal plans, reports, and meetings. Since last year’s CTW report, the department assigned a different instructor to the course and he modified the CTW assignments.
Georgia State University
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As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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.

Goals
G 1: Thinking
In Rels 3750 (Theories) students will demonstrate competency in critical thinking about religious phenomena. In Rels 4750 (capstone seminar) students will demonstrate clear critical thinking about religious phenomena and demonstrate the ability to evaluate arguments scholars have offered regarding those phenomena.

G 2: Writing
In Rels 3750 students will demonstrate competency in writing clearly and effectively about religious themes and topics. In Rels 4750 students will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and effectively about religious themes and topics and the ability to articulate original ideas pertaining to the themes and topics they have reviewed.

G 3: Evaluation
In Rels 3750 students will demonstrate the ability to understand and to compare and contrast religious claims and scholarly arguments about religious phenomena, drawing on textual evidence to support their claims. In Rels 4750 students will be able to understand and evaluate religious claims and scholarly arguments, identifying strengths, weaknesses, and implications of scholars' arguments.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Written Communication (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Through paper assignments, students will demonstrate clear communication and organizational skills and the ability to write without grammatical errors that detract from the clarity of the argument. In Rels 3750, students will organize a clear paper that compares and contrasts two scholars' arguments clearly and effectively. This paper will incorporate quoted material in an appropriate manner. In Rels 4750 students shall demonstrate the abilities to formulate a clear thesis statement, to support this thesis statement with appropriate facts or evidence, to consider the facts and evidence in a logical manner, and to draw appropriate conclusions from the findings. This paper will incorporate quoted material in an appropriate manner and a works cited or bibliography section.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Writing for CTW (O: 1)
Rels 3750: In a final paper, students will compare and contrast two theorists that have been discussed in class. Students' comparative papers should utilize knowledge and materials assigned in the course and that require the formulation of critical judgments and assessment by the student. The assignment will include the statement of a focused comparison, organization, support for claims, clear writing, and appropriate grammar and syntax. Rels 4750: In brief response essays as well as a final paper, students will write about topics that the instructor determines are relevant to the class. Students' writing should utilize knowledge and materials assigned in the course and that require the formulation of critical judgments and assessment by the student. The assignments will include the presentation of a focused point of view (presented in the form of a thesis in the final paper), organization, support for claims, clear writing, and appropriate grammar and syntax. The final paper in Rels 3750 and the final paper and final response essay in Rels 4750 will all be assessed based on the following rubric. Each ranking will be multiplied by 5, so that each section will have a possible 25 points, with a possible total score for each assignment of 100 points. FOCUS 1. Does not have a thesis 2. Thesis is unclear 3. Thesis is stated but is not sustained over the course of the paper 4. Thesis is clear but focus on thesis could be stronger 5. Thesis is clear and is pursued throughout the paper (Possible 25 points) ORGANIZATION 1. There is no discernible organization 2. The organization of the paper is unclear 3. The organization is at times clear/sections of the paper are organized 4. The paper is organized but in a way that is not optimal 5. The paper's organization is clear and logical and it helps the author make his/her claims (Possible 25 points) IDEAS AND CONTENT 1. Ideas are largely incorrect 2. Ideas represent an adequate summary of other thinkers' views on the subject 3. Ideas represent a strong summary of other thinkers' views but evidence little original thought 4. Ideas evidence some sophisticated creative or new ideas 5. Ideas are consistently sophisticated and creative (Possible 25 points) WRITING 1. A large number of grammar, punctuation and style errors are present 2. A fair number of grammar, punctuation and style errors are present 3. Some grammar, punctuation OR stylistic errors are present 4. Very few grammar, punctuation or style problems are present 5. No significant grammar, punctuation or style problems are present (Possible 25 points) Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Written Communication
In Rels 3750, students will organize a clear paper that compares and contrasts two scholars' arguments clearly and effectively. This paper will incorporate quoted material in an appropriate manner. In Rels 4750 students shall demonstrate the abilities to formulate a clear thesis statement, to support this thesis statement with appropriate facts or evidence, to consider the facts and evidence in a logical manner, and to draw appropriate conclusions from the findings. This paper will incorporate quoted material in an appropriate manner and a works cited or bibliography section. In Rels 3750 and Rels 4750, the final papers will be evaluated
using the rubric, with scores of up to 25 points for focus, organization, ideas/content (support for claims), and accurate writing mechanics (appropriate grammar and syntax). Targets for final papers in Rels 3750 and 4750: at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Focus; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Organization; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Ideas Content; and at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Writing. Target for final response essay in Rels 4750: at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Focus; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Organization; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Ideas Content; and at least 75% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Writing.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

For Rels 3750: In spring '11 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final papers written for the Rels 3750 class using the rubric. 83% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 83% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 67% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 67% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for writing mechanics. Based on this finding, it appears that students completing the initial CTW course for Religious Studies majors are more successful at focusing on the ideas of the essay and writing mechanics effectively. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. However, they have greater difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively, and they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. One possible strategy to implement is to pass this information on to the Rels 4750 instructor and target these skills for special attention in the capstone seminar. For 4750: In spring '11 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final responses essays written for Rels 4750 using the rubric. 70% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 70% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 40% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 60% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for writing. The CTW ambassador also reviewed 10 final papers written for Rels 4750. 50% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 40% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for organization; 50% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for ideas/content; and 30% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for writing mechanics. In order to address the low scores, the Rels 4750 instructor will make changes to the syllabus to focus less on the content material and more on writing skills.

M 2: Rubric-based assessment of a series of progressively more advanced writing assignments (O: 1)

CTW Plan

Critical thinking in our discipline involves carefully analyzing religious phenomena in their different contexts, developing valid interpretations of these phenomena, and communicating these interpretations persuasively in writing. Since all upper-level Religious Studies courses require significant writing and since many of our majors go off to top graduate programs, the goal of our CTW program will be to hone skills introduced in other courses, generate active discussions about critical thinking and writing and help students apply their skills directly to theories and questions central to the discipline. CTW Assessment Plan Both of our CTW classes involve reading challenging primary texts; analyzing these texts, other arguments and theories in class; and discussing course material in seminar-style settings. Faculty members will emphasize "low-stakes" short writing assignments in order to build key competencies such as close reading, summarizing texts, evaluating evidence, and constructing and evaluating arguments. At least one assignment in each course will require students to revise written work previously submitted to the instructor. Longer writing assignments, in which students will be required to use skills learned in shorter tasks, also will be required. Each semester, CTW instructors will employ the rubric below to help evaluate the various written assignments in the course. While not necessarily consistent with the primary basis for grading in the course, the scores earned on each assignment by students will be recorded throughout the semester--both as a pedagogical tool for students in the course and to provide data for annual CTW assessment.

CTW instructors will provide copies of the Rel's 3750 final papers and the Rel's 4750 final papers and final response essay to the CTW ambassador. Each year the CTW ambassador will select randomly at least ten final papers from each CTW section taught in the previous calendar year. The CTW ambassador will not know what grades the instructor assigned to these assignments, and the papers will be chosen "blindly," without knowing the students' names or overall performance in class. The CTW ambassador will then review these papers (independently from the CTW instructor's assessment), using the same rubric employed by the course instructor, as follows. Note that the ranking for each category (focus, organization, ideas, and writing mechanics) is multiplied by 5 to yield a possible score of up to 25 in each category and a total possible score of 100. FOCUS 1. Does not have a thesis 2. Thesis is unclear 3. Thesis is stated but is not sustained over the course of the paper 4. Thesis is clear but focus on thesis could be stronger 5. Thesis is clear and is pursued throughout the paper (25 possible total points) ORGANIZATION 1. There is no discernible organization 2. The organization of the paper is unclear 3. The organization is at times clear/sections of the paper are organized 4. The paper is organized but in a way that is not optimal 5. The paper's organization is clear and logical and it helps the author make his/her claims (25 possible total points) IDEAS 1. Ideas are largely incorrect 2. Ideas represent an adequate summary of other thinkers' views on the subject 3. Ideas represent a strong summary of other thinkers' views but show little original thought 4. Ideas show sophisticated, creative, or interpretative sophistication 5. Ideas are consistently sophisticated and creative (25 possible total points) WRITING 1. A large number of grammar, punctuation and style errors are present 2. A fair number of grammar, punctuation and style errors are present 3. Some grammar, punctuation OR stylistic errors are present 4. Very few grammar, punctuation or style problems are present 5. No significant grammar, punctuation or style problems are present (25 possible total points) Once all selected papers are assessed, the CTW ambassador will aggregate all of the performance measures and draft an assessment report based on these findings. The CTW ambassador will then convene a faculty meeting at which faculty can discuss ways to improve the rubrics, alter assignments, and find other ways to teach more successfully critical thinking and writing. Targets for final papers: at least 75% of our students shall score 18 (out of 25) on Focus; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 (out of 25) on Organization; at least 75% of our students shall score 18 (out of 25) on Ideas & Content; and at least 75% of our students shall score 18 (out of 25) on Writing. 2010-2011 RESULTS In Fall 2010 Rel's 3750 "Theories and Methods in Religion" (CTW) was offered, with 25 students enrolled. In Spring 2011 Rel's 4750, "Seminar in Religious Studies" (CTW) was offered, with 25 students enrolled. The instructor used the rubric that was created in 2009-10 to evaluate all students. In Spring 2011, the CTW ambassador for Religious Studies reviewed 10 final student papers, as per the Department plan, and evaluated them according to the rubric. 2010 RESULTS Because of enrollment issues, the only CTW section offered in 2009-2010 was during the Spring 2010 semester and to employ the rubric to assess these assignments.

Target for O1: Written Communication

In Rels 4750 students shall write 3 short essays in response to prompts. The final response essay will be evaluated using the rubric, with scores of up to 25 points for focus, organization, ideas/content (support for claims), and accurate writing mechanics.
Most Important Accomplishments for Year

In 2010-11 we implemented the rubric that had been established in the past cycle for reviewing student work. The CTW ambassador reviewed the final response essay assigned for Rels 4750 according to the rubric. 70% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Focus; 70% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Organization; 40% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Ideas Content; and 60% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Writing.

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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

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 in CTW during the Spring 2011 semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Completion Date:</th>
<th>05/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>CTW Ambassador, and CTW Instructors</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>

Action plan in response to 2010-11 findings.

While some of the targets were met in Rels 3750, none of the achievement targets were met in Rels 4750. The syllabus for 4750 will be adjusted to spend less time on content material (readings) and more time on writing skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: The CTW ambassador will meet with the CTW course instructors for 2011-12 and review the findings. Together they will adjust the syllabus for Rels 4750 in order to increase the emphasis on writing skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Completion Date:</th>
<th>05/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>CTW ambassador for 2010-11 (McClymond), CTW ambassador for 2011-12 (Weiner), and CTW course instructor (Barzegar)</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>

Strategy for improving idea/content, writing mechanics achievements.

As noted in the findings, students completing Rels 3750 (the introductory Religious Studies CTW course) do not adequately exhibit mastery of content presented in the course readings, and they are not able to incorporate material from a primary or secondary source effectively. Finally, the findings indicate that they do not display competence in basic academic writing skills. The CTW ambassador will pass this information on to the Rels 3750 instructor, suggesting that more class time be spent discussing these writing issues when discussing the final paper. In addition, the Rels 4750 instructor will target these skills for special attention in the capstone seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: The CTW ambassador will pass this information on to the Rels 3750 instructor, suggesting that more class time be spent discussing these writing issues when discussing the final paper. In addition, the Rels 4750 instructor will target these skills for special attention in the capstone seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Completion Date:</th>
<th>04/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>CTW ambassador; Rels 3760 and Rels 4750 instructors</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>

Annual Report Section Responses

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

The CTW ambassador reviewed the final response essay assigned for Rels 4750 according to the rubric. 70% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Focus; 70% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Organization; 40% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Ideas Content; and 60% of our students shall score 18 out of 25 (72%) on Writing. All of these fall short of our achievement goal.

Most Important Accomplishments for Year

In 2010-11 we implemented the rubric that had been established in the past cycle for reviewing student work. The CTW ambassador...
assessed student work, compiled the results, and reported these through WEAVE online. The CTW ambassador also made arrangements to meet with the CTW instructors to review the results and target areas for improvement.

**Challenges for Next Year**
The challenge for next year will be 1) to maintain continuity as the CTW ambassador changes in the department, and 2) to make changes to the Rels 4750 syllabus to improve student achievement in the four writing areas targeted for improvement.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**
There are no modifications to intended outcomes from the previous cycle.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**
None.

**University-wide Committee Participation**
None.

**Publications and Presentations**
None.

**Academic Teaching Activities**
None.

**International Activities**
None.

**Contributions to Student Retention**
None noted.

**Service to the External Community**
Nothing noted.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW Respiratory Therapy**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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 graduating class, May 2011 passed both national examinations provided by the National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC) at Georgia State University. The first time pass rate for the certification examination was 100%, the national average is 70%. Ninety-four percent of the class passed the written registry on the first attempt. The national average for this exam is 65%. Seventy-nine percent of the class passed the clinical simulation exam on the first attempt. The national average for this exam is 57%. The passage of these exams allow 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

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

**Action Plan**
CTW courses will continue to develop the critical thinking ability of our students to complete the courses and to pass the national examinations. The goal will be to have a 100% first-time pass rate for the certification exam. The written registry and clinical simulation examinations will have a goal of 90% first-time pass rate.

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
*Implementation Status: Finished*
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
All students received a "C" or better in RT 3027 and RT 4085. A first-time pass rate for our students on the certification, written registry, and clinical simulation examination was 100%, 94%, and 79%, respectively. These results are similar to last year's results with biggest change in the pass rate of the clinical simulation.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
None currently.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The faculty continue to strengthen the course assignments for the CTW courses. The most problematic of these have been the assignments for RT 4085. This course has been a WAC course and we continue to work on productive CTW writings. The assistance from the CTW small group meetings have been helpful.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
The primary impact is for all student to pass the national examinations. Currently have exceedingly better numbers than the national average. No changes have been made as this time.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
None.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
None.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
The results were used to set the goals for this current year. No changes were made.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
We beleive that CTW instruction is more unified than in the past. We have had the same courses with the same instructors for the past 2 years. We will continue this consistency next year as all instructors from the past 2 years are currently assigned for next year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will continue to make changes to course assignments as needed to reflect the changing environment of respiratory therapy education.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Risk Management
As of: 12/13/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

Goals
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 be given a case study 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

2010-On the final case risk analysis 95% scored higher than the equivalent 12 out of 16 points on the new rubric.

**M 2: Exam Question (O: 2)**

Each student will be given a question on the first exam and on the final exam which assess their understanding of the risk management process. The question is not identical on each test, but should generate a similar answer. Here is a sample final question. You have been working for a company for a number of years. The director of enterprise risk management for your company was killed in a car accident. She was texting while driving, smoking, drinking coffee, and she was not wearing her seat belt when her car was struck by lightning. She was killed in the resulting accident. Unfortunately all the risk management documents for the company were also destroyed in the accident. The CEO asks that you take her job because you had a class in college on this topic. In a brief memo to your boss, J.P. Moneybags, explain what you will need to do get the risk management function operational once more. The first question was something like: Describe the elements of the risk management process. Results: On the final exam 82% received a 8 out of 10 on the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Goal 2 Value of Risk Management**

Target: 75 percent receive at least 8 out of 10 on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Results: On the final exam 82% received a 8 out of 10 on the rubric. However, the remaining students scored less than 6 with a number of students with 0 points.

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

**Rethink Assignments**

We received a number of complaints about the mini case study assignments. One of the problems was that the students had no context in which to conduct a risk assessment. They wanted an example case. I wanted them to use their imagination to look at the materials and then come up with a rough draft of an assessment. I really didn’t want to provide them with an example (as we developed a detailed rubric). I believe they will just copy the example and not really think about the assignment. So, instead of making thing the students look at a number of different companies, we will make them choose one for the semester. Each of the assignments will related to a part of the risk management process (Identification of risk tolerance, risk identification, risk quantification, etc) and we will develop a new rubric for each part of the assessment and link it to an example case. Because there are no books for this subject, I am conceding the need for some written material, and I am willing to develop a handbook on risk assessment for the class which in its first draft will be an example case. We will also be using a new case with a risk management simulation model which should also tie these concepts together. I need to develop new assignments using this case too.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Exam Question | **Outcome/Objective:** Goal 2 Value of Risk Management

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** M Grace

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this
Our goals were relatively modest as we essentially were trying to get students to think about the value of risk management and the process underlying it. These modest goals are met. I think we need to think about more challenging goals. Unfortunately, we are changing the course so much to find the right approach that we can only attempt to measure these modest goals right now. As we refine the course and reduce the number of new elements, we can challenge the students with higher order assessments. There is no standard curricula for this class. We are teaching this class differently than almost every other school and we do not yet have external benchmarks that can help us in terms of texts books or other materials.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
In the RCB, we do not yet have the ability to answer this question. We have an entry level class BA 3000 taught by people outside of our department and we do not really know what they are doing. I'd say that most students do not have much in terms of critical thinking skills when they get to our class. They are not required to make many critical decisions in their undergraduate classes and receive no reinforcement in any of the classes.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The biggest problem is developing a CTW class for a course that is fluid. We spend a great deal of time thinking about the class and what we are teaching. We are not floundering, but we are experimenting a great deal. It is almost like a new prep every time it is taught. Our biggest need is to develop the right course and it is really up to us to get that done. Once we have that almost better course in place, we can really make improvements on the CTW content.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
So far we have had no changes as a result of the CTW program. However, I am suggesting that we make one of our early-in-the-major classes a CTW class (in addition to the BA 3000 class) so we can make sure that we are getting our students the right types of CT skills. We are going to re-examine our undergrad program and as co-chair of the committee this is one of my main goals for our UG program. I’d also like to have more of my colleagues take part in the CTW thought processes. Only two of us teach an official CTW course, but I’d like to get the faculty who teach other courses to start to think about CT skills and how to reinforce them all the classes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 CTW Social Work**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the undergraduate social work program is to prepare students for generalist social work practice in a range of roles and services that deal with the existing and developing challenges that confront individuals, families, groups, and communities. A central feature of social work education is to support student's recognition and use of critical thinking skills to support practice behaviors.

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:

1. Raising important questions and problems, and articulating them concisely and precisely;
2. Gathering and assessing relevant information, and showing the ability to interpret it effectively;
3. Maintaining an open mind when considering alternative thinking/ideas, assessing and evaluating assumptions, implications and practical consequences;
4. Developing well-reasoned conclusions and solutions to problems, using relevant criteria and standards; and
5. Communicating effectively with others when articulating complex problems and possible solutions.


**Goals**

**G 1: SW3330: Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgements related to early human development**

Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, that informs understanding about early child development.

**G 4: SW3340: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment during adulthood.**

Apply various conceptual frameworks to support social work practice behaviors with adult populations.

**G 7: SW3930: Develop interpretations and inferences about social problems and the necessity for a policy response.**

Analyze and interpret social problems that require a public policy response.

**G 3: SW3330: Acknowledge diversity and difference in early human development**

Learn to recognize and communicate the importance of diversity in shaping early life experiences and social work practice.
G 5: SW3340: Acknowledge diversity and difference in human development during adulthood
Recognize and communicate an understanding of diversity in shaping life experiences in early, mid and late adulthood stages.

G 6: SW3340: Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgements about social work practice with adults
Demonstrate written communication skills using multiple sources of information.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 3: SW3930: Develop a written legislative brief on a current state policy (G: 7) (M: 3)
Students in SW3930 demonstrated critical thinking skills through the development of a written legislative brief based on tracking a state bill during the current Georgia legislative session in response to a social problem. However, only two sections of the paper were CTW designated - Problem Description and Problem Definition. Students were required to define and analyze the social problem addressed by the legislative bill. Literature reviews, data gathering, interviews with community stakeholders were all part of the process to describe the pervasiveness and intensity of the problem. Secondly, students determined how legislators and community stakeholders defined the problem addressed in a legislative bill.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: SW3330 Assignment Measures
The final paper for the course integrates course content using a specific case study. In the assignment, students demonstrated the ability to assess a problem within a theoretical framework, consider ethical case management decisions, and identify/evaluate possible practice interventions. Students were required to submit one draft of the paper in October; the final submission was due in December. The rubric was used to assist in identifying the student’s writing strengths and weaknesses, as well as the final grading. (Please see the document repository for SW3330 assignment and rubric). The assignment grade had a maximum of 80 points (40% of the total course grade). The full paper sections were problem assessment, literature review, ethics, intervention and evaluation. In addition, students were assessed on the paper format (e.g., APA style, use of citations, grammar, etc.). For the draft, students were only required to submit three sections of the paper (problem assessment, literature review, ethics), worth a total of 31 points.

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

M 3: SW3930: Assignment Measures (O: 3)
Students were required to develop a legislative brief for the course, worth 40% of the total course grade. However, only two sections were designated as CTW focused, Section 1- Problem Description and Section 2 - Problem Definition. The complete description of the sections, as well as the entire assignment can be found in SW3930 Legislative Brief Instructions located in the document repository. Two sections of the evaluation rubric assessed the student’s critical thinking skills: Item 4: to distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge based on background research on the social problem (e.g., use of multiple knowledge sources used to define social problem and policy response; and integration of knowledge sources in paper). Item 10: provide sufficient number of references; appropriate use of grammar and punctuation; appropriate use of APA formatting and communication format (e.g., graphs, tables, figures). The score range on the rubric scale is from 0 - 10, (0 = very low competency, and 10 = very high competency).

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

Target for O3: SW3930: Develop a written legislative brief on a current state policy
51% of the students will achieve a final rubric score of 7/10 or higher on each of the two evaluation rubric items, or a total of 14/20. This represents a majority of students achieving 70% of the assessed points for the CTW portion of the paper.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 85 students were enrolled in the course, divided into 3 sections. Three faculty had teaching responsibilities for the course. There was inconsistency in the submission of drafts across course sections. Students’ drafts were scored using the assignment rubric for two course sections; one section of 24 students did not have draft scores using the rubric for the two CTW portions of the paper. For the two sections that provided rubric scores for the drafts consisting of 61 students or 72% of the total student enrollment, the average draft score for item #4 (distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge) was 7.05, with a range of 4-10; the average score for item #10 (demonstrate effective written communication skills) was 6.75, with a range of 2-10. The final rubric scores for the two assessed items across all three sections are as follows: average score for item #4 was 7.8, with a range of 6-10; average score for item #10 was 7.55, with a range of 4-10. 82% of the 85 students enrolled in the course achieved a score of 7 or higher on item #4 and 75% of students achieved a score of 7 or higher on item #10.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Under the leadership of the CTW ambassador and the CTW coordinator for CHHS, training sessions were held with CTW teaching faculty and writing consultants at the beginning of the Fall and Spring semesters. These trainings were specified in the 2009/2010 action plan to help organize faculty and orient writing consultants for the tasks required to implement the program. The trainings were held September 2, 2010 and January 27, 2011. CTW class sizes were reduced for the academic year, which was specified in the 2009-2010 action plan. Previously, the class sizes raised concerns among the faculty about the workload burden. In 2010 academic year, the class sizes were reduced so that 3 sections of a course were offered to students. Also the number of writing consultants were increased to accommodate the added number of course sections; three writing consultants were hired in the fall, and six were hired in the spring. The social work librarian, Sarah Steiner, contributed to the CTW work team. Her specific contributions included conducting a bibliography/literature review workshop for students, and serving as a consultant for students with individualized
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Based on the assessment scoring for CTW portions of course assignments, students have improved in various skills related to critical thinking. Specifically, in the policy class, students ability to analyze the varying sources of information has improved. The data sources included interviews with legislators to obtaining state data information on foster care services, as well as peer review information from periodicals. There are no “great leaps” in improvement, but students are recognizing the significance of their ability to critically analyze and synthesize information in a concise way. It must be noted that the emphasis on critical thinking is not limited to CTW courses in social work. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the accrediting body for schools of social work, has as one of its mandated competencies in social work education the emphasis on critical thinking (Educational Policy 2.1.3, 2008). As a result, all social work courses have an emphasis on critical thinking integrated in course assignments, readings or practice applications.

Students come to recognize the importance of critical thinking in social work practice very early in the program, and continues for the two years as a social work major. The concepts of critical thinking are reiterated constantly in every course in the curriculum. Therefore, the CTW designated courses in social work are only one additional aspect of a concept that is infused throughout the entire curriculum. It is very likely that there is a “spillover” effect that occurs when students are applying critical thinking skills in one course, and it is apparent in other course outcomes, as well.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

1. There is the need to gain consistency across faculty in a given course. Faculty seem to “drift” to their own instructional desires regarding assignments or how assignments are implemented. Discrepancies occur even after attending training orientations and participating in discussions about the necessity to have consistency in course assignments.

2. The consistent use of writing consultants continues to be a concern. Some faculty have a portion of the grade attributed to working with a writing consultant, other faculty do not, even for the same course.

3. Developing CTW course assignments that are not overly burdensome to faculty is an area that needs further development. Faculty tend to stick with assignments that may be too cumbersome for CTW focus. Helping faculty to divide up a large assignment into more manageable CTW assignments is a requested area that faculty have an interest.

4. Faculty finding creative and innovative ways of developing an assignment for a course. The traditional term paper is a staple in social work, which often lacks creativity.

5. Faculty interest in CTW is waning. Faculty are feeling overwhelmed with managing CTW assignments, writing consultants, and the other responsibilities they are required to do for the school. Assistance is needed on helping to re-engage faculty again.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

An issue that was raised as a concern was the requirement of having students take two CTW required courses during the spring semester. SW3340 and SW3930. Students felt overwhelmed with having to schedule to meet with two different writing consultants, the demands of the writing assignments, and the seemingly redundancy in addressing similar critical thinking issues across courses. Faculty also recognized that students were essentially choosing which course they would give attention for CTW purposes. For example, if both CTW courses required students to meet with the writing consultant, students would meet with only one, and forfeit the other. However, there is no acknowledgement that in working with one writing consultant for a course, students may use that information for other CTW and non-CTW courses. Therefore, depending on the student's needs and assignment requirements, it may not be necessary for a student to schedule multiple consultation visits with different writing consultants when taking more than one CTW course at a time. Working with one consultant may be sufficient to address multiple needs.

In response to this issue, the faculty in the School of Social Work made the decision to modify the CTW course options for social work majors. The BSW curriculum committee voted unanimously at their February 16, 2011 meeting to reduce the spring CTW course load by discontinuing SW3340 as a CTW course requirement; Social Welfare Policy (SW3930) will remain as the sole CTW course in the spring semester. This change in CTW course options will occur beginning the 2011-2012 academic year. The course change maintains the program requirements of providing two mandated CTW courses for social work majors (SW3330 and SW3930). Faculty will review the course options again at the end of the 2012 academic year to determine the effectiveness of this decision.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Efforts continue to refine assignments that reflect CTW course goals and objectives. As stated earlier, faculty are finding difficulty using old assignments to fit with the necessary criteria for CTW. This is especially true for SW3330. Discussions will occur over the summer to modify assignments. It would be helpful to have workshops on types of course assignments sponsored by CTW staff. At present, the course learning outcomes, and targets appear reasonable, however, this may change if assignments are modified.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

As stated earlier, the faculty in the School of Social Work made the decision to modify the CTW course options for social work majors due to the intensity of the workload required in both course. The BSW curriculum committee voted unanimously at their February 16, 2011 meeting to reduce the spring CTW course load by discontinuing SW3340 as a CTW course requirement; Social Welfare Policy (SW3930) will continue as the sole CTW course in the spring semester. This change in CTW course options will occur beginning the 2011-2012 academic year. The course change maintains the program requirements of providing two mandated CTW courses for social work majors (SW3330 and SW3930). A method to inform faculty of the CTW findings is important to help them recognize their efforts have value. To date, a formalized way of communicating to faculty the outcomes of CTW has not been executed. During a faculty meeting in the fall semester, faculty will learn the CTW findings. It is hoped that this information will help them to recognize their positive efforts and the areas where additional work is required.
Mission / Purpose
The mission of our department's CTW program is to offer a changing range of courses across our three specialty areas that develop students' analytical, interpretive, and communication skills. Students will be assessed in terms of how well they are able, through their writing, to demonstrate these components of critical thinking: a written articulation of their understanding of sociological work (research reports, articles, books and theories); the ability to analyze and interpret sociological work; and the capability to use the results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions.

Goals
G 1: critical understanding
Students will learn to articulate in writing their understanding of sociological work.

G 2: critical writing
Students will learn to write critically, analytically, and interpretively about sociological work.

G 3: original critical expansion
Students will learn to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses of sociological work in new directions in their writing.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: understanding (G: 1) (M: 1)
Professors of CTW courses will evaluate students' ability to demonstrate an understanding of sociological work in their writing assignments over the course of the semester. They will evaluate students using this scale: Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor (1).

SLO 2: writing (G: 2) (M: 2)
Professors of CTW courses will evaluate students' demonstration of their ability to critique, analyze, and interpret sociological work in their written assignments over the course of the semester, utilizing 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 in their written assignments over the course of the semester, utilizing a four-point scale: Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), and Poor (1).

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: understanding (O: 1)
Seven professors reported on students in ten CTW courses taught during the past academic year: eight sections of "Sociological Methods," one section of "Families and Society," and one section of "Gender and Sexuality." Data were submitted on 246 students. For examples of assignments, please see attached syllabi. Professors assessed 29% of students as "Excellent" in terms of their demonstration of sociological understanding in their writing assignments across the semester; they assessed 35% as "Very Good"; 20% as "Good"; and 16% 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; 64% did. This is a significant decline from last year -- 78% -- when far fewer students were assessed and fewer professors participated in assessment. The decline may be a result of these changes, and our students' higher level of success in past years may have been exaggerated. However, our achievement target for next year is to have a higher proportion of students show strength in this area.

M 2: writing (O: 2)
Seven professors reported on students in ten CTW courses taught during the past academic year: eight sections of "Sociological Methods," one section of "Families and Society," and one section of "Gender and Sexuality." Data were submitted on 246 students. For examples of assignments, please see attached syllabi. Professors assessed 28% of students as "Excellent" in terms of their ability to critique, analyze, and interpret sociological material in their written work over the course of the semester; they assessed 34% as "Very Good"; 20% as "Good"; and 17% 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; 62% did this year. This is a substantial decline from last year -- 73% -- when far fewer students were assessed and fewer professors participated in assessment. The decline may be a result of these changes, and our students' higher level of success in past years may have been exaggerated. However, our achievement target for next year is to have a higher proportion of students show strength in this area.

M 3: expansion (O: 3)
Seven professors reported on students in ten CTW courses taught during the past academic year: eight sections of "Sociological
Methods," one section of "Families and Society," and one section of "Gender and Sexuality." Data were submitted on 246 students.
For examples of assignments, please see attached syllabi. Professors assessed 28% of students as "Excellent" in terms of their ability to use results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or extend analyses in new directions in their written work over the course of the semester. They assessed 33% as "Very Good"; 22% as "Good"; and 17% 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; 55% did this year. This is a substantial decline from last year -- 63% -- when far fewer students were assessed and fewer professors participated in assessment. The decline may be a result of these changes, and our students' higher level of success in past years may have been exaggerated. However, our achievement target for next year is to have a higher proportion of students show strength in this area.

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

assessment tracking

This academic year, faculty judged that 64% of students are either excellent or very good in terms of demonstrating an understanding, in their writing, of sociological work. Faculty judged that 62% of students are either excellent or very good in terms of demonstrating, in their writing, the ability to analyze and interpret sociological work. Faculty judged that 61% of students are either excellent or very good in terms using the results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or extend analyses in new directions. Last year, 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). The changes (with a lower percentage of students in each category) may indicate that the increased number of courses evaluated this year were more challenging to students; this is likely since so many of the courses evaluated this year were methods course, which tend to be more difficult for students than other courses we offer. 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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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). In addition to our Methods course, this past year, we offered CTW courses in "Social Psychology," "Gender and Sexuality," and "Families and Society," broadening our offerings from the previous year, and thus achieving our goal of expanding a diversity of offerings. 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 in past years. We have striven to inform them via a variety of social networking strategies, about the CTW courses, feel like we have been successful in this regard this year also.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We are achieving success in our goal of offering a variety of CTW courses across our specialty areas. Assessment reporting on the part of faculty teaching CTW courses has increased. Our methods course, SOCI 3020, is always a CTW course; this year I have made several attempts toward getting the faculty who teach this course to articulate their CTW goals more clearly on their syllabi. We
have maintained generally consistent positive results, consistent with data collected in past years.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Our assessment measures are not specific to individual or common assignments. Because the faculty teaching these courses is not consistent, and because faculty teach courses differently, and because we do not do entry-exit type assessment, we do not have any data that precisely answer this question.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

My impression is that the evaluative committee has never strongly approved of our broad approach to CTW courses, nor of our broad and simple approach to assessment. Faculty in this department want to keep the demands of assessment as basic as possible. I would like support in achieving this goal.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

The primary change is that students who take CTW courses and faculty who teach them enjoy a class size of 25, when most of our courses cap at 45 (though “Sociological Methods” has long been limited to 25). We offered two new CTW courses in the past year, “Families and Society,” and “Gender and Sexuality.” I have attempted to address the criticisms offered on last year’s report in this current report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

I have revised my report from last year, to address reviewers’ concerns. Our program has not changed, nor has our rubric used to assess students’ learning outcomes.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

The data show we are accomplishing our goals. We do not plan any changes in our CTW program for next year, except to add new courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

The results were used for last year’s report, of which faculty were informed. The assessment data did not generate any need for action or change to our courses. Faculty continue to refine their own syllabi and assignments, of course; as far as I know, no one utilizes the assessment data we collect toward this end.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

We have learned that we are doing a good job of teaching critical thinking through writing. The data collected this year are consistent with data collected in previous years. Faculty judged that 64% of students are either excellent or very good in terms of demonstrating an understanding, in their writing, of sociological work. Faculty judged that 62% of students are either excellent or very good in terms of demonstrating, in their writing, the ability to analyze and interpret sociological work. Faculty judged that 61% of students are either excellent or very good in terms using the results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or extend analyses in new directions.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

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

I will continue to refine methods for communicating with and collecting data from faculty, as our program expands. I will consult with the Undergraduate Committee and the department overall to see whether they think changes should be made to our program.
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.

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.

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. Thoroughly 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 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 obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Does not justify results or procedures, nor explains reasons. Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason. In most places language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax or other errors are repeated with no evidence of proofreading. Goal is 4

Target for O1: Active reading skills
75% of students will score at least 4/6 on this writing assignment based on the assessment rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
72% of students scored at least 4/6 on this assignment: 14% scored 6/6, 27% scored 5/6, 31% scored 4/6 = 72%. 18% scored 3/6, 7% scored 2/6, 3% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6.

Target for O2: Historical analysis
75% of students will score a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment based on the assessment rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
70% of students scored a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment: 12% scored 6/6, 21% scored 5/6, 37% scored 4/6 = 70% attainment. 18% scored 3/6, 10% scored 2/6, 2% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6 = 30% no attainment.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### 75% of students attain 4/6 on assessment rubric

Based on the CTW assessment rubric, the CTW ambassador for the Spanish section (along with other participating faculty) will continue working to educate students taking Spanish CTW classes on the various elements of said rubric and its function in measuring student gains in critical thinking. Participating faculty will place greater emphasis on the attainment of a satisfactory score (4/6) based on the rubric and may implement a series of revisions to ensure attainment of minimum standards.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>CTW Ambassador/Spanish section (currently Rudyard Alcocer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 75% of students reach 4/6 based on assessment rubric

This particular assignment is more challenging to students because it calls on them to recall details of a text they read earlier in the semester. The greater difficulty is undoubtedly related to the lower percentage of students attaining a satisfactory score based on the rubric than in the other activity ("active reading skills"). Based on the CTW assessment rubric, the CTW ambassador for the Spanish section (along with other participating faculty) will continue working to educate students taking Spanish CTW classes on the various elements of said rubric and its function in measuring student gains in critical thinking. Participating faculty will place greater emphasis on the attainment of a satisfactory score (4/6) based on the rubric and may implement a series of revisions to ensure attainment of minimum standards.

<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>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>CTW ambassador / Spanish section (currently Rudyard Alcocer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Continued efforts toward attainment of 75% goal

As the Spanish section continues its implementation of the CTW initiative, it will make greater and more concerted efforts toward student achievement of the 75% (score 4/6 or higher) goal. To this end, the ambassador for the Spanish section will notify participating faculty during the semester midpoints to clarify and underscore the presence of the 75% goal so as to encourage better student performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>The ambassador for the Spanish section will notify participating faculty during the semester midpoints to clarify and underscore the presence of the 75% goal so as to encourage better student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Rudyard Alcocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Increased clarity and visibility of CTW assignments

The action plan for this particular measure is similar to the one on close reading skills (see below). The Spanish section has, I believe, sound CTW assignments, rubrics, and measures; at this point, the task becomes one of continuing our progress toward the desired 75% attainment goal. A central task for the 2011-12 academic year will be to increase the clarity and visibility of CTW assignments. While the Spanish section is making steady progress in its implementation of the CTW initiative, occasionally participating faculty and students are not constantly aware throughout the semester that they are part of the initiative until it becomes time to report on findings for the semester in question. Consequently, while we are making improvements toward the 75% attainment goal (72% this year vs. 70% last year), my task in the year ahead is to more regularly emphasize our work toward the desired goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>The Spanish ambassador will notify CTW faculty during the semester midpoint in an effort to remind both faculty and students to continue hard work and progress toward the attainment of the 75% goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Rudyard Alcocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Increased clarity and visibility of CTW assignments

A central task for the 2011-12 academic year will be to increase the clarity and visibility of CTW assignments. While the Spanish section is making steady progress in its implementation of the CTW initiative, occasionally participating faculty and students are not constantly aware throughout the semester that they are part of the initiative until it becomes time to report on findings for the semester in question. Consequently, while we are making improvements toward the 75% attainment goal (72% this year vs. 70% last year), my task in the year ahead is to more regularly emphasize our work toward the desired goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Report Section Responses

#### Modifications in Measurement Methods
None

#### Challenges for Next Year
The one area of CTW in our program that needs fine tuning is the reporting provided by faculty participating in the program. Part of the difficulty lies in highlighting CTW-driven changes to courses that many faculty had already been teaching over a number of years. In the year ahead (2011-12), I will have a greater store of literature/questionnaires to be given to faculty at intermittent stages of each semester.

#### Modifications in Intended Outcomes
There was a slight uptick in our efforts to reach the 75% benchmark in the attainment of our CTW assignments. While students still fall slightly below the benchmark (72% and 70%), the figures are rising and in the next year or two should be attained.

#### Most Important Accomplishments for Year
The Spanish section is making steady progress toward the implementation of the CTW initiative. Perhaps the greatest accomplishment in the previous year is the general implementation of the CTW initiative into the mindset of both students and professors: it is an initiative that is gradually becoming more central to the general aims of courses of which it is a part. Based on end-of-year reports submitted by students and on a scale from 0-5, the prevailing view is that CTW has been a useful tool. For example, the average score to the assertion "CTW assignments improved my ability to think like discipline" was 4.33; this score strongly indicates that students consider CTW assignments a helpful introduction to the kind of thinking that characterizes the discipline of Hispanic studies. While a slightly lower percentage (4.166) agreed with "CTW assignments improved my ability to write like discipline," this score is still satisfactory, although still a bit below the "5" optimum. The same score (4.166) was given to "CTW assignments prepared me for job I plan to pursue." This score suggests that students consider CTW a valuable tool, on the whole, for the pursuit of their overall professional plans.

#### CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
The Spanish section is making steady progress toward the implementation of the CTW initiative. Perhaps the greatest accomplishment in the previous year is the general implementation of the CTW initiative into the mindset of both students and professors: it is an initiative that is gradually becoming more central to the general aims of courses of which it is a part. Based on end-of-year reports submitted by students and on a scale from 0-5, the prevailing view is that CTW has been a useful tool. For example, the average score to the assertion "CTW assignments improved my ability to think like discipline" was 4.33; this score strongly indicates that students consider CTW assignments a helpful introduction to the kind of thinking that characterizes the discipline of Hispanic studies. While a slightly lower percentage (4.166) agreed with "CTW assignments improved my ability to write like discipline," this score is still satisfactory, although still a bit below the "5" optimum. The same score (4.166) was given to "CTW assignments prepared me for job I plan to pursue." This score suggests that students consider CTW a valuable tool, on the whole, for the pursuit of their overall professional plans.

#### CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Participating faculty report that, because of CTW, students more clearly understand the value of critical thinking and writing in the discipline of Hispanic studies. While the Spanish section has modified and improved the organization of the CTW component within the Spanish major and it remains a bit early to draw conclusions based on comparisons between the entry level and exit classes, students have become more conscientious about the presence and value of the CTW initiative.

#### CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The one area of CTW in our program that needs fine tuning is the reporting provided by faculty participating in the program. Part of the difficulty lies in highlighting CTW-driven changes to courses that many faculty had already been teaching over a number of years. In the year ahead (2011-12), I will have a greater store of literature/questionnaires to be given to faculty at intermittent stages of each semester.

#### CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes have your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
CTW has been instrumental in fostering closer scrutiny of the Spanish major in terms of the expectations we have for students completing our program. It has made the Spanish section (whether explicitly or implicitly in terms of CTW) reassess the coherence of the major and how all its moving parts work in unison.

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
The Spanish section is making steady progress toward the implementation of the CTW initiative. Perhaps the greatest accomplishment in the previous year is the general implementation of the CTW initiative into the mindset of both students and professors: it is an initiative that is gradually becoming more central to the general aims of courses of which it is a part. Based on end-of-year reports submitted by students and on a scale from 0-5, the prevailing view is that CTW has been a useful tool. For example, the average score to the assertion "CTW assignments improved my ability to think like discipline" was 4.33; this score strongly indicates that students consider CTW assignments a helpful introduction to the kind of thinking that characterizes the discipline of Hispanic studies. While a slightly lower percentage (4.166) agreed with "CTW assignments improved my ability to write like discipline," this score is still satisfactory, although still a bit below the "5" optimum. The same score (4.166) was given to "CTW assignments prepared me for job I plan to pursue." This score suggests that students consider CTW a valuable tool, on the whole, for the pursuit of their overall professional plans.

#### CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Participating faculty report that, because of CTW, students more clearly understand the value of critical thinking and writing in the discipline of Hispanic studies. While the Spanish section has modified and improved the organization of the CTW component within the Spanish major and it remains a bit early to draw conclusions based on comparisons between the entry level and exit classes, students have become more conscientious about the presence and value of the CTW initiative.

#### CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
The one area of CTW in our program that needs fine tuning is the reporting provided by faculty participating in the program. Part of the difficulty lies in highlighting CTW-driven changes to courses that many faculty had already been teaching over a number of years. In the year ahead (2011-12), I will have a greater store of literature/questionnaires to be given to faculty at intermittent stages of each semester.

#### CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes have your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
CTW has been instrumental in fostering closer scrutiny of the Spanish major in terms of the expectations we have for students completing our program. It has made the Spanish section (whether explicitly or implicitly in terms of CTW) reassess the coherence of the major and how all its moving parts work in unison.

---

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

#### 2010-2011 CTW Speech

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
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 3: Response Papers (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students wrote several response papers which required them to relate a specific concept from the day’s material to either their own experiences or to materials the instructor provided. Two of these papers were used in this assessment. Students were required to clearly define the concept, clearly explain the situation, and clearly connect the concept to the situation. Specific “prompts” were used to guide the students’ papers, and these prompts are provided in the attached document.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 4: Targeted Health Message (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Students studied a particular group all semester, and for this assignment, they completed a “targeted health message” for their group. This required identifying a specific health concern, explaining that concern and articulating how that concern was appropriate for their group; in addition, they were expected to identify the format of this health message (e.g., banner ad on website, print advertisement in paper, public service announcement on the radio, etc.), explain the details of the format, and articulate how this was appropriate to their selected group.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical Thinking Rubric 1 (O: 3)
This rubric focuses on defining the concept (scored 0-4), explaining the situation surrounding the concept (scored 0-4), and clearly connecting the concept to the situation (scored 0-10). Although these scores were components of the grade on each assignment,
these scores did not constitute the entire grade; an additional 7 points focused on other academic issues not related to critical thinking and are thus, not reported here. See attached sheet "Assessed Response Papers Assignment Persuasion 2011."

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

Target for O3: Response Papers

scores of 80% by the majority of the students, preferably on both assessed response papers but at least on the second assessed response paper; an 80% would mean 3/4 on the first two measures and 8/10 on the second measure.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

On the FIRST assessed response paper, 14/20 students achieved a score of 3 or higher on "defined the concept" and 17/20 students achieved a score of 3 or higher on "explained the situation" and thus, our achievement target was met. Unfortunately, students did not perform as well on the third rubric item "clearly connected the concept and the situation" and only 7/20 students achieved a score of 8 or higher. This did not meet our achievement target. On the SECOND assessed response paper, our achievement targets were met for all 3 rubric items, also showing an improvement from the first assessed paper to the second assessed paper. For this paper, 21 students achieved a score of 8 or higher on the third rubric item "clearly connected the concept and the situation." (N=21 student papers)

Target for O4: Targeted Health Message

The majority of students will achieve an average of 4/5, or a score of 80%, as an average across all 6 rubric items.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

This rubric was used for students in SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity for both the fall and spring semesters. Of the 32 students evaluated, 19 students achieved an average of 4.0 or higher. The achievement target was met.

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

Rubric Revision

Written in summer 2010: 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. Written in 2011: Discussions in the Fall of 2010 resulted in the creation of the two rubrics used this past academic year, one for each CTW course in the speech major. These rubrics are tailored to the current assignments but need to be discussed further by the faculty to determine how validly these may measure "critical thinking" as the faculty have defined it.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric 1 | Outcome/Objective: Response Papers
Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric 2 | Outcome/Objective: Targeted Health Message

Implementation Description: Topic to be on agenda for fall 2011 speech faculty meeting
Responsible Person/Group: All speech faculty

Assignment Bank Development

The speech faculty discussed in the Fall of 2010 the idea of creating a list of possible assignments to use in our CTW courses. In 2009-2010, two assignments were used in the SPCH 3250 Persuasion course, and in 2010-2011 a new assignment was used in this course. This was the first year we offered SPCH 4800, and the same assignment was used both semesters, though that assignment differed from those offered in the persuasion course. As new faculty move into the teaching rotation for these courses, it will become important to develop a bank of possible assignments that meet assessment requirements while still allowing instructors to have freedom in teaching the courses. Several assignments now exist, and it will be important to develop additional ones, as well as determine how effective any of these assignments have been for our students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric 1 | Outcome/Objective: Response Papers
Measure: Critical Thinking Rubric 2 | Outcome/Objective: Targeted Health Message

Implementation Description: This topic will be on the agenda for a fall 2011 speech faculty meeting.
Responsible Person/Group: Entire speech faculty

Faculty Training

The speech major has grown significantly over the past several years, and we will need additional sections of both CTW courses each year. This will require a more standard training procedure for the faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Student Advancement

In our Capstone course (SPCH 4800 Communication & Diversity), we require the students to "describe" a targeted health message that they would create for the group they have studied all semester long. The students have managed to describe interesting, appropriate, and research-based messages, and our assessment indicates that these have been effective (i.e., our achievement targets have been met for all fall and spring semesters). Now it is time to advance this project, to challenge the students to "create" these messages rather than merely describe them. The description will still be required, as this description is the explanation/justification that the content and format of their targeted health message is appropriate for their particular groups. When the speech faculty first discussed this assignment, their intent was that the students would actually "create" these messages, thus fulfilling part of the major's mission (not just knowing what was involved in an effective message or analyzing effective and ineffective messages but also creating effective messages). This coming academic year, faculty will be encouraged to have students "create" these targeted health messages rather than merely describing them in their final portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: More faculty so that we can offer more sections of both CTW courses.
Responsibility Person/Group: CTW Ambassador Jaye Atkinson

Student Articulation

In our SPCH 3250 course, one of our achievement targets was not met (for the first writing assignment assessed, though it was met for the second writing assignment assessed). This suggests that further instruction explaining how to connect a particular course concept to a specific situation could benefit the students earlier in the course. The experience of writing these papers does seem to improve their ability to perform, but additional instruction could enhance their performance even more. As such, the speech faculty will discuss shorter writing assignments that require students to articulate the connections between course material (e.g., theory or theoretical concept or research finding) and a particular situation (e.g., presidential campaign slogan, public service announcement, etc.). Brainstorming on these types of assignments will add to our "assignment bank" and will enable instructors to offer students further experience articulating the relationship between concepts and situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: More faculty to brainstorm and discuss, then instructors for SPCH 3250 will need to implement these new assignments in their courses.
Responsibility Person/Group: Speech faculty to brainstorm and discuss, then instructors for SPCH 3250 will need to implement these new assignments in their courses.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
We have taught two sections of our capstone CTW course: SPCH 4800 Communication & Diversity - it finally "made!" We trained a new instructor for CTW courses. The "targeted health message" assignment was successfully completed in both sections of the capstone course, and the students understood its relationship to their entire speech major experience. That is, they understood how various speech courses helped them complete that aspect of the capstone portfolio project. All of the students in our SPCH 3250 course improved their critical thinking scores from the early paper to the later paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Critical Thinking Rubric 2</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective:</th>
<th>Targeted Health Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: Instructors for SPCH 4800 will need to alter the final assignment in the course.
Responsibility Person/Group: CTW Ambassador Jaye Atkinson, as CTW Ambassador, will alter the final assignment in her section of the course AND offer training and support to other faculty teaching SPCH 4800 this academic year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
In our SPCH 3250 Persuasion course, students definitely improved their critical thinking from one assignment to the next assessed assignment. Although a majority of students met the target for the first two rubric items, all of them met the achievement target for all 3 rubric items on the second paper. In the capstone course (SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity), students understood and even enjoyed how their research over the semester (and information they had received in past speech courses) informed their "targeted health message." A majority of those students achieved the target, but with only 19/32 students achieving that target, there is definitely room for improvement in future sections of that course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Critical Thinking Rubric 1</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective:</th>
<th>Response Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Established in Cycle:</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: The speech faculty to brainstorm and discuss, then instructors for SPCH 3250 will need to implement these new assignments in their courses.
Responsibility Person/Group: Speech faculty to brainstorm and discuss, then instructors for SPCH 3250 will need to implement these new assignments in their courses.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
We have three main areas still in development: assignments, rubrics, and faculty training. All of these have improved greatly in the last 2 years, but now that more sections of these courses have been taught, more assignments have been created, and our definition of critical thinking needs to be re-evaluated. Our lofty ideals are valuable but need to be revised for the reality of the speech major. In the past 2 years, we have also revised the curriculum of the speech major, including a complete revision of the mission, goals, learning outcomes. Those revisions must now be reflected in our understanding of critical thinking and how that should be measured. Basically, we need to continue our determination to create an assignment bank for the CTW courses and reconsider our definition of critical thinking and how to measure it. Finally, the major has grown tremendously over the last several years, and we need to train more faculty so that we can offer more sections of both CTW courses. Training has been fairly informal in the past, and now it needs to become more formal and routine. As for assistance, I would find it helpful to continue workshops in a more focused fashion. I loved the conference we had last fall. Listening to formal presentations from faculty from other departments enabled me to see the diversity...
of definition and measurement for critical thinking. This significantly helped us improve our rubrics for this year, and yet, more improvement is definitely sought. If possible, could we duplicate that conference next fall and then offer some less formal version of it in the spring? Inviting our CTW instructors would also be extremely productive, though not sure how to encourage them to attend. (By the way, I disagree with some of the feedback last year that suggested we should be grouped by commonalities; I learned a lot from departments/majors I felt were quite different from my own.)

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
The primary change has been the conscious decision to add more thoughtful writing assignments to our courses, even designing the capstone portfolio as a true major capstone experience. Rather than requiring writing assignments that summarize past research or define concepts, we are now requiring our students to use past research and definitions to create arguments and targeted messages. In the mission for the speech major, we state that "speech communication explores the construction, diffusion, analysis, and impact of messages as they occur among individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures in the media age." Our CTW courses truly emphasize the mission of our major in a clear and focused manner. Changes include the assignments and the rubrics; these remain in development and discussion, as mentioned in previous reflection questions and action plans. We have improved our rubrics, but they are not yet what we want them to be. The 3 sections of our CTW courses this past year have illuminated our need to reconsider our definition of critical thinking - to be sure it reflects the newly revised curriculum and the reality of what we teach.

Annual Report Section Responses
Most Important Accomplishments for Year
We have taught two sections of our capstone CTW course: SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity - it finally "made!" We trained a new instructor for CTW courses. The "targeted health message" assignment was successfully completed in both sections of the capstone course, and the students acknowledged its relationship to their entire speech major experience. That is, they understood how various speech courses helped them complete that aspect of the capstone portfolio project. All of the students in our SPCH 3250 course improved their critical thinking scores from the early paper to the later paper.

Challenges for Next Year
More faculty will be involved in BOTH CTW courses this upcoming year. This past year only 2 instructors were involved. Training will need to be enhanced. Also, the assignments we are using need to be examined and discussed by the entire speech faculty; further assignment options should be created. Finally, the rubrics and our critical thinking definition need to be reviewed again by the entire speech faculty; developments over the past year (e.g., offering our capstone course for the first time) may have helped us clarify how we should define critical thinking (and thus, how we should measure it).

Modifications in Measurement Methods
As mentioned for "challenges for next year," we need to review our rubrics again and determine if these are effectively measuring all aspects of critical thinking. Our current definition is rather detailed and slightly different from our measures; thus, both need to be reviewed and modified.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 CTW Women's Studies
As of: 12/12/2016 04:14 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 explicating 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Identify main points and arguments (G: 3) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 3010, Students will identify and analyze main points and theoretical arguments in their readings for class, as shown in their written work.</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>SLO 2: demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 3010, students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate feminist and womanist theoretical perspectives, as demonstrated by writing assignments.</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>SLO 3: writing skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>SLO 4: Demonstrate writing skills (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>SLO 5: Theoretical Perspectives (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 4920/4950, students will demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use appropriate feminist/womanist perspectives.</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>SLO 6: Apply skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>SLO 7: Connect to lived experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</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>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: In 3010, Final Paper (O: 2, 3)

Your final paper will be a 5-7 page paper in which you both revise and expand on one of your short papers. Your final paper must demonstrate that you have re-thought the ideas presented in your short paper -- it will be both revised and developed.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Because this finding involved assessing a revised and expanded version of the earlier paper, it is not surprising that the scores are a bit higher than on the previous ones. In terms of the final paper, 90% of students received a 3, and 70% received a 4 or 5. This score is much closer to our goal.

#### 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.
On this assignment, 90% of students received a 3, and 60% of students received a 4/5. Again, it is unclear whether we scored these harder this time, or whether expecting 100% of students to do anything is unrealistic. Some of these students have always had difficulty with writing, so I think we need to make our target more reasonable.

M 2: In 3010, Short Papers (O: 1, 3)

Students will write 2-3 page papers that explore course readings and themes in greater detail. You might: 1) Use (at least 2) theorists from course readings to analyze some aspect of popular culture, daily life, or social interactions, politics, literature, art, etc. 2) Take issue with a theory or theorist we have read. In this case, you will need to use other sources (in addition to the ones you critique, either from course readings or from outside sources), to back up your claims. 3) Put two (or more) theorists from course readings in conversation with one another to expand on or develop a key debate within feminist theory. These are just suggestions — as long as you have an original and clear thesis statement that is grounded in course readings, you may develop a paper about whatever you are interested in exploring further.

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

Target for O1: Identify main points and arguments

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

On this measure 80% of students received a 3, and only 60% of students received a 4 or 5. This is lower than last year's, so we either need to examine the way in which we assessed this, or clarify on the assignment the desired goal of requiring that students really engage with course readings for this assignment.

Target for O3: writing skills

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

On this assignment, 75% of students received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4/5. Perhaps our standards are too high, or the scoring is too low, or else we need to clarify our assignment. Given that students knew that they were going to rewrite one of these papers for their final, they may have also not taken them as seriously as final papers.

M 3: In 4920/4950, Final Paper (O: 4, 5, 6, 7)

Senior Research in Women's Studies gives students an opportunity to do advanced work on a chosen topic. Both student and instructor will decide upon a project that the student will complete during the semester. The instructor is responsible for meeting with the student at agreed-upon times during the semester, for guiding and evaluating the student's work, and for assigning a grade. The student is responsible for completing the requirements agreed upon with the instructor. The main requirement for this course is the major paper, which should be approximately 20-25 pages long, and follow appropriate academic conventions for a research paper, including a substantial, properly cited bibliography. 1) Students must meet with their advisor regularly 2) Students must turn in material by the agreed-upon due dates. Since course predominantly focuses on the creation of a major paper, the paper requirements will include various due dates throughout the semester. These due dates comprise dates both that various readings must be completed as well as the material involved in writing and revising a major paper. Various due dates will include: a. Due date for working thesis b. Due date for bibliography c. Due date for outline d. Due date for introduction e. Due date for completed first draft f. Due date for Final paper g. If necessary, another due date for a revised draft (I can't fix the formatting on this to go back to the original indentation). Interns will also write a research paper (7-10 pp.) on a topic related to the organization's work. The paper should follow an acceptable academic style (APA, MLA, etc.) and should include academic references, such as books and articles in recognized journals. The paper might also include interviews with on-site personnel and/or publications by the organizations. The paper should be analytical and not merely report on the day-to-day activities of the intern. It must also go through a revision process, in which the advisor has the opportunity to read a complete draft before the student submits the final paper (50%).

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

Target for O4: Demonstrate writing skills

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

80% of students achieved at least a 3, which partially meets our goals, and 60% of students received a 4, which does not quite meet our target.

Target for O5: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

For this outcome, all students did indeed receive at least a 3, but only 60% received a 4 (instead of the targeted 75%). While our students are doing decent work, then, they are not performing as strongly as we would like.

Target for O6: Apply skills

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

On this measure, all students received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4 or 5. Our action plan therefore worked in terms of
this particular outcome, in that we were able to focus on students’ application of the skills they have learned throughout their major classes more successfully this year than last.

**Target for O7: Connect to lived experiences**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

On this measure, we found that 100% of students received a 4 (good). The action plan that involved increasing the focus on applying skills also proved beneficial in terms of the impact on connecting the theoretical perspectives to lived experiences.

**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.

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

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

- Measure: In 4920/4950, Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: Theoretical Perspectives
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Julie Kubala

**Improve writing skills**

We intend to try to implement more early intervention into writing skills in order to help students improve their writing skills in these short papers. One of the major challenges here is that these are ungraded papers; as such, students are not particularly motivated to work hard in their writing here. On the other hand, ungraded writing assignments have proven quite useful in contributing to improving students' writing in general.

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

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

- Measure: In 3010, Short Papers | Outcome/Objective: writing skills
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Julie Kubala and Amira Jarmakani

**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

**Increase time for revision**

While we have been doing a good job with this in terms of the Senior Research paper, what we realized this cycle is that we do not enforce enough time for revision for the final paper for the internship. We should ensure that students turn in a complete draft of their internship paper with at least 2 weeks for revision (which we do with the Senior Research paper). We hope this would increase the demonstration of writing skills in the internship final paper. Also, this year, in the single example of senior research, the student did not allow sufficient time for revision. We need to strengthen our emphasis on revision and on finishing tasks more quickly in order to have students write a strong research paper within a single semester.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: In 4920/4950, Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate writing skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Undergraduate Studies

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

The major CTW accomplishment for this year involves the improvement of the revision process in WSt 3010. This year, instead of solely using the students to do peer review, the instructor used a process that involved both student peer review and teacher feedback. Rather than have a number of weekly papers, the students turned in two (longer) short papers, which had undergone a peer review process, then the teacher provided substantive feedback, and then students expanded one of those papers into their
final paper. In terms of the student peer review process, the results, (predictably) were mixed. Some groups worked hard to provide clear and useful feedback, whereas others did not. Similarly, some students seemed to really incorporate and address the criticisms, whereas others did not. On the other hand, students did much more revision from the short paper to the long. One of the biggest challenges has been the revision process is convincing students of its utility. Having teacher feedback, as well as the pressure of the final assignment, did seem to be fairly effective in terms of convincing students of the importance of actually re-engaging with their papers so that they could substantially rework them into stronger arguments. Dr. Jarmakani's reflections also added, "My impressions were strong enough, though, that I would definitely try this assignment again…. I think one thing that really made a difference is that they had some weeks (or even months) to let the short paper simmer before they came back to it for the final, and it is that forced simmering period that is so hard to get normally. Also, I think it really helped them synthesize major concepts from class. They chose the one paper that they were really interested in, and came back to develop it after having read and discussed everything from class. Because they were interested in it, they could devote time to thinking more about it, and because they had a head start (a short paper), they could really build on and develop ideas, rather than having to be brilliant all at once when they were exhausted." The above analysis addresses two specific action plans: Improving the peer review process, and increasing writing intervention. In terms of the capstone classes, we wanted to expand the attention paid to exploring the ramifications of theoretical perspectives. In general, we were fairly successful in terms of helping students think through the connections between theory and practice, but again, it is difficult to make any sorts of generalizations with such a small sample size. In particular, this year we had far more students choose to take the Internship course rather than the Senior Research class. It seems obvious that the final paper from an internship course would be more concerned with addressing the implications of theoretical projects, so I do not want to overstate the effectiveness of this intervention.

CTW Reflection 2:  Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class ?

Within our department, we generally have two sets of critical thinking through writing goals. The first set, loosely categorized under "demonstrating theoretical knowledge" has consistently been more successful than the second, which involves more general writing and reading skills. Therefore, we have focused much of our intervention, especially in the 3010 class, on the writing/reading skills. In general, one of the areas we have focused on involves some basic critical reading skills, such as finding the main points and the arguments supporting them within class readings. Students are improving in terms of these skills, as we are seeing improvement in the ability to differentiate between author arguments and the opinions of the students. In other words, students are learning to be able to articulate the authors' points as separate from what students think they should be arguing. In terms of increasing writing skills, we have been using the revision process to address our persistent problems, which involve developing clear and focused thesis statements and providing sufficient evidence for students' arguments. I think our results here have been mixed. One of the central reasons that we chose the revision process (as well as providing clear instruction) for these issues is because I do think students learn best through concrete feedback on their particular papers; writing is an individual process that requires specific feedback. This process can be, though, quite time-consuming, so we have found it particularly helpful to focus on specific areas of concern and asking students to write about those areas. We have been using the revision process to address our persistent problems, which involve developing clear and focused thesis statements and providing sufficient evidence for their claims. One persistent problem that we encounter involves the ability to contribute to improvement within the time limits of undergraduate careers. We continually find that students who have significant writing problems in our lower-level classes may improve, but they often do not improve as much or as quickly as we would like them to. Similarly, students who are doing really well in the capstone class have generally always been strong writers. We would like to develop more ways to address these disparities, if possible.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

In general, I think we are doing a good job of accomplishing our ctw goals. We still could refine the revision process further. In particular, in 3010, we are still working to develop the most effective method of requiring students to revise their papers. It requires a balance between sufficient time to let ideas percolate, the time constraints of the semester, the amount of time any instructor has, and the desire that students not use original assignments as rough drafts to be edited by the teacher. In terms of the capstone classes, we need to require students to submit a complete draft earlier, so that there is sufficient time for revision. We have not always had hard-and-fast schedules here, especially with the internship, but I think we will need to mutually agree on some dates at the beginning of the semester so that we can ensure that students will really have time to re-engage with their own work as part of the revision. Furthermore, we are continually revising our writing instructional materials so that we can more effectively address common writing problems that students may have.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

It is hard to really think through the primary impact of CTW in our department, in part because our discipline has always focused on critical thinking, writing, and the connections between them. While we have always been committed to these practices, the most significant impact of the CTW program has been in making our teaching more consistent and formalizing certain instruction practices. We have collectively developed worksheets on writing instruction, for example. Most importantly, however, we have begun requiring revision within the CTW classes. As we work through which revision processes seem most helpful for writing and thinking, we are documenting and discussing the kinds of attention to pedagogy that we may have been using, but we hadn't been discussion and collecting information about in such a deliberate fashion. We have not really made substantial changes to the CTW initiative. Rather, we are continuing to work on refining the sorts of practices that we have started in order to strengthen what have always been our goals: getting students to read thoughtfully, write well, and think critically.
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 applications · 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

Target for O1: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls
75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Identify security and privacy circumstances and required controls Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately analyze security and privacy circumstances and propose appropriate control decisions. Students were not able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Only one student in this program took CIS 8080 during 2011-2012. This is not sufficient to assess.

M 2: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems (O: 2)
Students will design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems
75% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric below to the midterm or final paper in CIS 8080. Learning Objective: Design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure: Accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems Students were not able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Students were able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Students were able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems. Students were able to accurately design and appropriately employ ubiquitous and pervasive information systems.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
CIS 8070 was not offered during 2010-2011.

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. Students were not able to accurately articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Only one student in this program took this HA 8160 during 2010-2011. This is too few to assess.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No MBA HAIS students took HA 8670 during 2010-2011.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Early Childhood Education BSED
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
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Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science in Education Program in Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University is to prepare teacher candidates who will be qualified to direct the education of young children from pre-school through elementary grades. The theme of this program is to develop teachers as facilitators of learning. Coursework, extensive field experience and collaboration among school and university faculty combine to develop a program that supports the professional growth of the novice educator.

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, 5, 6)
Teacher candidates understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience,
meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

5.0 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.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 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.

Institutional Priority Associations

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

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

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

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

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points
4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

5.0 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.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

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

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.3 Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 3, 4, 6)

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

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

Standard Associations

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Supported Reading Project (O: 2)

Teacher candidates have multiple opportunities in their course and field experience work to plan and implement lessons. The Supported Reading Project is a comprehensive, instructional project in which teacher candidates develop supported reading lessons that they implement with elementary aged students. Candidates plan reading lessons to address the instructional needs of their students. Candidates reflect upon their teaching of each reading lesson, create new lessons that address both the strengths and weaknesses of the initial lesson, and use self-evaluation and feedback to improve future lessons. Candidates write reflections that discuss their evaluations of each lesson. This is a mid-program key assessment in ECE 3601: Reading and Language Arts in Early Childhood Education that assesses teaching diverse groups of learners, planning effectively for instruction, understanding and using assessment 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 receive a rating of at least 3 ("adequately met") on a 4 point scale rubric to demonstrate competency in planning effectively for instruction (outcome 2). If the teacher candidate does not receive this rating, the teacher candidate has an opportunity to review the instructor’s feedback and revise and resubmit lessons for further evaluation. The project score is factored into the course grade. Teacher candidates must receive a passing grade of "C" or better in the course, or they will be required to repeat the course before moving forward in the program.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

#### Target for O2: Plans effectively for instruction

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a rating of 3 ("adequately met") on a 4 point scale.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The ECE BSE Traditional Program (Early Childhood Education) and ECE BSE SPE Dual Certification (Early Childhood & Special Education) teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.84 and a modal score of 4. The aggregate pass rate for this assessment was 95% or 145/152 students. Data was collected using the assessment management system, LiveText, that converted rubric ratings to mean scores.

#### M 2: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM) (O: 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 KWLS charts, pre and post tests, learning gains graphs, and grade books. The Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM), in the student teaching course ECE 4661, is a comprehensive, teacher work sample documenting the teacher candidate’s use of all of these assessment tools. The teacher candidate uses content knowledge to plan and implement the integrated thematic unit, motivate and manage students, and assess student learning. Throughout the project, the teacher candidate provides written reflection on student progress as well as her/his own professional development. The rubric used to assess the PTLM highlights competencies aligned with the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. A 100 point rubric is used to rate/score the candidate’s project on four components: planning, implementing, assessing, and reflecting. Ratings include: 5 ("proficiently met"), 4 ("adequately met"), 3 ("partially met"), 2 ("minimally met"), and 1 ("not met"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive a rating of at least 4 ("adequately met") on the assessing components in order to demonstrate competency is using assessment methods to document student learning (outcome 4). If the teacher candidate does not demonstrate that she/he has met these performance standards with ratings of at least 4 for each assessing component, an action plan is generated. The university supervisor monitors the teacher candidate’s progress in meeting goals outlined in the action plan prior to the completion of student teaching. (Note: The rubric was revised as follows: 4 ("proficiently met"), 3 ("adequately met"), 2 ("partially met"), 1 ("minimally met"), and 0 ("not met"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive a rating of at least 3 ("adequately met") on the assessing components in order to demonstrate competency is using assessment methods to document student learning (outcome 4). 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 3 ("adequately met") on a 5 point scale on the revised rubric.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 ("adequately met") with the mean score of 3.88 and the modal score of 4. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met the target rating of 3 ("adequately met") with the mean score of 3.22 and the modal score of 4. The aggregate pass rate for this assessment was 99% or 146/148 teacher candidates. Data was collected using the assessment management system, LiveText, that converted rubric ratings to mean scores.

#### 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/performance and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all students in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in the university course work. Teacher candidates have three practicum field experiences prior to their clinical practice (student teaching) with up to 1300 hours of field experiences over the course of the program. The Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) is an overall evaluation of the candidate and is completed by the university supervisor at the end of student teaching, in the course ECE 4661. The evaluation is a comprehensive review of the candidate’s competencies across all 5 learning outcomes and the rubric is aligned to the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. The university supervisor rates the
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 2 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale revised rubric for certification; however, the new program target has been identified at level 3 ("very good"). This report will use the achievement target of level 3 on the revised rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.85. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 3.85.

**Target for O2: Plans effectively for instruction**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 2 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale revised rubric for certification; however, the new program target has been identified at level 3 ("very good"). This report will use the achievement target of level 3 on the revised rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.74. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 3.48.

**Target for O3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 2 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale revised rubric for certification; however, the new program target has been identified at level 3 ("very good"). This report will use the achievement target of level 3 on the revised rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.82. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 3.64.

**Target for O4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 2 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale revised rubric for certification; however, the new program target has been identified at level 3 ("very good"). This report will use the achievement target of level 3 on the revised rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.78. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 3.53.

**Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions**

The teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 2 ("satisfactory") on a 5 point scale revised rubric for certification; however, the new program target has been identified at level 3 ("very good"). This report will use the achievement target of level 3 on the revised rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score of 3.86. The ECE BSE Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target with a mean score of 3.72.

**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 (prior to fall 2010). Fall 2010 forward: Using the new rubric, Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals, the teacher candidate is expected to achieve a mean score of 3.0 on a 4 point scale at the completion of student teaching (clinical practice). A rating of 4.0 is expected one year post graduation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The ECE BSE Traditional and Dual Program teacher candidates met and surpassed the target rating of 3 with a mean score...
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

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 and assessment. Faculty will closely monitor these areas and note any differences in data, specifically outcome 2 (plans effectively for instruction) and outcome 4 (uses assessment methods to document student learning) as identified in the Final Student Teaching Evaluation.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) | Outcome/Objective: Uses assessment methods to document student learning

Implementation Description: ECE 3440: ESOL Curriculum & Instruction will be required 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 and assessment. Faculty will closely monitor these areas and note any differences in data, specifically outcome 2 (plans effectively for instruction) and outcome 4 (uses assessment methods to document student learning) as identified in the Final Student Teaching Evaluation.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: BSED faculty and supervisors
Additional Resources: The proposed change requires a net gain of one load fall 2011 and each spring semester thereafter and will be covered by current ECE faculty. No additional resources will be needed as ESOL supervision will be restructured and included as
part of general education supervision. This change in supervision coverage will absorb the cost of the additional load.

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Dispositions Assessment Review - Dual Program

A review of programs by concentration revealed an aggregate pass rate on the Dispositions Assessment for Traditional and Dual concentration programs combined at 94%; however, the Dual concentration candidate pass rate in this area was 88% or 22/25 candidates, somewhat lower, in meeting the target on the assessment. BSE faculty will monitor closely by reviewing Disposition Assessment results 2011-2012 to see if there is any change in the Dual concentration program data.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Dispositions
- Outcome/Objective: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** BSE Faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### ESOL Endorsement: PTLM Assessment

Although current data from the Planning, Teaching, Learning Module indicate "met" targets in using assessment for learning, it was noted that pre-service teachers experienced most difficulty with the assessment components of the project. 08-09 assessments also showed lowest ratings in using assessment for learning. 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. Data indicated an increase in the aggregate pass rate from 95% to 99% from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011. Faculty will closely monitor these areas and note any differences in data in the 2011-2012 academic year, specifically outcome 4 (assessment components) as identified in the Planning, Teaching, and Learning Module.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM)
- Outcome/Objective: Uses assessment methods to document student learning

**Implementation Description:** ECE 3440: ESOL Curriculum & Instruction will be required for all "traditional - non dual certification" program students. ESOL/TESOL Standards addressed in ECE 3250 will be integrated into the following courses: ECE 3021 (Child Development), ECE 3600 (Language & Literacy in ECE), and ECE 3360 Assessment.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** BSED faculty and field supervisors

**Additional Resources:** The proposed change requires a net gain of one load fall 2011 and each spring semester thereafter and will be covered by current ECE faculty. No additional resources will be needed as ESOL supervision will be restructured and included as part of general education supervision. This change in supervision coverage will absorb the cost of the additional load.

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Planning and Assessment; ELL & Special Education Focus

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 for the Dual concentration program with the following mean scores 3.48 for planning and 3.53 for assessment compared to Traditional concentration program mean scores of 3.74 in planning and 3.78 in assessment. Additionally, data from end program candidate surveys indicate that Traditional and Dual concentration program candidates rate themselves lower in confidence in working with students with special needs and/or linguistic needs. As a result faculty will provide course inputs in ESOL for Dual program candidates and continued inputs in Special Education for Traditional program candidates. Also faculty will closely monitor assessments and note any differences in data, specifically outcome 2 (plans effectively for instruction) and outcome 4 (uses assessment methods to document student learning) as identified in the Final Student Teaching Evaluation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E)
- Outcome/Objective: Plans effectively for instruction

**Implementation Description:** Course inputs in ESOL for Dual concentration program and continued course inputs in Special Education for Traditional ESOL concentration program. Monitor key assessments in planning and assessment.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** BSED faculty and/or part time instructors

**Additional Resources:** One faculty load to cover course inputs in ESOL and special education.

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Technology for Student Learning

In an effort to increase pre-service teacher knowledge and skills in implementing technology for student learning, program faculty have embedded the NET Standards throughout program course work, designating specific assignments that will target this area. Additionally, a two day Digital Literacy Seminar for all candidates enrolled in ECE 3602: Reading and Language Arts II with a focus on creating digital literacies for student use in learning. It had been noted by university supervisors, that pre-service teachers have sufficient knowledge and skills in implementing lessons that require teacher use of technology; however, more instruction in student use of technology for learning would be beneficial. BSED faculty will expect to see higher ratings for Outcome 3; specifically, Standard 6C: Communication Skills - Demonstrates competency in using technology to support student learning.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
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 school based personnel. We will continue to use LiveText to document, collect, analyze, and report program data.

Changes and improvements to the educational program based on this year’s assessment data are as follows: 1.) In review of student performance mean scores and aggregate pass rates across all five learning outcomes, BSE students met or surpassed all identified assessment targets. A review of programs by concentration revealed an aggregate pass rate on the Dispositions Assessment for Traditional and Dual concentration programs combined at 94%; however, the Dual concentration candidate pass rate in this area was 88% or 22/25 candidates, somewhat lower, in meeting the target on the assessment. Additionally, 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 for the Dual concentration program with the following mean scores 3.48 for planning and 3.53 for assessment compared to Traditional concentration program mean scores of 3.74 in planning and 3.78 in assessment. In the coming year we will specifically monitor the results on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation and the Dispositions Assessments for the Dual concentration program, and faculty will continue to maintain and monitor progress in all other areas. 2.) In earlier years the lowest assessment results have been identified in the areas of adapting instruction for diverse learners and in using assessment for learning. As a result in 2005 an Assessment course was added and scores improved but still continued to be lower than the other areas. Beginning fall 2010 the BSE program was revised to require the ESOL Endorsement for all “traditional – non dual certification” program students (Note: Traditional concentration candidates receive P-5 certification in Early Childhood Education and the ESOL Endorsement and Dual concentration candidates receive P-5 certification in Early Childhood Education and P-12 certification in Special Education, General Curriculum). 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. Additionally, this year faculty noted that candidate surveys completed at the end of the education program also indicated that candidate confidence was lowest in areas specified in working linguistically diverse learners and learners with special needs. For Dual concentration candidates, faculty have been identified and will provide supplemental course inputs in ESOL supporting this program, while Traditional concentration candidates will continue to receive additional course inputs in special education. Candidates in both program concentrations work with diverse learners in diverse field experience practicum internships and during student teaching. Traditional concentration candidates have additional experiences working with ESOL certified teachers and English language learners. Dual concentration candidates have additional experiences in classrooms with full inclusion (i.e. general and special education collaborative teaching) at the elementary level and additionally at the middle and high school levels. The program faculty will continue to monitor these areas and note any differences in data upon the implementation of these program changes. The first cohort of Traditional ESOL concentration candidates is expected to graduate spring 2012 and the affected Dual concentration cohort will graduate spring 2013. 3.) Follow up to the 2009-2010 plan to increase pre-service teacher knowledge and skills in implementing technology for student learning, program faculty not only embedded the NET Standards throughout program course work, designating specific assignments that will target this area; but also, faculty will facilitate a two day Digital Literacy Seminar where candidates will create digital technologies for the purpose of student use for learning. Faculty are continuing to collect data and results will be reported in the next year. We will also review candidate scores on the performance-based Observation Field Performance Evaluation, including a focus for observation on the use of technology. 4.) In follow up to the pilot program, BSE Writing Mentor Support, developed and implemented by Early Childhood Education BSE faculty in the 2010-2011 academic year, initial data indicate that candidates are developing as writers and becoming more confident. Faculty are continuing to collect data and results will be reported in the next year.
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. A system-wide articulation agreement allows a pathway to the B-5 bachelor's degree completion for students with an Associates Degree in Early Care and Education from an accredited technical college program. As of June, 2011 forty-six (46) students have been admitted to the B-5 program, with 12 graduates during the 2010-2011 academic year.

**Goals**

**G 2: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**
The teacher candidate will possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to plan and teach effectively.

**G 3: Student Learning**
The teacher candidate will use varied instructional strategies, assessment techniques and critical reflection to document children's development and learning.

**G 4: Professional Dispositions**
The teacher candidate will work collaboratively with diverse professionals and display professional and ethical behaviors.

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
The teacher candidate will possess the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum they teach.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**
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.

**SLO 2: Plans effectively for development and learning (G: 2) (M: 2)**
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.

**SLO 3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher candidate understands the goals and benefits of assessment and uses formal and informal strategies to evaluate the development and learning of the child.

**SLO 4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 4)**
The teacher candidate knows and uses the ethical guidelines of the profession. She/he uses reflection to improve practice and displays interpersonal and communication skills with diverse learners, families and colleagues.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Evaluation of Field Performance (Clinical Practice) (O: 1)**
This measure rates the candidate's overall professional performance in the early childhood classroom. The measure/rubric is based on the 15 professional standards of the early care and education profession (NAEYC and CEC). At the completion of student teaching (clinical practice), teacher candidates must receive a rating from the university supervisor of "meets" or "exceeds" on each standard/element of the rubric. If a candidate does not receive a minimum rating of "meets," s/he will be required to extend or repeat student teaching with additional coaching and action plans until mastery of standards is demonstrated.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge**
85% of candidates will receive ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for all standards demonstrating content knowledge in the field.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
92% of teacher candidates (12/13) received ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for all standards demonstrating content knowledge in the field. The mean rating for candidates was 2.7 / 3.0. One teacher candidate did not pass student teaching and received ratings of "does not yet meet standard" on this measure.

**M 2: IEP/IFSP Project (O: 2)**
This measure rates the teacher candidate's ability to plan for a young child with special needs by completing a sample IEP or an ISFP. An IEP is the formal plan that teachers, parents and specialists develop to meet the educational needs of a student age 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 develop the formal plan in a methods course for exceptional children EXC 4530. A 32 point rubric aligned with professional standards (NAEYC and CEC) is used to rate 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 mid-point in the program since it may be their first exposure to the IEP/IFSP process and the project proceeds their full-time student teaching experience. Birth-Five candidates will receive the Preschool Special Education Endorsement upon program completion.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
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.

<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>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>B-5 Program Coordinator</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>

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 ability to plan effectively for children's development and learning.

<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>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>06/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>B-5 Program Coordinator</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>

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

100% of teacher candidates (13/13) received a rating of at least "developing" on six of the eight indicators. A few teacher candidates did not receive the minimum rating of "developing" on the indicators of "transition plan" and "establishing dates of service." The mean rating for candidates was 3.6 / 4.0.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

92% of teacher candidates (12/13) received ratings of "satisfactory" or "exceeds expectations" on the portfolio rubric rating for "impact on student learning." The five 2010 Fall completers all received ratings of "exceeds" with DOL project scores ranging from 93-100. The eight 2011 Spring candidates received ratings of "exceeds" (3), "satisfactory" (4) and "unsatisfactory" (1). The candidate who received a rating of "unsatisfactory" on this measure did not successfully complete student teaching.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The mean rating for the five B-5 program completers in Fall, 2010 exceeded 3.0 with an average of 3.8. The mean rating for the 8 candidates in Spring 2011 also exceeded 3.0 and ranged from 3.25 - 3.62 on the dispositions survey. One teacher candidate in the Spring 2011 group received ratings below the "acceptable" level on the dispositions survey. This candidate did not pass student teaching and did not complete the program.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

85% of teacher candidates will obtain "satisfactory" or "exceeds expectations" on the portfolio rubric rating for "impact on student learning." This rating includes scores on the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project from 73 - 92 (satisfactory) or 93 - 100 (exceeds).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

92% of teacher candidates (12/13) received ratings of "satisfactory" or "exceeds expectations" on the portfolio rubric rating for "impact on student learning." The five 2010 Fall completers all received ratings of "exceeds" with DOL project scores ranging from 93-100. The eight 2011 Spring candidates received ratings of "exceeds"(3), "satisfactory"(4) and "unsatisfactory"(1). The candidate who received a rating of "unsatisfactory" on this measure did not successfully complete student teaching.

M 3: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) (O: 3)

This measure rates the teacher candidate’s performance against national standards through a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes artifacts and reflective narratives. Examples of artifacts are lesson plans, child case studies, research reviews, and photo documentation of children's learning. Candidates organize the portfolio based on the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC). Candidates submit assigned artifacts and rationales each semester for progress monitoring. The final portfolio evaluation is completed at the end of student teaching. One key component of the portfolio is the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project that measures the candidate's impact on student learning. This project requires the candidate to document children’s learning during a 10 day thematic unit implemented during student teaching. The portfolio rubric element that rates the candidate's performance on the DOL project is titled "impact on student learning." Rubric ratings are "exceeds expectations," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory."

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

M 4: Dispositions Survey (O: 4)

The College of Education administers an online survey to assess all teacher candidate's professional dispositions. The measure is called "Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals." Candidates receive a rating from program faculty mid program and end of program. Ratings are as follows: Exceptional (4 pts), Acceptable (3 pts), Marginal (2 pts), Unacceptable (1pt).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 5: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) (O: 3)

This measure rates the teacher candidate’s performance against national standards through a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes artifacts and reflective narratives. Examples of artifacts are lesson plans, child case studies, research reviews, and photo documentation of children's learning. Candidates organize the portfolio based on the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC). Candidates submit assigned artifacts and rationales each semester for progress monitoring. The final portfolio evaluation is completed at the end of student teaching. One key component of the portfolio is the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project that measures the candidate's impact on student learning. This project requires the candidate to document children’s learning during a 10 day thematic unit implemented during student teaching. The portfolio rubric element that rates the candidate's performance on the DOL project is titled "impact on student learning." Rubric ratings are "exceeds expectations," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory."

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The achievement target is a mean rating of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. This rating would indicate that B-5 teacher candidates demonstrated professional dispositions at the "acceptable" level at the end of program.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The five 2010 Fall completers all received ratings of "exceeds" with DOL project scores ranging from 93-100. The eight 2011 Spring candidates received ratings of "exceeds"(3), "satisfactory"(4) and "unsatisfactory"(1). The candidate who received a rating of "unsatisfactory" on this measure did not successfully complete student teaching.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The candidate who received a rating of "unsatisfactory" on this measure did not successfully complete student teaching.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The mean rating for the five B-5 program completers in Fall, 2010 exceeded 3.0 with an average of 3.8. The mean rating for the 8 candidates in Spring 2011 also exceeded 3.0 and ranged from 3.25 - 3.62 on the dispositions survey. One teacher candidate in the Spring 2011 group received ratings below the "acceptable" level on the dispositions survey. This candidate did not pass student teaching and did not complete the program.
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 assessment this reporting 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.

Course assignment will be redesigned

There are three indicators on the IEP/IFSP project rubric where more than 85% of candidates received ratings of "beginning," which is below the achievement target. These indicators are: "provides statement of environments other than natural or general education classroom," "identifies the person responsible for implementation," and "provides for transition planning." Among these three indicators, over half of the candidates (61%) scored below expectation in "provides for transition planning." An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students' lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).

Revise assessment and extend assessment over two courses

There are three indicators on the IEP/IFSP project rubric where more than 85% of candidates received ratings of "beginning," which is below the achievement target. These indicators are: "provides statement of environments other than natural or general education classroom," "identifies the person responsible for implementation," and "provides for transition planning." Among these three indicators, over half of the candidates (61%) scored below expectation in "provides for transition planning." An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students' lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).
**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The B-5 program has revised and simplified learning outcomes to match those required by state and national accreditation standards, as well as the conceptual framework of the unit (Professional Education Faculty). These changes were made to provide clearer reporting and update alignment of assessments. As described in the action plan, improvements will be made to one assessment, the IEP/IFSP project, so that students will follow the rubric more closely. Additionally, students will have more opportunity to master the content of the assessment over two courses, rather than one.

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

The data obtained from assessment findings confirms that Birth Through Five students are achieving required learning outcomes at target levels. The program will continue to maintain and monitor student's performance data for the coming assessment cycle. There are no recommended revisions to curriculum, courses, sequence, etc., at this time.

---
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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 MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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)**

Normal 0 false false false Educators adjust their practice according to learners' individual differences. Educators have an understanding of how learners develop and use this knowledge to make decisions about how to teach. Educators treat learners equitably. An 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

**SLO 2: Applies expertise for learning and development (M: 2, 4, 5, 6)**

Normal 0 false false false Educators appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organized and linked to other disciplines. Educators have specialized knowledge about how to convey content to learners. Educators generate multiple paths to learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS#2; PSC Standard Domain: Content Knowledge

**SLO 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development (M: 1, 2, 5)**

Normal 0 false false false 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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Disposition Survey (NBPTS) (O: 1, 3, 5)

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Prior to 2010, dispositions were measured using the NBPTS Advanced Program Survey. Each TSS participant was rated by the Ed.S. program faculty using a scoring guide from 1.0 (Not demonstrated) to 5.0 (Advanced). Six items (see list for Fall 2009) comprised the disposition questions for 2009, 12 items for 2007 and 2008. Target for disposition measure is at the Intermediate (4>) level at midpoint and Advanced (5) at the end of the program. Beginning in Summer 2010, the COE adopted a new disposition measure. The Dispositions Survey [1] is built upon National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) based upon the Five Core Propositions: 1: Teachers are Committed to Students and Learning 2: Teachers Know the Subjects They Teach and How to Teach Those Subjects to Students 3: Teachers are Responsible for Managing and Monitoring Student Learning 4: Teachers Think Systematically about Their Practice and Learn from Experience 5: Teachers are Members of Learning Communities Program instructors rate EdS candidates on five dispositions using formative and summative data collected throughout the program at two transition points (midyear- end of fall semester and end of program-summer 2/follow through). The Likert rating includes: 1: Unsure means that the rater (self or other) is not sure if the student holds the disposition. 2= Emerging means that the rater (self or other) has seen evidence of the disposition. 3= Developing means that the student is aware of the disposition and values it. 4= Strength means that the disposition is a pervasive trait of the student. Source of Evidence: Professional Standards [1] The Dispositions Survey was adapted from Usher, L., Usher, M., & Usher, D. (2003). Five dispositions of effective teachers. Paper presented at the 2nd National Symposium on Teacher Dispositions. November 20-21, Richmond, KY.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target for O1: Shows commitment to learning and development

Each EdS participant is rated by the Ed.S. program faculty in team discussions on elements using the following rubric at the end of the fall semester. Targets: Midyear-Intermediate (4>); End of the Program-Advanced (5>-old measure Midyear-Acceptable (3>); End of the Program-Exceptional (4>-new measure 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Findings (2010-2011) (data table attached) The majority of EdS participants were rated at acceptable on all five dispositions at the midpoint assessment. No unacceptable ratings were reported. Four areas evidenced rates as Exceptional with highest in Positive View of Self (42% as exceptional). All candidates were rated either acceptable or marginal on Empathy but it is expected that these dispositions will improve in ratings by the end of the EdS program. At midpoint assessment, students are continually challenged to examine their personal perspectives leading to cognitive dissonance in some cases. Although increases are expected overall in the next assessment, the area of Authenticity is where instruction is targeted for spring and summer terms. Prior to 2010, dispositions were measured using the NBPTS Advanced Program Survey. Each TSS participant was rated by the Ed.S. program faculty using a scoring guide from 1.0 (Not demonstrated) to 5.0 (Advanced). Six items (see list for Fall 2009) comprised the disposition questions for 2009, 12 items for 2007 and 2008. Target for disposition measure is at the Intermediate (4>) level at midpoint and Advanced (5) at the end of the program. At midpoint, the majority of students were on target with range of 3.93 (item 5.1) to 4.07 (items 4.1, 4.2). Data for end of program completion is being compiled in livetext currently. Due to transition from old disposition measure to new instrument and the transition to use of the assessments in livetext, the end of program dispositions for this group was not compiled in livetext. Currently reentering data.

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 = strong agreement and 1 = strongly disagree. The remaining 4 items address whether or not supervisors had clear plans of action for every conference, gave relevant and ongoing feedback, were knowledgeable and professional. The remaining 4 items invite respondents to comment upon supervisor strengths, weaknesses, whether or not they would recommend the supervisor and finally, observations of overall supervisory performance.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development

An overall Likert score of 4.0 or better is expected for all supervisors.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

On average, student interns rated the EdS teachers who served as their supervisor on average 4.574 out of 5.0; ratings represent placements and supervision during the Fall 2009 semester (n= 17). The number of supervisors for Fall 2010 were reduced dramatically due to low program enrollment. Supervisor ratings were high, ranging 4.5-5.0 with average of 4.92. 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 Summer 2010 Program Completers Supervision Fall 2009 (n=17) Summer 2011 Entries Supervision Fall 2010 (n=6) Average 4.574 4.92 Minimum 2.833 4.50 Maximum 5.0 5.0
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 O1: Shows commitment to 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students who meet this criteria are scored 100 points across 4-point scale from proficient (4) to beginning (1) with an “not met” option.

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 begins each fall term and after completion of the two TSS specific courses each fall term. 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 begins each fall term and after completion of the two TSS specific courses each fall term.

**Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The capstone experience is designed by faculty and participants to provide final refection 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.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students who meet this criteria are scored 100 points across 4-point scale from proficient (4) to beginning (1) with an “not met” option.

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 courses (ECE 8100, ECE 8200, ECE 8400, ECE 8410, and ECE 8920). The internship (ECE 8860), 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 summer 2.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Date Table: Content GPA Summer 2010 Ed.S. Program Completers (program entry summer 2009) (n=15) Fall 2010 TSS Program Completers Ed.S. Midpoint Program (program entry summer 2010) (n=8) Average Exit GPA 3.92 4.03 Low GPA 3.63 3.72 High GPA 4.26 (program moved to grade +/- schedule, A+ available) 4.30

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

### Action Research Cycle
Data reported here represents program completers from summer 2008. Shift cycle to match PSC for 2009-2010 and participants who enter summer 2009 and complete coursework in summer 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010. There will be no expected program completers for next report cycle as this group will not complete the action research project until summer 2010 and will be counted in the next round.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Action Research Project
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Applies expertise for learning and development
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director

### Capstone Cycle
Data reported here represents program completers from summer 2008. Shift cycle to match PSC for 2009-2010 and participants who enter summer 2009 and complete coursework in summer 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010. There will be no expected program completers for next report cycle as this group will not complete the capstone until summer 2010 and will be counted in the next round.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Capstone Experience
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Shows commitment to learning and development
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director

### Electronic Worksamples
The program is moving to pilot a system for electronic collection of work samples and key assessments for the program for future management, analysis and reporting purposes. The program will pilot livetext with ECE 8800 in summer 2010 to meet this goal.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Supervision Summative Report
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Reflects on & learns from professional experience
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director

### STARS Survey
Revise use of STARS survey with new unit conceptual framework.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Disposition Survey (NBPTS)
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Shows commitment to learning and development
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Director

### 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Evaluation of Ed.S. Supervisor by Intern
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Applies expertise for learning and development
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EdS program Coordinator

### 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
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since the 2010-2011 assessment report, the following changes have been made: All faculty in the Ed.S. Program are using LiveText for assessments. All assessment rubrics have been aligned with the new COE conceptual framework. Refined rubrics to be more sensitive to student learning. Disposition measure for Unit changed. Program adapted new instrument and aligned assessments with NBPTS. The number of required Supervision Cycles was reduced in response to student feedback on the logistical and time constraints they experienced due to being enrolled in the Ed.S. Program and teaching in the classroom full time. Supervision Cycles are incorporated into the summative report which is a key assessment for the TSS portion. Offered flexible options for assignment design and completion for performance-based measures, i.e. combined Problem-Solution project with action research. Provided information to students on how to seek external support for their action research. One student was successful in securing funding.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

1. The disposition survey indicated that the students had a low overall score on “Empathy” at the midpoint assessment. To rectify this, we intend to be more explicit and intentional with the students about our assessments of their dispositions. At the start of the Fall semester, 2011, each student was given a copy of the NBPTS Dispositions Survey. Each faculty member will be considering ways in which the NBPTS Dispositions can be addressed and developed throughout their courses. ECE 8100 and ECE 8200 are particularly sensitive to student learning. Since the 2010-2011 assessment report, the following changes have been made:

   - The number of required Supervision Cycles was reduced in response to student feedback on the logistical and time constraints they experienced due to being enrolled in the Ed.S. Program and teaching in the classroom full time. Supervision Cycles are incorporated into the Summative Report which is a key assessment for the TSS portion. Offered flexible options for assignment design and completion for performance-based measures, i.e. combined Problem-Solution project with action research. Provided information to students on how to seek external support for their action research. One student was successful in securing funding.

   - The disposition survey indicated that the students had a low overall score on “Empathy” at the midpoint assessment. To rectify this, we intend to be more explicit and intentional with the students about our assessments of their dispositions. At the start of the Fall semester, 2011, each student was given a copy of the NBPTS Dispositions Survey. Each faculty member will be considering ways in
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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, linguistical, 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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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 Technology (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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Faculty Rating 7 - Plan for Instruction (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Faculty Rating 8 - Assessment for Learning (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Faculty Rating 9 - Professional Reflection (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: Faculty Rating 10 - Professional Relationships (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### 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
Mission / Purpose

The Collaborative Master's Program (CMP) provides a unique approach to educational graduate studies, unparalleled in the nation. Educational equity and student-focused teaching are guiding tenets of the program. We believe students from all backgrounds should have equal access to quality instruction, resources, and other educational opportunities. Each year we invite teachers from the metropolitan Atlanta area to explore the practices, ideas, and beliefs which guide and direct their teaching. In line with our focus on educational equity, teachers consider questions such as, How do my lived experiences impact how I view my students, how my students learn, and their families? What does teaching for educational equity look like? Why is there an achievement gap? Are the interests of my students reflected in my instruction? Our focus on student-centered teaching asks teachers to consider questions such as, Why do I teach the way that I do? When are my students engaged in learning? Does my instruction meet the needs of all of my students? During the year-long program, teachers engage in rigorous study, debate, and research focused on improving their teaching and their students' learning. The teachers' classrooms are the contexts for their work. Their classrooms are their laboratories. The teachers are guided by faculty who are educators and researchers.

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)**

The “Impact of Program Rubric” assesses the candidate's perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment of candidate's occurs twice during the program—end of Spring semester, via Benchmark assignment, and then at the end of the second summer semester, via a Capstone assignment. The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework and the NBPTS graduate teaching standards. Specifically, the rubric assesses the candidate's: (a) knowledge of child-centered pedagogy (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 1, 2, 3) (b) knowledge of the content (Conceptual Framework standard: CF.1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 2, 4) (c) ability to monitor and manage student learning; (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2; NBPTS Standard: 3) (d) to think systematically about their practice and learn from performance (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.2, 1.3, 2.3 and NBPTS Standard: 4) (e) participation in a learning community (Conceptual Framework standard: 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and NBPTS Standard: 5).

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Target is 75%. For the 13 students the scores ranged from 15-22 out of 24. The average score is 18; therefore students as a whole met target.

**M 2: Capstone (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**

The “Impact of Program Rubric” assesses the candidate's perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment of candidate's occurs twice during the program—end of Spring semester, via Benchmark assignment, and then at the end of the second summer semester, via a Capstone assignment. The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework and the NBPTS graduate teaching standards. Specifically, the rubric assesses the candidate's: (a) knowledge of child-centered pedagogy (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 1, 2, 3) (b) knowledge of the content (Conceptual Framework standard: CF.1.1, 1.2 and NBPTS Standard: 2, 4) (c) ability to monitor and manage student learning; (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2; NBPTS Standard: 3) (d) to think systematically about their practice and learn from performance (Conceptual Framework standard: 1.2, 1.3, 2.3 and NBPTS Standard: 4) (e) participation in a learning community (Conceptual Framework standard: 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and NBPTS Standard: 5).

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

**Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.**

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 samples 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%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Target is 80%; or a score of 20/24. For the 13 students the scores ranged from 19-24 out of 24. A score of 20 is at the 80% mark. For this group, the average score is 20; therefore students as a whole met target. However, of the 13 students, only 5 of the 13 students scored at or above 20; whereas 8 scored at 19. Although target was met as a group, action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark.

**Target for O3: Educators reflect on their practice.**

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 samples 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%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Target is 80%; or a score of 20/24. For the 13 students the scores ranged from 19-24 out of 24. A score of 20 is at the 80% mark. For this group, the average score is 20; therefore students as a whole met target. However, of the 13 students, only 5 of the 13 students scored at or above 20; whereas 8 scored at 19. Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark.

**Target for O4: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.**

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 samples 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%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Target is 80%; or a score of 20/24. For the 13 students the scores ranged from 19-24 out of 24. A score of 20 is at the 80% mark. For this group, the average score is 20; therefore students as a whole met target. However, of the 13 students, only 5 of the 13 students scored at or above 20; whereas 8 scored at 19. Although target was met as a group, action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark.

**Target for O5: Educator will show commitment to student learning.**
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 40. For a 40 point scale, 33 is score needed to achieve 80%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Target is 80% or a score of 20/24. For the 13 students the scores ranged from 19-24 out of 24. A score of 20 is at the 80% mark. For this group, the average score is 20; therefore students as a whole met target. However, of the 13 students, only 5 of the 13 students scored at or above 20; whereas 8 scored at 19. Although target was met as a group, action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark.

**M 3: Teacher Development (O: 1, 2)**

This project enables teacher candidates to improve their classroom practice. Two program activities focus directly on the teacher's in-classroom practice: faculty classroom visits and teacher video clubs. Faculty Classroom Visits: Program faculty visit each teacher two times during the Fall semester and two times during Spring semester. 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. Teacher Video Clubs: Teachers meet in small groups three times Fall semester and three times Spring semester. At each meeting, one to three teachers share a 5 to 10 minute video clip of a lesson. Teachers prepare to share their clips by completing the protocol.

**Target for O1: Educators manage and monitor student learning.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. A rubric is used to score student performance. Total possible score is 40. For a 40 point scale, 33 is score needed to achieve 80%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Out of 13 students: 3 students received 30/40; 6 students received 35/40; 4 students received 40/40. Average score for 13 is 35. Therefore students as a whole met target.

**Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.**

Educators who score at the 80% level are considered to have met the target performance level. A rubric is used to score student performance. Total possible score is 40. For a 40 point scale, 33 is score needed to achieve 80%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Out of 13 students: 3 students received 30/40; 6 students received 35/40; 4 students received 40/40. Average score for 13 is 35. Therefore students as a whole met target.

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

**Examine literature on achievement gap between majority and minority students.**

During the Glue classes attention will be directed toward examining reasons behind the achievement gap between majority and minority students. Students will read a variety of texts and hold classroom discussions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Students will be given their first reading related to the achievement gap at the first glue class in August.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The two program directors will be responsible for selecting readings and for leading the discussions.

**Incorporate monthly video clubs**

Teachers will meet 1 Wednesday of each month with their video club groups. The focus of the clubs is on the student – teacher language interactions. Each teacher will seek feedback on her language interactions during either a math, literacy, community language 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

**Action Plans**

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Rubrics for Impact of Program Rubric I and II and Teacher Development I and II were created and will be used for the 2011-2012 assessment cycle. The inclusion of these rubrics will enable Weave assessments to align with the College of Education Livetext assessment system.

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

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educator will show commitment to student learning.

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

Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.

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

Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.

**Action Plans**

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educator will show commitment to student learning.

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

Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educator will collaborate with peers and others.

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

Measure: Capstone | Outcome/Objective: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

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

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 3:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Although target was met as a group, the following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Capstones identified two areas that need to be addressed. These are: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, the program will intensify its focus on writing. Specifically, 1. The literacy course will include a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review will be assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.
summer. To help with organization, the students will be provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to include mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. 2. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to include mini lessons and in-class revision sessions.
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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

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

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

**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

**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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning (O: 1)**
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into the UACM MEd database for Standard 1: Disposition Assessment.

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 dispositions needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous reflection, planning, and action.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
95% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

**M 2: Faculty Rating 2- Expertise for Learning & Develop (O: 2)**
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into the UACM MEd database for Standard 2: Capstone Project.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
95% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

**M 3: Faculty Rating 3-Manage & monitor student learning (O: 3)**
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into the UACM MEd database for Standard 3: Teaching and Learning Project.

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 and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

**M 4: Faculty Rating 4 - Engaging in Scholarship (O: 4)**
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into the UACM MEd database for Standard 4: Action Research Project.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
95% of Master's candidates achieved satisfactory or better on this standard.

**M 5: Faculty Rating 5-Professional Learning Communities (O: 5)**
Scores for candidates on the following assessment are aggregated and entered into the UACM MEd database for Standard 5: Field Experience Observation, which Cross Career Learning Community is a part of the overall score.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

95% 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:** Terminated
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **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 UACM 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 UACM MEd (GATAPP) mentorship course, university mentors initially 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 (PreK-5) report back to the GSU classes.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **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 5 - Professional Learning Communities | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in professional learning communities

**Implementation Description:** Target date is the first week students (PreK-5) report back to GSU classes.

**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Faculty

**Additional Resources:** N/A

**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: Medium

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: Faculty coordinated the program schedule to ensure that students could receive all of their contact time on Monday evening.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Assess and Revise Assessment Rubrics
The UACM MEd (GATAPP) program is assessing and revising our assessment rubrics to improve the effectiveness of the data collected. First, the assessment rubrics are being adapted to a 5-point scale in the hopes of getting more refined data. Second, the assessment rubrics are being aligned with the new COE conceptual framework.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: The program director in coordination with appropriate faculty members will review and revise each rubric to be on a five-point scale.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Director and UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Implement New Assessment System
In the 2011-2012 academic year, the UACM MEd (GATAPP) program will implement a new assessment system called Livetext for program assessment storage and reporting. The program is now moving to using Livetext for all key assessments with the new cohort beginning in fall 2011. All program faculty have been trained in livetext.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Faculty were trained on the Livetext system. Key assessment rubrics were reviewed and revised. Key assessment and rubrics were loaded into Livetext, and faculty will score these assessments in Livetext at designated benchmarks in the program.
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Program Director and Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Restructure ECE 6415 Literacy/Social Studies Integration
The UACM MEd (GATAPP) program is an unique approach to teacher certification and graduate school. After an accelerated certification process, candidates continue their graduate studies into their first year as a teacher of record. In order to meet the demands of a first-year teacher who is also attending graduate school, courses need to be structured to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Currently, ECE 6415 is a traditional graduate course with many of its requirements not related to the lived experiences of our candidates. The UACM faculty is committed to analyzing and restructuring this course to facilitate candidates’ critical thinking in order to improve their pedagogy.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Faculty will meet to discuss and restructure ECE 6415 to meet the goals of the program.
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Faculty
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since the last assessment report, the following changes have been made: LiveText Assessment System now is being used for assessment data collection and analysis. All assessment rubrics have been aligned with the new COE’s new conceptual framework. Rubrics have been refined to be more sensitive to student learning. Disposition measure for Unit changed. Program adapted a new field observation instrument, which is aligned with the Georgia Framework and NBPTS.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Early Childhood Education UACM 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. Although, all objectives were met, a closer analysis of the data revealed that candidates tend to score lower in greater numbers around their ability to reflect and analyze practice. This has led the UACM faculty to conclude that by restructuring some components of the program, it will reduce the candidates’ stress allowing candidates the ability to think in more critical ways, facilitating their growth in becoming more effective teachers. The UACM MEd (GATAPP) program is an unique approach to teacher certification and graduate school. After an accelerated certification process, candidates continue their graduate studies into their first year as a teacher of record. In order to meet the demands of a first-year teacher who is also attending graduate school, the program needs to be structured to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Thus, the program faculty made the flowing 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 will start these observations early in the fall semester. 2. We have adjusted the program schedule to better meet the needs of our students. 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. 3. Currently, ECE 6415 is a traditional graduate course with many of its requirements not related to the lived experiences of our candidates. The UACM faculty is committed to analyzing and restructuring this course to facilitate candidates’ critical thinking in order to improve their pedagogy. 4. We have reviewed and revised the key assessment rubrics, making them clear for candidates and providing the program better data. 5. We started implementing the LiveText assessment tracking system to help organize and evaluate program assessment date to improve the program.
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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

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

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

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

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Five out of five students passed their comprehensive exams in 2010-11 (Czaplickik, Hooper, Cronin, Lewis, Bernard). All passed on the first attempt.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate research skills**

80% will pass the comprehensive exams on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of those taking comprehensive exams (total 5) passed on their first attempt.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Six of seven students completed their university teaching apprenticeship in 2010-11 (Cain, Barrett-Mynes, Pendergrast, Lewis, Alicia, Carothers).

**Target for O4: Knowledgeable teachers**

All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Six of seven students successfully completed their university teaching apprenticeship for 2010-11.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Four out of four (100%) of our students completed rigorous dissertations in 2010-11 (Matthews, Faran, Kavanagh, Lacke).

**Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge**

One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PHD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of eligible students presented a rigorous dissertation.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate research skills**

One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PHD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% (4 out of 4) eligible students presented 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*
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

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

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

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

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

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

Monitoring of comp exam process
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

A committee is currently meeting (2011) to discuss changes in PHD program based on anticipated changes in the college. The goals will remain the same but there will likely be changes in the process/format of the program.

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

A change needed based on assessment of our University teaching apprenticeship is to create a systematic way to provide feedback to students that is supportive, useful, and accurately matches requirements of the apprenticeship.

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: Comprehensive examination
- Outcome/Objective: Thoughtful writers and speakers

Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator of PHD program

UTA assessment

Our first student did not pass her University Teaching Apprenticeship. The good news is because it is now a course, we have ways to monitor and guide students who are not yet competent in university teaching. What we need is a systematic way to give feedback to students that is supportive, useful, and accurately matches requirements of the apprenticeship.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Julie will take this issue to the PHD advisory committee. As they deliberate changes in the PHD program, this can be part of the discussion. Looking at what other universities do might be helpful.
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Mission / Purpose

Program Theme: Teaching PreK-5 Mathematics in a Learner Centered Classroom

Program Description: The Master of Education (M.Ed.) program in Early Childhood Education is designed for the teacher who wishes to establish a learner-centered classroom. Through an integrated approach that provides choices and opportunities for decision making and dynamic group interactions, teachers participating in one of the master’s program become partners with faculty in shaping the path or paths by which content is learned. The M.Ed. in ECE program is based on the assumption that learning is a constructive process which builds on the knowledge and experience of the learner. The teacher functions as a collaborator with parents and children to focus on strategies for enhancing effective child learning. Therefore, All ECE coursework and instruction will incorporate reflective practice, collaboration, theories of child development, and strategies for managing classrooms and affirming diversity. Within the Master’s program there are two courses of study: Collaborative and Mathematics Education. Upon meeting the College of Education admissions requirements, students are eligible to pursue either of these courses of study. However, admission into the Collaborative program also requires an interview with the Early Childhood Education faculty. All applicants must hold certification in early childhood education. Mathematics Education The M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education with an elementary mathematics education concentration (the Program) is designed for the PreK-5 teacher who wants to understand mathematics and become a teacher-leader in establishing learner-centered classrooms consistent with the standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Through this graduate level program, teachers become knowledgeable of current research and methods for teaching mathematics in today’s diverse PreK-5 classrooms. This Program is closely aligned with the Vision, Mission, and related Outcomes established by the Georgia State University (GSU) Professional Education Faculty (PEF) unit. The Outcomes related to the conceptual framework are measured through several key assessments: Vision: The vision of the Program is aligned with the vision of the PEF: to provide international leadership in educational research and to create and implement exemplary educational programs in metropolitan areas. As a part of the PEF unit, the program 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. Finally, as a part of the PEF faculty, the program faculty believe that all people should be lifelong learners. Mission: The mission of the Program is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which 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, the mission of the program is to prepare educators 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.

Goals

G 1: Knowledge of Content and Curriculum
Knowledge of Elementary Mathematics Content and Curriculum: Candidates will understand and use the major concepts of mathematics appropriate for grades K-5.

G 2: Knowledge of Learners, Learning, and Teaching
Knowledge of Learners, Learning, and Teaching: Candidates will understand and use research-based knowledge of how children learn mathematics with understanding and effective strategies for teaching for understanding.

G 3: Assessment of Student Learning
Assessment of Student Learning: Candidates will understand and use multiple, appropriate assessment methods to assess student learning and improve program effectiveness.

G 4: Knowledge of Diversity
Knowledge of Diversity: Candidates will understand and use knowledge of student diversity to affirm and support full participation and continued study of mathematics by all students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 5)
Learning Objectives: The following objectives summarize the requirements of the Georgia Professional Standards Commission for the K-5 Mathematics Endorsement (see PSC 505-3-68). These objectives are consistent with the GSU PEF Conceptual Framework. Demonstrates knowledge of elementary mathematics content and curriculum (G1): Candidates appropriately use knowledge of mathematical content and curriculum emphasized in national, state, and local standards for grades K-5 in preparing learning experiences for children.

SLO 2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 4, 5)
Demonstrates research-based pedagogical content knowledge (G2): Candidates use instructional strategies based on current research and applicable standards and use appropriate technology and a variety of physical and visual materials for exploration of mathematical concepts and procedures and development of children’s thinking, understanding, and problem solving across the strands of the elementary mathematics curriculum.

SLO 3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness (G: 3) (M: 2)
Assesses student learning and program effectiveness (G3): Candidates understand and use multiple, appropriate assessment methods to assess student learning and improve program effectiveness.

SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity (G: 4) (M: 2)
Demonstrates knowledge of student diversity (G4): Candidates demonstrate knowledge of student diversity (e.g., gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, language, special needs, etc.) and use this knowledge to affirm and support the learning of mathematics by all students.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection (O: 1)
The Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection Assessment is graded at the end of each of the four mathematics content/pedagogy courses in the program (ECE 7393, ECE 7394, ECE 7395, and ECE 7396). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: Collection of Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks and Rationales The NCTM Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics (1991) emphasizes the posing of learning activities it calls worthwhile mathematical tasks. These tasks are to be based on— Sound and significant mathematics; Knowledge of students’ understandings, interests, and experiences; Knowledge of the range of ways that diverse students learn mathematics; And these tasks are intended to— Engage students’ intellect Develop students’ mathematical understandings and skills; stimulate students to make connections and develop a coherent framework for mathematical ideas; Call for problem formulation, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning; Promote communication about mathematics; Represent mathematics as an ongoing human activity; Display sensitivity to, and draw on, students’ diverse background experiences and dispositions; Promote the development of all students’ dispositions to do mathematics. (p. 25) “In selecting, adapting, or generating mathematical tasks, teachers must base their decisions on three areas of concern: the mathematical content, the students, and the ways in which students learn mathematics” (pp. 25-26) Stein, Smith, Henningsen, and Silver (2000) encourage the analysis of mathematics instructional tasks for “the kind and level of thinking required of students in order to successfully engage with and solve the task” (p. 11). Their analysis of cognitive demands divides mathematics tasks into two general categories, each of which are divided further into two subcategories: Lower-Level Demands (including Memorization Tasks and Procedures Without Connections Tasks) and Higher-Level Demands (including Procedures With Connections Tasks and Doing Mathematics Tasks). “Since the tasks with which students become engaged in the classroom form the basis of their opportunities for learning mathematics, it is important to be clear about one’s goals for student learning. Once learning goals for students have been clearly articulated, tasks can be selected or created to match these goals. Being aware of the cognitive demands of tasks is a central consideration in this matching” (p. 11). The NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics (2000) elaborates on the role of problem solving in learning mathematics by specifying that— Instructional programs from prekindergarten through grade 12 should enable all
students to—build new mathematical knowledge through solving problems; solve problems that arise in mathematics and in other contexts; apply and adapt a variety of appropriate strategies to solve problems; monitor and reflect on the process of mathematical problem solving. (p. 51) “Problem solving means engaging in a task for which the solution method is not known in advance. [The 1989 NCTM Curriculum and Evaluation Standards called this nonroutine problem solving.] In order to find a solution, students must draw on their knowledge, and through this process, they will often develop new mathematical understandings. Solving problems is not only a major means for learning mathematics, but also a major means for understanding mathematics. Students should be given a variety of opportunities to formulate problems, grapple with, and solve complex problems that require a significant amount of effort and should then be encouraged to reflect on their thinking.” (NCTM, 2000, p. 51) Tasks and Rationales: Select, adapt, or generate (and organize) ten (10) worthwhile mathematical tasks across grades 2-5 focusing on developing the understanding of the major concepts of elementary mathematics emphasized in this course. For each task collected, provide a rationale/cover page that identifies the following (refer to Stein, Smith, Henningsen, & Silver, 2000, pp. 16, 21); Anticipated students (age, grade level, and prior knowledge/experience); Goals for student learning (identified in the NCTM Standards or mathematical features of the task, including what students are asked to do, in what context, with what tools (including the impact of the use of calculators or other technology), etc.; Level of cognitive demands (kinds of thinking required by the task); Rationale for the categorization of cognitive demands. Your Solutions to the Tasks: For each of the tasks in your collection, provide a complete solution of your own work. Following your solution, explain in writing your thinking used to complete the task. This assessment is graded using the Worthwhile Mathematical Tasks Collection Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum**

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Across four uses of this measure during 2010-2011, 100% of candidates scored Meets Expectations / High Quality or better for a mean rating of 4.80 out of 5 or a percentage equivalent of 96.0% compared to a target of 80%.

**M 2: Student Interview Assessments (O: 3, 4)**

The Student Interview Assessments are graded during three of the four mathematics content courses in the program (ECE 7393, ECE 7394, and ECE 7395). These assignments provide a model for student-centered teaching. Instructions to candidates for these assessments are as follows: Student Interview Assessments The Teaching Principle from the NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics indicates teachers’ must understand children’s thinking to make effective curricular and instructional decisions. Specifically—Effective teaching requires knowing and understanding mathematics, students as learners, and pedagogical strategies. Teachers need several different kinds of mathematical knowledge—knowledge about the whole domain; deep, flexible knowledge about how ideas relate and about the interconnections to their grade level; and knowledge about the strategies that students are likely to encounter in learning these ideas; knowledge about how the ideas can be represented to teach them effectively; and knowledge about how students’ understanding can be assessed. This knowledge helps teachers make curricular judgments, respond to students’ questions, and look ahead to where concepts are leading and plan accordingly. (NCTM, 2000, p. 16) Interviewing individual students provides an opportunity to apply research on children’s thinking and to develop a deep understanding of how children construct conceptual understandings in the context of solving nonroutine problems. Interactions with individual children provide the foundation for developing student-centered instruction attending to each child’s needs. For this assignment during the Number and Operations Course (3 Interviews): Interview #1: Addition and Subtraction (First Grade) a. Prepare a script of 11 potential addition and subtraction word problems to pose to a child in First Grade. Include one of each type of problem identified in the CGI framework of addition and subtraction problem types. Vary the names of participants, objects, and numbers used in the collection of problems. Provide for your selection of alternative number sizes during the interview, depending on the as yet unknown needs of the child. The problems must make sense with all of the alternate number sizes. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be engaging yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about solving addition and subtraction word problems. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use in solving the problems. Begin by asking one of the easier problems from your script and record in as much detail as possible what the child does and does not understand. Then solve the problem on the basis of the child’s understanding and success in solving the problems you pose. Additional problems that will explore the depth of the child’s understanding and success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problem you posed, identifies the problem type from the CGI framework (e.g., JRU for Join Result Unknown), describes the child’s response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s response on the basis of the CGI framework for solution strategies. Repeat this process (problem as posed, CGI problem type, and CGI analysis) for each of the problems that you posed. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the child’s understanding of addition and subtraction, the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, the range of numbers with which the child was familiar, and the types of strategies the child demonstrated. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one word problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing the student’s understanding of addition and subtraction. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. Interview #2: Multiplication and Division (Second Grade) a. Prepare a script of 10-12 potential multiplication and division word problems to pose to a child in Second Grade. Most of the problems for this interview should be Grouping and Partitioning problems (multiplication, measurement division, and partitive division) as identified in the CGI framework. Include only one multiplication problem from each of the Rate, Price, and Multiplicative Comparison types at the end of your script. Include at least one partitioning problems with a remainder, considering the four different types of problems. Use realistic contexts for all problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The problems must make sense to a child. The goal is for the problems to be engaging yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what that child understands about solving grouping and partitioning word problems. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use in solving the problems. Begin by asking one of the easier problems from your script and record in as much detail as possible what the child does and says in trying to solve the problem. On the basis of the child’s strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the child’s strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child’s success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a report that lists the problem you posed, identifies the problem type from the CGI framework (e.g., G/P-FD for Grouping/Partitioning-Partitive Division), describes the child’s response as completely as possible, and analyzes the child’s response on the basis of the CGI framework for solution strategies. Repeat this process (problem as posed, CGI problem type, child’s response, and CGI analysis) for each of the problems that you posed. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the child’s understanding of grouping and partitioning the types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, the types of strategies they demonstrated. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write one word problem that is an appropriate next problem to ask this student to solve to continue developing the student’s understanding of multiplication and division. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. Interview #3: Base-Ten Understanding (Third Grade) a. Prepare a script of 10-12 potential word problems to pose to a child in Third Grade with the purpose of determining what the child understands about base ten concepts. Most of the problems for this interview should be grouping and partitioning problems that use groups of ten and addition problems that encourage the use of invented algorithms to deal with carefully selected number combinations. Provide for your selection of
Interview a small group of children (or an individual child) with the purpose of coming to know what each child understands about equality. Provide appropriate materials for the children to use in solving the problems. Record in as much detail as possible what the children do and say in trying to solve the problems. On the basis of the children's responses, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the children's understanding while continuing to encourage and support the children's success with the problems you pose. c. Write a paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children's understanding of equality. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's understanding of equality. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's understanding of equality. Interview #5: Children's Relational Thinking. a. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of equality. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Prepare a script of 6-10 problems, including open number sentences (e.g., 8 + 4 = 5 + ?) and True-False number sentences (e.g., 8 + 3 = 7 + 4 True or False?). See Thinking Mathematically, pp. 9-24 for examples. Carefully and deliberately choose numbers and your problem sequence to elicit children's understanding of equality (both the concept and the symbol) and explore the extent of children's understanding. b. Interview one child with the purpose of coming to know what each child understands about equality. Provide appropriate materials for the children to use in solving the problems. Record in as much detail as possible what the children do and say in trying to solve the problems. On the basis of the children's responses, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the children's understanding while continuing to encourage and support the children's success with the problems you pose. c. Write a paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children's understanding of equality. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's understanding of equality. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's understanding of equality. Interview #6: Children's Understanding of Geometry OR Measurement a. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of key concepts of geometry or measurement through solving nonroutine problems. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be nonroutine, engaging, and challenging, yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child to assess what that child understands about geometry or measurement as well as the child's ability to use that understanding in nonroutine problem solving consistent with grade-level expectations. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use. On the basis of the child's strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the child's strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child's success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a paragraph that lists the problems you posed, describes the children's responses as completely as possible, and analyzes each child's relational thinking. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children's relational thinking. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's relational thinking. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's relational thinking. Interview #6: Children's Understanding of Geometry OR Measurement b. Design an adaptive performance assessment of understanding of geometry or measurement through solving nonroutine problems. Target the assessment to a specific (P-5) grade level of your interest. Use realistic contexts for all problems, but make the problems as simple in context and syntax as possible. The goal is for the problems to be nonroutine, engaging, and challenging, yet easily understandable. b. Interview one child to assess what that child understands about geometry or measurement as well as the child's ability to use that understanding in nonroutine problem solving consistent with grade-level expectations. Provide a collection of appropriate physical materials as well as paper and pencil for the child to use. On the basis of the child's strategy and success in solving the first problem, sequence additional problems that will explore the extent of the child's strategies and understanding while continuing to encourage and support the child's success in solving the problems you pose. c. Write a paragraph that lists the problems you posed, describes the children's responses as completely as possible, and analyzes each child's relational thinking. At the end of this report, write one paragraph that summarizes what you learned about the children's relational thinking. Conclude the report with an Instructional Decision as follows: Write an appropriate next problem to ask this student to continue developing this student's relational thinking. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's relational thinking.

Target for O3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Across six uses of this measure during 2010-2011, 100% of candidates scored Meets Expectations / High Quality or better, with an mean rating of 4.76 out of 5 or 95.2% compared to the target of 80%.

Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Diversity
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Across six uses of this measure during 2010-2011, 100% of candidates scored Meets Expectations / High Quality or better, with an mean rating of 4.76 out of 5 or 95.2% compared to the target of 80%.

M 3: Data Project and Presentation Assessment (O: 1)
The Data Project and Presentation Assessment is graded using the data analysis and probability content/pedagogy course in the program (ECE 7396). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: Data Project and Presentation Assessment is adapted from Russell, S. J., Schifter, D., & Bastable, V. (2002). Working with data: Facilitator's guide. Parsippany, NJ: Dale Seymour (Pearson Learning Group). People collect data in order to answer a question or to illuminate some aspect of their lives. For this
Selected Course Grades (O: 1, 2)

Professional Portfolio Project (O: 2)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

ECE 7395: Algebra in the Elementary Classroom

Course grades from the four courses in the program integrating content and pedagogy in elementary mathematics classrooms reflect

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

the use of electronic-recording media for

reason, every aspect of data collection and analysis must be evaluated in light of the purpose of the investigation. For example, was the investigation designed in such a way that it produced the needed data? Did respondents interpret the survey question in the way it was intended? Were the measurements accurate enough to be reliable? Does the way the data are represented in a graph or table give a view of the data that helps answer the original question? (Russell, Schifter, & Bastable, 2002, p. 122) Assignment Instructions:

1. Prepare a written Data Project Report that documents the following activities: a. Form a worthwhile, interesting, researchable question that involves a familiar context, involves numerical data that can be consistently interpreted, anticipates the range of possible responses, compares data from at least two groups, and is likely to get the information required to accomplish the purpose of the study. b. Gather applicable data, differentiating between the real-world event and the abstracted data documenting some aspects of that event. c. Create and interpret data displays that support the purpose of the study and communicate a useful picture of the range and distribution of the data to the intended audience. Appropriately treat values of zero and zero frequencies in these displays. Use available technology (e.g., Excel) in preparing these data displays. d. Analyze, summarize, and interpret the data recognizing emergent features of the aggregated data (such as center, spread, and shapes that are not visible within the variability of the individual cases; provide a summary of appropriate averages and consider the various ways in which typically is communicated by midrange, majority, mode, median, and mean; and interpret the data by comparing group results using averages or other representative values. e. Relate the interpretations of the data back to the real situation by making statements and claims about the real-world situation rather than just the representations of the data. 2. Prepare and present (a) a poster presentation and (b) a PowerPoint presentation to convey your question, methods, and findings to your peers. This assessment is graded using the Data Project and Presentation Grading Rubric.

Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Thirty-two out of 33 candidates (97.0%) enrolled in ECE 7396 during 2010-2011 scored Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%) or better. The mean rubric score was 4.48 out of 5, which is an equivalent percentage of 89.6% compared with the target of 80%.

The Professional Portfolio Project is graded at the end of the clinical practice course in the program (ECE 7740). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: Professional Portfolio Project This assignment is adapted from the PSC K-5 Mathematics Endorsement Program Portfolio Guidelines. The portfolio is organized into three sections and must include a minimum of ten lesson plans and other artifacts that illustrate your effective implementation of mathematics student achievement. The portfolio will be evaluated as Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) based on completeness and the quality of included artifacts. Section 1. Content Implementation This section of the portfolio includes artifacts generated from demonstrating implementation of content knowledge in teaching. A minimum of four lesson plans demonstrating implementation of instructional strategies, one from each of the four mathematics content areas in ECE 7393, 7394, 7395, and 7396). These lesson plans must have been taught by you and must include your written lesson reflection and analysis. Observer notes and comments regarding a minimum of two taught mathematics lessons based on a pre-established observation rubric. Section 2. Student Learning The portfolio must include a minimum of two different types of artifacts illustrating evidence of impact on student mathematics learning. A minimum of four lesson plans (which you have taught and include your written reflection and analysis) with collected student work or other assessment evidence demonstrating the impact of the lesson on student learning. At least one of these lesson plans must demonstrate the following: A lesson developed in response to formative student assessment data. May include recommendations for enrichment or remediation. A differentiated lesson based on specific student needs or interests. A written response to a lesson-observation rubric completed by an observer, specifying lesson modifications intended to improve the impact of the lesson on student mathematics learning. Section 3. Technology Integration The portfolio must include a minimum of two artifacts demonstrating the integration of available technology into mathematics instruction. A minimum of two lesson plans (which you have taught and include your written reflection and analysis) incorporating available technology into mathematics instruction. A personal statement that could be shared with parents on the effective use of technology in mathematics instruction to support learning mathematics with understanding. Notes: All lesson plans, teaching, and reflections included in the portfolio must originate while enrolled in K-5 Mathematics Endorsement Program courses (ECE 7393, 7394, 7395, 7396, and/or 7740). A minimum of 2 of the 10 lesson plans included in the portfolio must be taught in a grade band (K-2 or 3-5) that is different from your regular classroom assignment. A minimum of 2 of the 10 lesson plans included in the portfolio must provide evidence of working with diverse students as demonstrated by submitting demographics of the classes taught with the lesson plans. The use of electronic-recording media for the purpose of lesson analysis is not considered technology incorporation into mathematics instruction. This portfolio is graded using the Professional Portfolio Project Rubric.

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

Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / Satisfactory (80%).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Twenty-nine out of 32 students (90.6%) enrolling in ECE 7740 during Spring 2011 have completed the course with a portfolio rating of Meets Expectations / Satisfactory. Three students have not yet completed the course pending satisfactory completion of the portfolio. The mean portfolio score for 2010-2011 is 90.6%. This meets the achievement target for the year.

Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum

GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The aggregate GPA for the four elementary mathematics content courses during 2010-2011 was 3.774 (A-). All candidates achieved a GPA for those courses of 3.00 or better.

M 4: Professional Portfolio Project (O: 2)

M 5: Selected Course Grades (O: 1, 2)

Course grades from the four courses in the program integrating content and pedagogy in elementary mathematics classrooms reflect candidate knowledge of major concepts of mathematics content appropriate for grades K-5. These courses are as follows: ECE 7393: Number and Operations in the Elementary Classroom; ECE 7394: Geometry and Spatial Sense in the Elementary Classroom; ECE 7395: Algebra in the Elementary Classroom; ECE 7396: Data Analysis and Probability in the Elementary Classroom

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
The overall GPA for the four elementary mathematics content courses during 2010-2011 was 3.774 (A-). All candidates achieved a GPA for those courses of 3.00 or better.

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

Increase Pedagogical Emphasis and Tools
The qualitative data from program key assessments has indicated a need for greater emphasis and support for implementing standards-based pedagogy. We have introduced a standards-based lesson plan format for use in each of the math content/pedagogy courses that supports teachers' attention to important elements of standards-based pedagogy. This increased emphasis will be continued through the current cycle of four math content/pedagogy courses that concludes in May 2012. Results from key assessments for 2011-2012 will be analyzed for improvement in attention to these pedagogical details.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Program Co-Coordinators (Dr. Smith and Dr. Swars)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
2010-2011 is the first year of this program. We met all outcome objectives. We are very pleased with the data provided by the key assessments. No changes in the assessment process have been made or are currently planned. The key assessments are doing a good job of providing data that is helpful in planning adjustments in the program and its courses.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The assessment findings identified an opportunity to improve the program curriculum as indicated in the Action Plans, specifically to provide a greater emphasis on standards-based pedagogy in the four math content/pedagogy courses. The assessment findings also indicated that the program has been successful in meeting our expectations and objectives. No additional program changes are planned at this time.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Economics Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Economics's undergraduate program and its central role in the University core curriculum is to increase substantive knowledge, analytical skills and communication skills by educating students about economic principles and by imparting an appreciation of economic issues from a global perspective.

Goals

G 1: goals
The goals of the Department of Economics's undergraduate program and its central role in the University core curriculum include teaching students the "economic way of thinking", and helping them appreciate and understand the global economy in which we live today.

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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**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). 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

For ECON 2100, the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 69.8%. There were a total of 241 students assessed across 4 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 2105 the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 73%. There were a total of 110 students assessed in one section reported. See the attached document in the measures section for more details on the questions and the variations in the percentage of correct answers. For ECON 2106, the weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 77.3%. There were a total of 502 students assessed across 4 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 had already planned changes in our assessment plans for the future before we gathered the data this year, but it was too late to follow the new plan. Next cycle, we expect to have a standard set of questions for each course and to require every instructor to use them, so the number of students assessed will increase next year.

**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 exams of selected sections of ECON 2100: The Global Economy. 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 weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions for each course to be at least 75%.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

The weighted average of the percentage of correct answers across all sets of questions was 66.6%. There were a total of 241 students assessed across 4 different sections with 3 different instructors. See the attached document in the measures section for the results of each individual question.

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

increase number of students assessed

Each year, the Department of Economics asks instructors of the economics courses in the core curriculum to volunteer to participate in assessment of the contemporary issues general education learning outcomes. In the future, we hope to get more instructors involved in the assessment, and therefore, increase the number of students assessed. Starting in Fall 2012, all instructors of ECON 2100, 2105, and 2106 will be required to participate in assessment efforts.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008

Implementation Status: Planned
compose new assessment questions
After reviewing last year's assessment report, the Department of Economics Undergraduate Program Committee decided to compose a standard set of questions to be used for each core course (ECON 2100, 2105, and 2106) and to require instructors to embed those questions on an exam and report results to the Committee for the assessment report. We are in the progress of composing such questions; it was too late to implement this strategy this year, but we hope to do so for next year's report.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Multiple Choice questions embedded on unit exams | Outcome/Objective: Global Perspectives
  Measure: Multiple Choice Questions on Final Exams | Outcome/Objective: social science core learning outcome - econ

Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Department of Economics Undergraduate Program Committee

Academic Program Question 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We are revising the questions we ask and revising our plan for how to do the assessment in the core courses - it will no longer be voluntary for instructors to participate - everyone will include the assessment questions on one of their exams throughout the semester.

Academic Program Question 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have not made changes to our program, but we are considering changes to the principles courses. We might start going with a "less is more" approach because we are concerned that students are being overwhelmed with too much minutiae at the expense of missing the big important themes.
M 1: Tracking Examination (O: 1, 2)

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 50 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 50 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 fall and spring to measure learning outcomes 1 and 2. See the attached document for 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided (called econ tracking exam results 2011 report). While the percentage correct of a few questions decreased from last year to this one, most of them increased, as well as the average across all questions. We are pleased to see this. Our target of 65% was met.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided (called econ tracking exam results 2011 report). While the percentage correct of a few questions decreased from last year to this one, most of them increased, as well as the average across all questions. We are pleased to see this. Our target of 65% was met.

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 the rubric on the group presentation.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
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 in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. We are planning to change the tracking exam questions for the first 2 learning outcomes. We did not select questions from the tracking exams to assess learning outcome #3 in either cycle. 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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate programs committee in consultation with ECON 4999 instructors

change questions for the tracking exam

Upon inspection of the findings from last year, the Department of Economics’ Undergraduate Program Committee decided to change the tracking exam questions to better reflect the learning outcomes we are seeking to measure.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields
- Measure: Economics Basic Theories

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: economics undergraduate programs committee in consultation with ECON 4999 instructors

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We decided that our tracking exam questions should be changed. We felt that some of the questions were not necessarily assessing the most important concepts. We put together some subcommittees to make new questions for the tracking exams and hope to implement those in classes next year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are considering broad questions about how our courses are taught, particularly at the principles level. We are concerned that students leave the intro courses overwhelmed with the level of details taught in the courses at the expense of missing the main points. We are considering moving to a "less is more" approach in those courses. We are also considering questions like what is the optimal mix of teaching faculty - how many clinical teaching faculty, tenure-track faculty, PTIs, and GTAs should be teaching our...
undergraduate courses? Curriculum changes may come out of these discussions, but we are still in the quite early stages of the discussions.

--
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### Mission / Purpose

The Master of Arts in Economics program is designed to train students for careers in local, state, and federal government and in the private sector. The program emphasizes basic analytical skills, micro- and macro-economic theory, and mathematical statistics, at a level necessary for contributing to and assessing policy research. Microeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8100. Macroeconomic skills are taught in Economics 8110. Statistical skills are taught in Economics 8740 and 8840. Students’ mastery of these skills is assessed with midterm and final examinations in the respective courses. The program also emphasizes advanced understanding of selected topics. Students must take seven additional economics courses, chosen in consultation with their advisors. They must demonstrate mastery of this course material through midterm exams, final exams, and research papers. A final high-quality research paper chosen by the student must demonstrate that the student has the ability to examine an economic problem at a level consistent with advanced graduate course work.

### Goals

**G 1: Theoretical and applied background.**  
To equip the MA program graduates with wide-ranging and in-depth knowledge of theoretical and applied economics. Graduates should be able to perform applied economic analysis based on sound theory and data analysis.

**G 2: Professional success and continued education.**  
To facilitate the continued academic and professional development of the MA program graduates. Graduates should possess the necessary theoretical and analytic background to perform successfully in the job market and to be able to pursue further graduate level education.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Analytical Skills. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**  
To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Applying Economic Models. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 3)**  
To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

**O/O 2: Economic Disciplines. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**  
To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking economic issues.

**O/O 4: Economic Data. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)**  
To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Core exams. (O: 2, 3)**  
All graduating Master of Arts in Economics students will be assessed on their basic learning of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics (e.g., Master of Arts in Economics, Learning Outcome 1). The assessment will be based on the performances of their final examinations in macroeconomics, microeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.  
*Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level*

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**  
Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
There were 17 students that took the macroeconomics exam. There was an improvement in the two weakest areas in last year’s exam: Math and Analytics. In 2009-10, the scores were Math (3.18) and Analytics (3.36). In 2010-11, the scores improved to 4 and 3.47, respectively. There were 24 students that took the microeconomics exam during 2010-11. Scores ranged from 3.92 to 4.2 across categories, a similar range to last year. Analytics (4.2) and Application (4.16) were the
strongest areas. There were 18 students who took the econometrics course in 2010-11. Scores were very good across all categories ranging from 4.05 (Analytics) to 4.47 (Defintional). Overall, the results showed good performance across categories in each of these three core exams.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 17 students who took the macroeconomics exam. There was an improvement in the two weakest areas in last year's exam: Math and Analytics. In 2009-10, the scores were Math (3.18) and Analytics (3.36). In 2010-11, the scores improved to 4 and 3.47, respectively. There were 24 students who took the microeconomics exam during 2010-11. Scores ranged from 3.92 to 4.2 across categories, a similar range to last year. Analytics (4.2) and Application (4.16) were the strongest areas. There were 18 students who took the econometrics course in 2010-11. Scores were very good across all categories ranging from 4.05 (Analytics) to 4.47 (Defintional). Overall, the results showed good performance across categories in each of these three core exams.

**M 2: Essay. (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

All students will submit a research paper to demonstrate their learning in a chosen subject of their own and to show their understanding, usage, and analysis of economic data. The Essay will typically be a product of the interaction with at least one faculty member in the Department of Economics, and will be assessed by the faculty member(s) involved. The Essay will be evaluated on several criteria (e.g., overall contribution to the literature, understanding of the literature, writing, technical proficiency, and so on).

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Applying Economic Models.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven essays were submitted in 2010-11. Applying economic models were judged by the following two categories: Ability to Cover the Research Question and by Economic Analysis. The average for both of these categories was 4.16, which indicate a solid performance.

**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

This category was measured by Comprehension of the Literature. The average grade was 4.5 which indicates strong performance in this category.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

This category was measured by the Theoretical Skills and Overall Contribution rankings. The average score in Overall Contribution was 4.0 which indicates solid performance. The average score in Theoretical Skills was 3.5, which while not a high score, is consistent with the applied orientation of our MA program.

**Target for O4: Economic Data.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

This category was evaluated by Data Collection, Measurement and Computation. The average score was 4.16, which indicates good, solid performance.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

We received 5 responses to the alumni survey. The responses were generally favorable. In response to, "The program improved my ability to carry out research projects," the average response by the alumni was 4.8. This is encouraging as it would indicate that graduates feel that the program adequately improved their research skills. In addition, when asked if alumni would recommend our program to their peers, the average score was 4.0. This score was the same as last year, which indicates an overall positive experience in the program. On the other hand, alumni felt that we could improve in two particular areas. First, integrating MA students more into departmental life/events. Second, we could provide more support for them to identify and pursue job opportunities.
**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:** In-Progress
  - **Priority:** High
  - **Responsible Person/Group:** Bess Blyler

### 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:** Finished
  - **Priority:** High

### Exchange programs
- Increase the number of students who participate in international exchange programs by providing comprehensive information.
  - **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:** Finished
  - **Priority:** High
  - **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2011

### 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:** Finished
  - **Priority:** High
  - **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2011

### 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:** Finished
  - **Priority:** High
  - **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2011

### 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
  - **Implementation Description:** An internship course has been created, ECON 8941. It will run parallel to the PMAP course. This should encourage our students to obtain more internships.

### 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

### Start a Seminar Series for our MA students
- A special seminar series that met a couple of times a semester will be developed. The purpose is to integrate MA students specifically into our departmental activities. There are many other seminars offered throughout the semester, but are only typically attended by doctoral students and faculty. This new MA seminar series would be on topics specifically of interest to them such as: talks by alumni of the program on their job experiences and advise; talks by faculty about topical issues at a level accessible to MA students, etc.
  - **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
  - **Implementation Status:** Planned
  - **Priority:** High
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process that we have (outcomes, measures, targets) is generally fine. We have not implemented any major changes. We have, however, implemented various changes in response to assessments, which is the subject of the next question.

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

There are several changes implemented in response to findings. First, we have established a set of guidelines for the MA-Econ non-thesis paper. These guidelines make clear the expectations for the content of the non-thesis paper. Second, we have begun to address the issue of better integration into department life that was brought up in the alumni survey. In Fall 2011, the MA Symposium was started with presentations of exclusive interest for MA-econ students. In addition, we have also begun to provide more career service advice to our students with the establishment of a dedicated Career Services office at our college, AYSPS, this year. This office will hold workshops, critique resumes, bring employers to meet students, and other activities that should be helpful for our students in their job search.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
See response to Academic Program Question 1.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
See response to Academic Program Question 2.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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 is generally doing well. Only minor changes to continue improving the outcomes are needed as described above.

---
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**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, 9040, and 9050. Necessary skills for microeconomics are taught in Economics 9020, 9040, and 9050. Necessary skills for macroeconomics are taught in Economics 8030, 9710, 9720, and 9730. Students' mastery of these respective skills is assessed in mid-term 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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
The Public Finance field exam was given to 4 students in summer 2010. Three of the four students passed the exam. The average evaluation scores per category were comparable to the last year’s group of students. The Labor Economics field exam was given to 5 students in summer 2010. Four of the five students passed the exam. The one student who failed passed the exam (on the third attempt) in Summer 2011. The Urban/Environmental field exam was given to 2 students in Spring of 2011. One of the two students passed the exam. The other student passed the exam on the second in Spring 2011; he received a “High Pass” On his second attempt. The Experimental Economics field exam was given to 1 student in summer 2010. The student passed the exam. In comparison with the previous year, the number of students who took field examinations went up from 7 to 12. Examinations were given in four different fields doubling the previous year figure of two.

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Since the end of Spring 2010 12 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category are comparable to those of previous years. The average score for the overall contribution to the literature was about 4.48 (out of 5); this figure is similar to the average score of 4.46 during the Spring 2009 - Spring 2010 period. 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
NA

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Since the end of Spring 2010 12 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category are comparable to those of previous years. The average score for the overall contribution to the literature was about 4.48 (out of 5); this figure is similar to the average score of 4.46 during the Spring 2009 - Spring 2010 period. 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
NA
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Since the end of Spring 2010 12 Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The averages in each category are comparable to those of previous years. The average score for the overall contribution to the literature was about 4.48 (out of 5); this figure is similar to the average score of 4.46 during the Spring 2009 - Spring 2010 period. In 5 cases, the dissertation committee judged that the work would deserve publication in the top journal of the particular field.

M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 4)

Graduates of the Ph.D. program are asked to complete a questionnaire that assesses how what was learned in the program contributed to their performance in their current job. This survey includes questions about whether the dissertation (or parts of the dissertation) have been submitted for publication or have already been published. This survey is given at one year and three years after graduation.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research

NA

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Seven alumni responded to the survey this year; they were graduated during 2007-2008. Overall the alumni gave high scores to the program; the average scores varied from 3.9 (improved oral ability to communicate ideas) to 4.4 (improved job opportunities). They state that the program has expanded their job opportunities; the score was 4.4 (out of 5). They suggested that the program should utilize different teaching pedagogies and that publishable research should be emphasized. The program's effects on acquired analytical skills, carrying out research projects and improving the ability of collaboration with professionals all received scores of 4.3 (out of 5). All seven alumni would recommend the program to their peers (4.2 out of 5). These alumni are performing quite successfully. They have published a total of 29 papers (since the year they graduated) and have been presenting their work in 56 conferences all over the world. Four of them have academic positions in Minnesota, Arkansas, United Kingdom and Mexico and one is a post-doc at IFPRI in Washington.

M 5: Senior Ph.D. Student Survey (O: 4)

Ph.D. students in their 4th and 5th year are asked to complete a questionnaire that evaluates the program. The survey includes questions about the students' current research output, including published and submitted research papers and presentations at research conferences.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research

NA

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Seven PhD students responded to the survey. Overall the students valued the program highly. They would recommend the program to their peers (3.9 out of 5). They value the program with respect to improved analytical skills (4.1); improved oral communication of ideas, collaboration with professionals in their fields and perceived value of the program on expanding job opportunities all earned a score of 4. Slightly lower scores were obtained on preparation for an academic career (3.6) and teaching (3.3). All students participated in reporting on their research activities. The total number of papers, book chapters and policy reports already published is 14; the figure for working papers is 28. Furthermore, there were 11 paper presentations at conferences and professional meetings. Five students have teaching experience and two of them taught as instructors at Georgia State University. Overall, from the students' point of view the program seems to be on track; they appreciate the core courses and econometrics but they also recommend that a mixture of applied and theoretical econometrics should be emphasized more in the program.

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

CV writing course
We organized a CV writing course for Ph.D. students.

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

Job market preparation
Organize the consulting sessions during which faculty will give advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications. This activity is organized by the GSA.

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

Job market presentation
We continue to require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag during the Fall semester. As reported in findings this change has been shown to improve 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%.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Students' characteristics and success in the program.
We are working on creating 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.

Summer support
Development of an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support.

Tutoring Experience
We continue to rotate all 3rd year students through the tutoring lab. Last year this helped with staffing the tutoring lab and provided graduates with valuable teaching experience, which we expect to increase their value on the job market.
Coordination of tutoring assignments with research schedules

Coordinate rotation of tutoring lab assignments with research schedules. All 3rd year students will continue to be rotated through the tutoring lab. This will continue to help with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market. Coordination of the tutoring lab assignments with sponsored research grant support from faculty and students’ own research grants will minimize conflicts between program objectives.

Further Development of procedures for summer support

Further development of the administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support. Develop specific procedures for inclusion of research and educational activities carried out at non-university sites with approval by faculty advisers.

New Course on Casual Inference

We added a new course: ECON8899/PMAP8899: Causal Inference and Evidence-based Policy. This course on causal inference is intended for graduate students in social and behavioral sciences broadly and is appropriate for students with advanced empirical training as well as students with only the pre-requisites (graduate-level statistics course covering probability theory and multivariate regression). The course emphasizes a deeper understanding of causality and the designs and methods used to draw causal inferences from experimental and non-experimental (observational) data. It comprises readings, class participation, practice problems, a manuscript review and a term paper and presentation.

Use information from the database to inform admission decisions for applicants to the graduate program

Begin the process of using the graduate student database to inform the admissions decision. We have been developing 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 determinants of what students’ characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. A next step is to use information from the database to inform admission decisions for applicants to the graduate program.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 working on creating 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. Other important changes to the Ph.D. program that the department implemented last year are as follows. 1. Students now are required to take an additional dissertation workshop (ECON 9515) in which they present research and give peer feedback. All job market candidates are required to give a full 1 hour and 30 minute talk with other students in the class critically assessing their market candidates are required to give a full 1 hour and 30 minute talk with other students in the class critically assessing their performance. Particular attention is paid to presentation skills and the substance of the research. 2. All 3rd year students now are rotated through the tutoring lab. This helps with staffing the tutoring lab and provide graduates with valuable teaching experience which will increase their value on the job market. 3. We have developed an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support. Prior to the summer each graduate student is queried to determine whether or not they intend to be at GSU and available to work for the summer. If they agree to these terms they are awarded a RA assignment but if they intend to be out of the Georgia and unavailable they do not receive a RA assignment and the payment that goes with it. 4. With respect to job market preparation we continued: (i) to organize a CV writing course for Ph.D. students; (ii) to run consulting sessions during which faculty gave advice to students on how to prepare their job market applications; (iii) to require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag seminar during the fall semester. We expect these changes to help to improve job market outcomes. 5. To maintain high standards in core classes, instructors of the core classes paid special attention in their teaching towards providing theoretical content with applied relevance and analytical skills.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) 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. The department intends to continue to:

1. work with the instructors of the core classes to maintain high standards across all measured outcomes, with particular emphasis on providing theoretical content with applied relevance and analytic skills.
2. organize the CV writing course for Ph.D. students. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes.
3. 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. We expect that these changes will help with job market outcomes.
4. require that all graduating students present job market papers in the brown bag seminar series during the fall semester. We expect that this change will help with job market outcomes.

This year we also added a new course: ECON8899/PMAP8899: Causal Inference and Evidence-based Policy. This course on causal inference is intended for graduate students in social and behavioral sciences broadly and is appropriate for students with advanced empirical training as well as students with only the pre-requisites (graduate-level statistics course covering probability theory and multivariate regression). The course emphasizes a deeper understanding of causality and the designs and methods used to draw causal inferences from experimental and non-experimental (observational) data. It comprises readings, class participation, practice problems, a manuscript review and a term paper and presentation.

**Administrative Dept Question 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

See answers to Academic Question 1.

**Administrative Dept Question 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

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 Dept Question 3:**

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

See answers to Academic Question 2. The program is well established, and students show strong performance. Therefore, radical changes are not needed. Yet, continued emphasis on objectives is essential to maintain and further raise the standards. From an administrative point 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.
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

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

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

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).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Doctoral Indicator Survey- Research section (O: 1)
Evidence of submitted database articles, number of published articles, number of book chapters, and participation in grant development as compiled from the research activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

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

Target for O1: Students will design and conduct investigations
By candidacy, 100% of students will have submitted a manuscript in which they are senior author to a refereed journal.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
We continued to have students participate in a wide range of activities as specified below: Scholarly Activities In 10-11, all students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Additionally, 40 articles were submitted by 18 students (with students being the senior author on 11 of these articles); 21 articles were published by 15 students (with students being the senior author on 6 articles); 6 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 4 students, and 9 grants were prepared with the assistance of 5 students.

M 2: Evidence of teaching college courses (O: 2)
Evidence of teaching college courses as teaching assistant and/or instructor, number of guest lectureres, number of students who supervised practica, as compiled from the teaching activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

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

Target for O2: Students will teach at the university level
By candidacy, 100% of the students will have completed their requirement of assisting or teaching a university course.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Teaching Experience In 10-11, all students who had reached candidacy has assisted or taught at least one university course. For the 10-11 year, 14 students assisted in teaching 58 courses; 11 students taught 21 courses as GTAs, 12 students gave 19 guest lectures; and 8 students supervised 93 practicum students.

M 3: Evidence of professional development (O: 3)
Evidence of professional development including presentations and participation in professional organizations as compiled from the professional development section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Presentations and Involvement in Community In 10-11, all students who had reached candidacy had assisted or taught at least one conference or workshop presentation. 16 students made 33 national conference presentations, 13 students made 17 state conference presentations; 8 students made 11 workshop presentations; and 1 student held office in professional organizations.

M 4: Successful rating on annual evaluation (O: 4)
The student will demonstrate content expertise through successful rating on annual evaluation consisting of a review of course grades and participation, comprehensive exam scores, and prospectus (as appropriate).

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

Target for O4: The student will meet course/program requirements
Students will rate a satisfactory or higher on annual evaluations which include a review of course grades and participation,
**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-11, there were a total of 31 doctoral students, including 3 who had graduated, 1 who withdrew, and 1 who was dropped from the program. All 31 students demonstrated expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in special education. Seventeen of the students received funding support. Outcomes were very positive this year as evidenced by the annual evaluation results.

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

### Exit interviews need to be further refined

Exit interviews have been redesigned and a newly designed questionnaire has been sent to graduated PhD students. We are in the process of collecting data.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Successful rating on annual evaluation
  - **Outcome/Objective:** The student will meet course/program requirements

  **Implementation Description:** The redesigning of the exit interview for graduated PhD students has been completed.

  **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:** Finished
- **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 year with no further action needed.

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

### Doctoral Program Changes

A restructuring of the EXC doctoral program is anticipated to align with proposed changes being made by the College of Education. The current EXC PhD program will be reexamined to determine appropriate changes, taking into consideration assessment data. When program changes are approved and implemented, assessment data will be used to determine effectiveness.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Successful rating on annual evaluation
  - **Outcome/Objective:** The student will meet course/program requirements

  **Implementation Description:** Implementation will consist of a new EXC doctoral program with restructured/new courses. Once implemented, assessment data will be examined to determine the programs' effectiveness on doctoral students' knowledge and skill in research, teaching and service.

  **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013

  **Responsible Person/Group:** PMA committee/ department

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The exit interview were reexamined again with further revision to the exit interview questions and to the process of conducting the exit interview. Changes were made to this a smoother process and to be sure the questions captured the targeted data.
**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).
**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: Little or no thought given to the 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. Makes professional development plan presentation somewhat relevant to the implementation of school improvement strategies and initiatives. Students will participate in professional development activities that address personal and professional needs. 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. Makes professional development plan presentation relevant to the implementation of school improvement strategies and initiatives. Students will participate in professional development activities that address personal and professional needs. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Target for O2: Significant Educational Problem**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the significant educational problem rubric (EPEL 8000).
Target for O2: Analysis of significant educational problem
90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the significant educational problem rubric (EPEL 8000).

M 3: Legal and ethical considerations (O: 3)
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: Minimal 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 undetermined; 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).

M 4: Equity audit (O: 4)
Students will initiate and facilitate an equity audit using key stakeholders with their school or districts in order to determine the school's or district's status regarding diversity (i.e. whether the school or district is a monolithic, diverse, or multicultural organization). Students will help school and/or district stakeholders identify diversity issues related to school policies, curriculum, instruction, culture, management, and operations, personnel, and parent involvement and then apply those issues toward the audit. (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 O4: Equity audit
90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the equity rubric (EPEL 8020).

M 5: Curriculum reform model (O: 5)
Each student will work with a group of teachers and parents within the school or district to evaluate a school reform model or curriculum package based on principles of curriculum theory and design. Based on the analysis, the student and his or her team of stakeholders will determine the appropriateness of the model or package for the district, the resources needed for successful implementation, potential modifications for the sake of consistency with district/school mission and the needs of the particular population, and a consistent means for ongoing monitoring of the package or reform. (EPSF 8440). CURRICULUM REFORM MODEL RUBRIC: Exceeds Expectations: Student meets all indicators outlined in the curriculum analysis guidelines (purpose, aims, and goals; macro-curricular structures; micro-curricular structures; assessment and evaluation; and overall analysis) and provides a thorough, thoughtful, well-documented analysis with highly significant recommendations for the school and/or district. Student leads a presentation that clearly and effectively communicates analysis and recommendations. Meets Expectations: Student meets at least 80% of the indicators outlined in the curriculum analysis guidelines (purpose, aims, and goals; macro-curricular structures; micro-curricular structures; assessment and evaluation; and overall analysis) and provides adequate, documented analysis with appropriate recommendations for the school and/or district. Student leads a presentation that adequately communicates analysis and recommendations. Does Not Meet Expectations: Student meets less than 80% of the indicators outlined in the curriculum analysis guidelines (purpose, aims, and goals; macro-curricular structures; micro-curricular structures; assessment and evaluation; and overall analysis) and provides an inadequate, poorly documented analysis with few or no recommendations for the school and/or district. Student leads a presentation that does not adequately communicate analysis and recommendations.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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).

M 6: Instructional leadership (O: 6)
Students will identify a teacher and provide instructional supervision and support that teacher that teacher. The support and supervision with include a self assessment for the supervised teacher, classroom observations, periodic conferences, review of lesson plans, examination of student work, review of test scores assessment of class policies, plus other relevant data and information. (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 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
Mission / Purpose

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 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. Goal 5: Ethics and Integrity: Graduates will possess the knowledge and understanding of professional ethical behavior and integrity. Goal 6: The Education System: Graduates will possess the knowledge and understanding of interrelated systems of political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts that effect education. OBJECTIVES (What we want our students to KNOW OR BE ABLE TO DO). Note: Objectives are measurable. 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. Goal 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.

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.

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)
GOALS

G 1: Goals 1-4


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 by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision 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 understanding, responding to, and influencing the local, political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by making the organization, operations, and resources in a way that improves a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 4. 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. 5. 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. 6. 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. 7. 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 local, political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 8. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by articulating, implementing, and stewardship of a school vision supported by the school community. 9. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to design a school environment that promotes the success of all students by designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 10. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to design a school environment that promotes the success of all students by designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.
have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Institutional Priorities

Established By: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Institutional Priorities

Established By: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Institutional Priorities

Established By: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Institutional Priorities

Established By: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Institutional Priorities

Established By: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.
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

#### M 1: Evaluations in Key Courses (O: 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Group</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations in key courses (O:1) (Final)</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>All leadership faculty</td>
<td>Greater collaboration with research faculty and others with expertise in school-based research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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. The in-school performances have been shifted to the courses to allow for more attention in the practicum courses on data analysis and action research.

#### 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 new 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 PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

There have been no changes made to the assessment process for this academic year as our MEd programs are currently under revision in order to better align with the PSC (Professional Standards Commission’s) new certification rules. We anticipate making...
substantive changes in the next two reporting cycles.

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

The Professional Standards Commission has proposed and adopted substantive changes to both teacher leader certification and educational leadership certification. As a result of these changes, our programs are undergoing substantive change. These changes will take place in draft form during the 2011-2012 reporting year and in final form beginning 2012-2013.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Educational Policy Studies PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Educational Policy Studies offers a Ph.D. degree in Educational Policy Studies with concentrations in educational leadership, social foundations of education, and research, measurement, and statistics. The program allows students to examine the philosophy and practice of education and to develop skills in both the methodology and the study of educational practice. Students will prepare to become policy makers and examiners of policy and the effects of policy on education. The broader requirements of the Department of Educational Policy Studies offer students the opportunity to linked their programs of study with broader social and educational issues in such areas as race, gender, leadership, and policy. This broader context established an understanding of the programs of study as essential components rather than separate structures of our social, economic, and political lives.

### Goals

**G 1: Critically Evaluates Literature**

This goal is important for the department to evaluate whether our doctoral students have demonstrated the ability to critique, summarize, and interpret the findings from published research and scholarship.

**G 2: Interprets Schooling/Education in Diverse Contexts**

The purpose of this goal is to evaluate whether our doctoral students have demonstrated a knowledge base of theories on how to analyze educational issues about race, class, and gender.

**G 3: Conducts Scholarly Research**

The purpose of this goal is to evaluate whether doctoral students have demonstrated the ability to design and execute a major research study in their program.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Students will examine policymaking power (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Although student learning comes from a number of classes, we are using just one of the doctoral cohort classes—EPS 9270—for measuring the assessment. The policy paper must examine a key characteristic of policymaking: power. There are, as we will examine in the readings on policy, a number of ways to examine policy. To some degree there are two sets of policy studies, one focused on how to make the system work better and one focused on how deeply flawed the system is. Yet underneath both sets, and sometimes brought to the forefront of policy discussions, is an important question: What is power?

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**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 & Femininities, Sexualities, and Social Class Differences.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Three Social Foundations doctoral students met 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.

#### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Three Social Foundations doctoral students graduated during the reporting period.

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

#### Cultural Studies Analysis

Program faculty will maintain existing outcome measures for the doctoral cohort and monitor current levels of performance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Cultural Studies Analysis
  - Outcome/Objective: Students will prepare a cultural studies analysis

  **Responsible Person/Group:** LOA Coordinator
  **Additional Resources:** None
  **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Dissertation Quality

Program faculty will discuss the evaluation of dissertation defenses, and consider the design and implementation of a scoring rubric for quality writing outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Dissertation Scoring Assessment
  - Outcome/Objective: Students will write high quality dissertations

  **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012
  **Responsible Person/Group:** LOA Coordinator
  **Additional Resources:** None
  **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Power Analysis

Program faculty will maintain existing outcome measures for the doctoral cohort and monitor current levels of performance.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Power Analysis
- **Outcome/Objective:** Students will examine policymaking power

**Responsible Person/Group:** LOA Coordinator

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We created an analytical rating guide (uploaded) to inform our evaluation of students' written work. We revised the dissertation rubric to identify work that the program faculty could signify as "honors" level quality. The honoree would receive a certificate at COE honors day.

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

No planned revisions to curriculum and courses at this time. We will receive further assessment data from OIR for the APR report, and use that to inform our program goals and objectives.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Educational Psychology MS**

*As of: 12/13/2010 04:11 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to master content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Masters level prepares students to pursue a variety of career paths, including research, evaluation, and the applied practice of a number of disciplines, including K-12 instruction. There were 25 students (including two concurrent students) in the MS program as of summer 2014; 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

**G 5: Professional Seminar**
Attendance of a professional seminar in their first semester of enrollment in the EPY program.

**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.

**SLO 2: Students demonstrate independence and competence (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.

**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

**SLO 4: Understand and apply research methods (G: 4) (M: 4)**
Understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
### SLO 5: Exposure to the field of EPY (G: 5) (M: 5)

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

2 Student promotion and progression

### 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 2010-2011 - 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 student will complete their theses/projects

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students successfully completed coursework related to research expertise prior to beginning work on their project or thesis.

#### M 5: Educational Psychology Seminar (O: 5)

All EPY students are required to enroll in EPY 8961 during the first semester of their first year. As part of this seminar, students discuss current issues and topics in Educational Psychology.

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

**Target for O5: Exposure to the field of EPY**

All students will complete this professional development seminar.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students successfully completed this professional development seminar.

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

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: As decided last year, all new students, in the fall of 2010 took EPY 8961, a course which orients them to GSU, EPSE, and EPY. This past fall, the COE approved our decision to make this a requirement. During this year, we discussed implementing a test option for students to choose from, in addition to selecting a project or thesis. Details need to be finalized, and this option will either become available in the spring of 2012 or the fall of 2012.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator
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 is an ongoing action
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
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
Implementation Description: This is an ongoing action
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and EPY faculty
Additional Resources: none

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
This was the first year we required our first semester Master’s students to take EPY 8961. We are pleased with the results of this course, and will continue to monitor its success this coming fall when we require our new students to take it. This coming fall is the first time that we will encourage advanced Master’s students (those ready to work on their thesis/project) to take EPY 8010. This class focuses on writing literature reviews and proposal, and we think it may be beneficial for these students. We discussed providing students with a test option instead of the project or thesis, and will probably implement this alternative in the spring or fall of 2012.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Educational Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Educational Psychology Program is to offer students a unique opportunity to apply the principles of experimental psychology to the systematic study of education. Majoring in educational psychology allows the student to emphasize content areas such as learning, instruction, cognition, motivation, life-span development, applied behavior analysis and socialization. The educational psychology program at the Doctoral level prepares students for careers in teaching in schools, colleges, and universities; as researchers in state and city departments of education; and professionals in training research programs in government and industry. There were 30 students as of Fall 2010 in the Ph.D. program; of these 3 graduated during this academic year.
Goals

G 2: Annual Review
Students will undergo an annual review of their PhD performance

G 3: Professional Seminar
Students will attend a professional seminar in their first semester of enrollment in the EPY PhD program.

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

SLO 3: Exposure to the field of EPY (G: 3) (M: 2)
Students will attend EPY 8961 to obtain exposure to major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Educational Psychology

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.

SLO 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 5) (M: 4)
Develop competence in college teaching

SLO 6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities (G: 6) (M: 5)
Demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
All students except for 2 received a rating of "satisfactory" or better in their annual review. These 2 students were informed in writing about areas in which they are not meeting goals of the program, and will meet with their adviser, so that a remediation plan will be prepared and signed by the both of them.

M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 3)
All EPY doctoral students are required to enroll in EPY 8961 during the first semester if their first year. 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All first year doctoral students completed this seminar in their first semester. The four students from last year, who did not complete this professional development seminar, completed the seminar during this year, and received satisfactory grades.

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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During this reporting period, approximately 30 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

### 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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **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

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This was implemented over the course of last year. We reviewed it during this year, to see if this turned out to be a worthwhile action, and decided that it was not. Due to the sensitive nature of most of our discussions, students only ended up attending about 15 minutes of the meeting and since most of the time they had traveled to GSU just for the meeting, it was decided that it was not the best use of their time.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** EPY faculty and students
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. We will also keep records in the same excel file for each applicant in regards to evaluations of the different sections of their applications.

- 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. A new addition that we started this year, is to also record our evaluations of the different aspects of their application, such as their essays, vita, letters of recommendation, etc.
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
- 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
- Implementation Description: This is an ongoing action
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: EPY coordinator and 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: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: This is an ongoing process
- Projected Completion Date: 02/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

During this past year, we required all students to take EPY 8961 in their first semester. This practice will continue. We have also made changes to EPY 8010 and this course will be taught in the new way for the first time, this fall. Both changes were approved by the COE curriculum committee. This year we will discuss the possibility of requiring directed readings. We also will encourage all students to teach an undergraduate course prior to graduation. We decided that inviting students to our program meetings did not make sense, because they were only able to participate for 15 minutes, and this did not make sense given their commute time (our meetings occur on Fridays—days most of our graduate students do not have to attend academic functions). Finally, we will continue to monitor our acceptances in terms of GRE scores and demographic characteristics.
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to cultivate and develop future educational researchers who are capable of investigating complex problems of the 21st century.

This is in keeping with the university’s overarching goal to be recognized as a dynamic academic community where teaching and research combine to produce leaders and create solutions to conquer the challenges of the 21st century.
**Goals**

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: 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.

SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6)

Be able to write a review of an article found in a professional journal.

SLO 3: Design a research study (G: 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

SLO 4: Analyze data and report the results (G: 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

**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

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

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

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

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

### 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

### Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

### Target for O3: Design a research study

100% of projects/theses submitted by students are approved by the advisor/committee

### 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

### Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

### Target for O3: Design a research study

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

### Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results

100% of students meet or exceed the standard

### 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
Georgia State University
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### Mission / Purpose
Lower Division Studies in the English Department is committed to providing the highest level of writing and reading instruction for our students as they enter the University. We seek to develop students' writing skills, critical thinking, and reading comprehension by engaging them in a variety of expository, argumentative, and literary (on the sophomore level) readings that lead to competent writing skills; and through encouraging understanding of the social and discourse communities that shape writing.

### Goals

**G 1: Competency in Writing**
Student will demonstrate competency in writing through organization, mechanics, development, and audience awareness (rhetorical situation);

**G 2: Reading Comprehension**
Student will demonstrate ability to interpret a text accurately, particularly in terms of main ideas or important concepts

**G 3: 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 thinking through analytical reading of literary, cultural, and other works.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Organization (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate effective and logical organization in their writing.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

**SLO 2: Development (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate logical and clear development of their ideas through examples, illustrations, and details.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1. Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

**SLO 3: Rhetorical Situation (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate an awareness of audience and rhetorical situation as they consider a given or changing context.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate...
comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

**SLO 4: Mechanics/Usage (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate appropriate standard written English.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

**SLO 5: Reading Comprehension (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)**
Students demonstrate comprehension of texts through summary

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 6: Articulate Argument in Readings (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)**
Students will demonstrate interpretation and argument within readings

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Written assignment assessing writing skills (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
In order to assess writing skills, instructors gave ENGL1101 students a choice of three essay topics based on the university-required summer reading, Outcasts United by Warren St. John. Students' writing was then assessed following a rubric that evaluated writing skills: organization, development, rhetorical situation, and mechanics/usage.

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

**Target for O1: Organization**
Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on Organization.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Students' scores averaged 2.88 on a 4-point scale on Organization.

**Target for O2: Development**
Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on Development.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Students' scores averaged 2.88 on a 4-point scale on Development.

**Target for O3: Rhetorical Situation**
Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on Rhetorical Situation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students' score averaged 3 on a 4-point scale on Rhetorical Situation.

**Target for O4: Mechanics/Usage**
Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on Mechanics/Usage.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students' scores averaged 3.11 on a 4-point scale on Mechanics/Usage.

**M 2: Written assignment assessing reading comprehension (O: 5, 6)**
In order to assess reading comprehension skills, instructors gave ENGL1101 students a choice of three essay topics based on the university-required summer reading, Outcasts United by Warren St. John. Students' reading was then assessed following a rubric that evaluated reading comprehension and argument.

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

**Target for O5: Reading Comprehension**
Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on Rhetorical Comprehension.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Students' scores averaged 2.72 on a 4 point scale on Reading Comprehension.

**Target for O6: Articulate Argument in Readings**
Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on Articulate Argument in Readings.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Students' scores averaged 3 on a 4 point scale on Articulate Argument in Readings.

**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

**Lower Division Lit Survey Assessment**
Currently, lower division is working to implement new assessment strategies for the literature survey courses. The office of lower division is working with the lower division studies committee to create a new plan assessment of these courses. Pending approval of the committee, in summer 2012, all literature survey courses will include a list of three assessment goals on the syllabus, and each goal will be tested by one assignment: essay, exam, and digital media. Assignments will be submitted to the office of LDS in advance and approved. Summer 2012 will be used to pilot the assessment, which, if all goes well, will begin full scale in fall 2012.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Committee discussion in spring 2012 pilot in summer 2012 Implement in fall 2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Office of LDS (Associate Director, Angela Hall-Godsey) and LDS committee

**Revise Rubrics**
The reading comprehension rubrics did not provide adequate information for assessment in the 2010/2011 review of lower division. Lower division will allow GTAs to revise the rubric to fit their assignment headings, using the same rubric dimensions and
We hope this will give us a better idea of the types of assignments they are assessing so that we know what each number stands for when they are assessing. We will review the changes in the 2011/2012 assessment of lower division studies and consider revising the rubric and assignments if they 2011/2012 findings do not give us a clearer idea of how the students are doing.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Written assignment assessing reading comprehension  |  Outcome/Objective: Articulate Argument in Readings  
|  Reading Comprehension

**Implementation Description:** Discuss changes with GTAs at annual conference.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** GTAs and office of lower division studies

---

### Georgia State University  
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---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: 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: Demonstrate Content Knowledge related to Creative Writing (M: 2)**

Students will demonstrate an understanding of content knowledge related to Creative Writing (writers that have influenced their creative output, literary techniques they have used in their own writing, vocabulary they have learned about the genre they have selected, etc).

**SLO 2: Demonstrate familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works (M: 2)**

Students will demonstrate a familiarity with representative examples of writing in fiction or in poetry, depending upon the student’s choice of genre.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 2: Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 1, 2)**

While the senior exit portfolios have been required of students since the fall of 2002, we have collected data only since the fall of 2004. In the middle of his or her final semester, every graduating senior submits a portfolio, which consists of selected writings produced during the course of the student's career in the program as well as a reflective essay in which the student considers his or her progress as a student of English. The specific instructions for the compilation of the portfolio are different for each of the department's four concentrations: Literature, Secondary English, Rhetoric and Composition, and Creative Writing. Every portfolio is read by two faculty members associated with the student's particular concentration. The faculty members assess the portfolios, using criteria aligned with the department's undergraduate learning outcomes. Each criterion is rated on a 5-point scale, and the results are tabulated with mean scores and median scores for each criterion. In the summer, the Assessment Coordinator meets with each of the directors of the four concentrations to analyze the data and make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. The suggestions are presented to the full faculty at the first department meeting of the semester and, if approved, integrated into the yearly assessment plan. From 2004-2010, the portfolios for all concentrations were reported on in one assessment report, but in 2009-2010, the department decided that each concentration would report separately. This switch has also opened up the possibility for each concentration to select particular outcomes to concentrate on for a particular assessment cycle (even though the portfolio review still involves assessment for all the criteria listed on an assessment form). In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the Creative...
Writing concentration chose to focus on two outcomes: demonstration of content knowledge related to Creative Writing and the demonstration of familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works.

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

### Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge related to Creative Writing

The 2009-2010 assessment plan indicated that a target of 4.2 out of 5.0 would be set for this outcome concerning the demonstration of content knowledge related to Creative Writing.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Twenty-three fiction students submitted senior portfolios this year as did eight poetry students. The average score for the fiction students for this outcome was a 4.28, meaning that these portfolios did meet the target. The average score for the poetry students was a 4.15, slightly below the target. This was the first year that this outcome was included on the assessment form, so there is no comparative data from previous years.

### Target for O2: Demonstrate familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works

The 2009-2010 assessment plan indicated that a target of 4.2 out of 5.0 would be set for this outcome concerning the demonstration of familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Twenty-three fiction students submitted senior portfolios this year as did eight poetry students. The average score for the fiction students for this outcome was a 4.56, meaning that these portfolios exceeded the target. The average score for the poetry students was a 4.0, below the target. In the past two assessment cycles, the fiction score has been a 4.3, meaning that this year’s score was an improvement. The previous poetry scores were a 3.8 and a 4.0, in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 respectively.

### 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:** Finished
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator, Renee Schatteman
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty in Creative Writing
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Continue to track the discrepancy between the number of fiction students and poetry students

There year, there was a sizable discrepancy between the number of poetry students (8) and the number of fiction students (23). The Creative Writing Faculty is still uncertain of the reason for this gap. They will continue to track the numbers and try to find the cause for it and to consider the implications of it.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing

Lower target for outcome (familiarity with appropriate examples) for poetry portfolios

Since the poetry faculty have had a harder time norming their grades, the poetry portfolios often do not meet the targets. Therefore, the poetry target for this outcome (familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works) will be set at 4.0 for poetry in the next assessment cycle while the target of 4.2 for fiction portfolios will remain the same.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate familiarity with appropriate examples of literary works

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Additional Resources: Assessment Coordinator

Lower the target for this outcome (Content Knowledge Related to Creative Writing) on the poetry portfolios

Since the poetry faculty have had a harder time norming their grades, the poetry portfolios often do not meet the targets. Therefore, the poetry target for this outcome (Content Knowledge related to Creative Writing) will be set at 4.0 for poetry in the next assessment cycle while the target of 4.2 for fiction portfolios will remain the same.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge related to Creative Writing

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes took place in the assessment process for this concentration since last year’s assessment report, but during the course of this year: the mission statement and goals will be revised so that the language is more relevant to the particulars of Creative Writing.

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

Two findings from last year’s assessment results have significance. First, there continues to be a discrepancy between the number of students in the fiction section and the number in the poetry section. Historically, fiction has always attracted more students, but the difference has not usually been so great. The Creative Writing faculty will continue to track this difference to try to determine the cause and to see if it has any implications for the program. Secondly, because the poetry portfolios again have not met the targets set for Creative Writing portfolios, the fiction portfolios will continue to use the target of 4.2 but the poetry portfolios will use a target of 4.0 instead.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 English Concentration in Literature
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

Goals
G1: 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 literary history, major figures, and genres (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate knowledge of major figures, genres, and historical periods of English, American, and World literature.

**SLO 3: Mastery of basic elements of writing (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate an ability to use basic elements of writing (such as grammar, punctuation, diction, syntax, and organization).

**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, we have been collecting data only since the fall of 2004. In the middle of his or her final semester, every graduating senior submits a portfolio, which consists of selected writings produced during the course of the student’s career in the program as well as a reflective essay in which the student considers his or her progress as a student of English. The specific instructions for compiling the portfolio are different for each of the department’s four concentrations: Literature, Secondary English, Rhetoric and Composition, and Creative Writing. Every portfolio is read by two faculty members associated with the student’s particular concentration. The faculty members assess the portfolios, using criteria aligned with the department’s undergraduate learning outcomes. Each criterion is rated on a 5-point scale, and the results are tabulated with mean scores and median scores for each criterion. In the summer, the Assessment Coordinator meets with each of the directors of the four concentrations to analyze the data and make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. The suggestions are presented to the full faculty at the first department meeting of the semester and, if approved, integrated into the yearly assessment plan. From 2004-2010, the portfolios for all concentrations were reported on in one assessment report, but in 2009-2010, the department decided that each concentration would report separately. This switch has also opened up the possibility for each concentration to select particular outcomes to concentrate on for a particular assessment cycle (even though the portfolio review still involves assessment for all the criteria listed on an assessment form). In 2009-2010, the Literature concentration chose to focus on three outcomes: knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres; ability to think critically and interpret texts; and mastery of the basic elements of writing.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
There were 43 portfolios submitted in the Literature concentration this year. The average score for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills was a 4.3, meaning that it met the target. This average was also in keeping with the scores earned for this outcome in the previous six years, which ranged from 4.3 - 4.4.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres**
The target for this outcome related to the knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
The average score for this outcome related to the knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres was a 4.1, meaning that it did not meet the target. This average was also on the low end of the scores earned for this outcome in the previous six years, which ranged from 4.1 - 4.3.

**Target for O3: Mastery of basic elements of writing**
The target for this learning outcome related to the mastery of basic elements of writing is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The average score for this outcome related to the mastery of basic elements of writing was a 4.35, meaning that it met the target. This is the first year that this outcome was included on the Literature portfolio assessment form.
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Assessment coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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; outcome 6: mastery of basic elements of writing; outcome 7: ability to use rhetorical strategies to communicate effectively in writing; outcome 8: Ability to engage in effective oral communications; outcome 9: ability to research effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Director of Undergraduate Studies, Audrey Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Literature Senior Exit Portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of basic elements of writing

| Projected Completion Date: | 01/2011 |

### Advise students about portfolio contents
Because the writings in a number of the Literature portfolios have demonstrated a limited breadth of knowledge, we need to help students see the importance of including a wider range of essays (American/British/world literature, from different periods, with theoretical engagement). More detailed instructions about the need to a diverse selection of writings will be supplied to instructors of the senior seminar so that these instructors can provide better guidance to students as they prepare their portfolios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</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>08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continue using same outcomes and targets in portfolio assessment
This concentration will continue to focus on the following three outcomes in their assessment of the senior portfolios: the ability to think critically and interpret texts; the knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres; and the mastery of basic elements of writing. The targets will also remain the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</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>08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year was the first year that this concentration focused on the following three outcomes in their assessment of the portfolios: ability to think critically and interpret texts; knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres; and mastery of basic elements of writing. The targets were met for two of these outcomes but not for the one concerning content knowledge. The faculty associated with this concentration think that this problem is related more to the choices students are making in terms of the selection of writings rather than to their mastery of content knowledge. Therefore, the Director of Undergraduate Studies will provide an instruction sheet for those faculty members who are teaching the senior seminar course so that their students can be informed of the importance of submitting works that reflect a wide variety of periods, regions, and authors. They will continue to track this outcome to see if these enhanced instructions result in portfolios that reflect a more comprehensive knowledge of English studies.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Faculty associated with the Literature concentration were pleased to see that the outcome related to the mastery of basic elements of writing was met, especially since this was the first year this outcome was assessed. It suggests that students are getting adequate writing instruction during the course of their program. Since the only target that was not met is assumed to have been caused by a procedural problem rather than a programmatic problem, there are no changes to the program planned for this year.
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, creative writing, rhetoric and composition, professional and technical writing, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

Goals

G 1: 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
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
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

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: In-Progress
Priority: High

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: Finished
Priority: High
Change the outcomes assessed for the senior portfolios
The portfolio outcomes currently read "ability to think critically and interpret texts," "effective written communications," and "knowledge of language and linguistics." To more effectively reflect the assessment process in this concentration, these outcomes will be changed to read "ability to think critically through writing," "ability to write with structural integrity and conventional usage," and "knowledge of rhetorical theories and history of rhetoric."

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Change the portfolios to a 5-point rather than a 4-point assessment
When the Rhetoric and Composition faculty began doing senior portfolios entirely on line, they used a 4-point ranking system rather than a 5-point ranking system. Since that differs from the other undergraduate concentrations and causes confusion, they are going to revise their on-line form to a 5-point system and put it in place for the next round of assessments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Contact Person in Rhetoric and Composition

Set new targets for the portfolios
Given that the portfolios are going to be ranked on a 5-point scale, the following targets will be set: 4.0 for the ability to think critically and interpret texts; 4.1 for effective written communications, and 4.0 for knowledge of language.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2011

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 in the assessment process for this degree program in the past year. However, four procedural changes will be made during the upcoming year: the assessment form for the senior portfolios will have a 5-point scale, the targets will be changed to reflect the change in rankings, the mission statement and goals will be revised to reflect the particulars of this concentration; and the outcomes on the senior portfolio assessment report will be changed to reflect the specificities of this concentration.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The targets set for the three learning outcomes on the portfolios were all met, suggesting that Rhetoric and Composition students turned in successful work this year. There are therefore no changes planned to the educational program right now.
### G 2: Knowledge of reading, writing, and literature
Students in this undergraduate concentration grow knowledgeable about the processes of reading and writing and the study of literature.

### G 3: Application of content knowledge to classroom
Students in this undergraduate concentration become capable of transferring content knowledge from the college classroom to a middle or secondary school setting.

### G 4: Understanding of various pedagogical approaches
Students in this undergraduate concentration begin to learn various pedagogical approaches appropriate to the subject and the setting.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Effective Written Communications (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to reflect upon the profession of teaching and the effectiveness of particular classroom practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While the senior exit portfolios have been required of students since the fall of 2002, we have collected data only since the fall of 2004. In the middle of his or her final semester, every graduating senior submits a portfolio which consists of selected writings produced during the course of the student’s career in the program as well as a reflective essay in which the student considers his or her progress as a student of English. The specific instructions for compiling the portfolio are different for each of the department’s four concentrations: Literature, Secondary English, Rhetoric and Composition, and Creative Writing. Every portfolio is read by two faculty members associated with the student’s particular concentration. The faculty members assess the portfolios, using criteria aligned with the department’s undergraduate learning outcomes. Each criterion is rated on a 5-point scale, and the results are tabulated with mean scores and median scores for each criterion. In the summer, the Assessment Coordinator meets with each of the directors of the four concentrations to analyze the data and make suggestions for procedural and programmatic change. The suggestions are presented to the full faculty at the first department meeting of the semester and, if approved, integrated into the yearly assessment plan. From 2004-2010, the portfolios for all concentrations were reported on in one assessment report, but in 2009-2010, the department decided that each concentration would report separately. This switch has also opened up the possibility for each concentration to select particular outcomes to concentrate on for a particular assessment cycle (even though the portfolio review still involves assessment for all the criteria listed on an assessment form). In 2009-2010, the Secondary English concentration chose to focus on three outcomes: knowledge of language and linguistics; effective written communications; and the ability to reflect upon teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: Knowledge of language and linguistics

According to the 2009-2010 assessment report, the target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Thirty Secondary English senior portfolios were submitted this year. Students averaged a 4.22 for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics, meaning that their portfolios met the target for this outcome. It should be noted, however, that on 11 portfolios, reviewers were unable to determine a score for this criterion, suggesting that there is some confusion about how students might be able to demonstrate this knowledge in the content of the senior portfolio. The range of scores for this outcome in the past six years was from 3.7-4.3.

#### Target for O3: Effective Written Communications

According to the 2009-2010 assessment report, the target for this outcome related to the effective written communications is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students averaged a 4.43 for this outcome related to effective written communications, meaning that their portfolios met the target for this outcome. This score was at the higher end of the averages earned in the past six years, which ranged from 3.9 - 4.5.

#### Target for O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching

According to the 2009-2010 assessment report, the target for this outcome related to the ability to reflect upon teaching is a 4.2 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for this outcome was a 4.48. This score met the target and was in the middle of the scores earned over the past six years, which ranged from 4.2 - 4.6.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator

**M 2: Senior Seminar Exam (O: 4)**

Starting in 2009-2010, the Senior Seminar for students in the Secondary English concentration has included a question on the final exam that asks students to reflect upon what they have learned about the profession of English teaching from the various elements of the course (lesson and unit planning, the integration of the standards in teaching, resources available for classroom instruction, classroom management as demonstrated by teachers at their observation sites, and content enhancement possibilities through teaching conferences). Scores for the question on the exam that asks students to reflect upon teaching will be tabulated and reported as part of the assessment report.

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

**Target for O4: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching**

No target was set for this measure. Since this is the first year we will get data on this measure, we will use that information to set a target for the 2011-2012 assessment cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Twenty-seven students took the senior seminar final exam. On the question that asked student to reflect upon the practice of teaching, students averaged a 90.6%. Four students earned a B (86%), two students earned a B+ (87-88%), fifteen students earned an A- (90-92%), and six students earned an A (93-95%).

**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Secondary English committee

**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:** In-Progress  
**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)

---

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Twenty-seven students took the senior seminar final exam. On the question that asked student to reflect upon the practice of teaching, students averaged a 90.6%. Four students earned a B (86%), two students earned a B+ (87-88%), fifteen students earned an A- (90-92%), and six students earned an A (93-95%).
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: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

Design a special Introduction to Literary Studies course for concentration
A special section of English 3040 (Introduction to Literary Studies) will be offered starting in the fall of 2012. The purpose of this course will be to introduce Secondary English concentration students to the teaching profession and to the basic concepts of pedagogy early in their academic program. This course will also encourage the Secondary English student to approach all of their courses in the major from the perspective of a potential teacher. If this course proves successful, the department plans to offer one section of this specialized 3040 course each year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman (instructor for the course in the fall 2012)

Promote and Support the internship program for Secondary English students
Efforts were made in the spring and summer to encourage students in the Secondary English concentration to sign up to do an internship in a school at some point in their program. As a result, some ten students will likely be doing internships this year. Funding has been allocated for an instructor to serve as the director of this specialized internship program. We plan to advertise the internship program again this year (by distributing fliers in the 3040 classes, sending out reminders on the undergraduate listserv, and offering an internship workshop) so that an even greater percentage of Secondary English students get experience in the schools as interns. While we are not yet requiring this as a course, we are strongly encouraging this group of students to take advantage of this opportunity.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Secondary English Committee
Additional Resources: Funding needed to provide one course release for an instructor to direct this specialized internship program.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Require students to include a paper about language in portfolios
Starting in the spring of 2012, students will be required to include in their senior portfolios a piece of evidence demonstrating their explicit knowledge of language. This writing should come out of one of the following classes: Practical Grammar (English 3105), Language Analysis for Teachers of English (English 3190), Introduction to the English Language (English 3200), Advanced Grammar (English 3210), History of the English Language (English 3220), and Language in the African-American Community (English 3955). This requirement is in addition to the requirements already listed in the portfolio instructions for this concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of language and linguistics

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Renee Schatteman, Assessment Coordinator

Requiring students in the senior seminar and the specialized 3040 class to write a statement about their teaching philosophy
Last year, we asked students in the Senior Seminar to write a final exam question that required them to reflect upon the practice of teaching. This year, we will instead ask students to write a statement which articulates their teaching philosophy, drawing upon the various experiences they have had in this course. Starting in the fall of 2012, the instructor who teaches the specialized introductory class (English 3040) for prospective teachers will also ask students to write a teaching philosophy statement. At first, we will look at the scores from each class to see how much students are learning in these two individual classes. In a few years’ time, we will be able to compare the teaching philosophy statement written at the beginning of a student’s program with the statement that same student is able to write at the end of the program, which will give us a sense of development in this learning outcome over the full program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Senior Seminar Exam | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Reflect upon Teaching

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of the 4330 class and the specialized 3040 class

Set target for the teaching philosophy assignment
The expectation for the teaching philosophy assignment to be completed by students in the senior seminar is that at least 75% will receive a 90% or above for this assignment. For all the portfolio outcomes, the department will use the same targets as were used in the last portfolio assessment cycle.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Secondary English faculty have recently revised the mission statement and the goals for this undergraduate concentration so that they are more specific to the particulars of teaching.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

All the targets set for the portfolios in this concentration were met. This suggests that students performed effectively on these learning outcomes. One concern was that for over one third of the portfolios, readers were not able to determine a score for the outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics. This is because a number of the portfolios do not include evidence that explicitly demonstrate of language. Since we feel that language knowledge is such a critical component of English teaching, we have decided to require that students include a piece of writing from one of the department's language classes. By making this a requirement, we intend to stress the importance of this aspect of English studies in their chosen profession. Students will include this piece of evidence as an addition to the five pieces of writing already required for the portfolio. This new requirement will start in the spring of 2012. Another outcome we have given particular attention to in this past assessment cycle was the ability to reflect upon teaching. We asked students in the Senior Seminar to answer a question on the final exam, describing what they have learned about the profession from the various activities of the course. This exam question was met with success (the average score was a 90.6%), but for next year, we have decided to tweak this assignment. We will ask students in this class to write a teaching philosophy statement at the end of the course.

When asked about the Secondary English program, students in the Senior Seminar strongly suggested that more classes about English pedagogy be offered before their senior year. To answer this request, we have decided to offer a specialized Introduction to Literary Studies class for students interested in teaching. This course will be offered in the fall of 2012 and if it is successful we will offer it at least once a year. The aim of this course will be to teach students to study literature from the perspective of a prospective teacher and to make them more aware of the profession. It will also serve as an opportunity to advertise the Internship program as a means of getting classroom experience before the end of their undergraduate program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 English Creative Writing MFA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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)
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)**
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: 2)**
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken communications.

**SLO 6: Researching Skills**
Students will conduct graduate-level research on topics related to English studies and will demonstrate mastery in using traditional methods of research as well as non-traditional information technology.

**SLO 7: Evaluative Skills**
Students will be able to evaluate information and materials for their accuracy, persuasiveness, and relevance to a research project.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: M.F.A. Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3)**
The Creative theses have been assessed since 2009-2010. During that first year, only 1 thesis was assessed compared to the 4 MFA theses assessed this year. Students who finish their thesis are assessed collectively by their thesis committee members who fill out a form (with a 5-point scale) that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes (see attached assessment form). If there are dissenting opinions about the scores, those different scores can be indicated on the assessment form. The committee chair is responsible for making sure that the assessment form is completed and turned into the assistant to the Graduate Director after the thesis work has been submitted. A student cannot 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**
In 2009-2010, the target for the content knowledge outcome of the MFA thesis was set at 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The average score for the content knowledge outcome (familiarity with representative examples of writing, an understanding of literary history, and an understanding of form and theory of fiction or poetry) on the M.F.A. thesis was a 4.8. That score met the target.

**Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies**
In 2009-2010, the target for the application of literary studies outcome of the MFA thesis was set at 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The average score for the application of literary studies outcome on the M.F.A. thesis was a 4.8. That score met the target.

**Target for O3: Craftsmanship**
In 2009-2010, the target for the application of craftsmanship learning outcome of the MFA thesis was set at 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The average score for the craftsmanship 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)) on the M.F.A. thesis was a 4.8. That score met the target.

**M 2: M.F.A. Exams (O: 1, 5)**
M.F.A. students in the Creative Writing Program are required to pass two four-hour exit exams given over two days. The exam given on the first day tests the student's knowledge of literary vocabulary, major literary figures, literary history, and form and theory in the literature of the student's chosen genre before the twentieth century. The exam given on the second day tests the student's knowledge of literary vocabulary, major literary figures, literary history, and form and theory in the literature of the student's chosen genre after the beginning of the twentieth century. Each M.F.A. exam is read and graded by a committee of three faculty chosen by the student. The committee consists of the student's major professor, a second member who must be in the relevant area of creative writing, and a third member from the English department.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**
In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target was set for the Creative Writing MFA exams that 25% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Two MFA exams were taken this year (one in poetry and one in fiction) and neither student received a low pass or failing grade. The poetry exam was awarded a high pass while the fiction exam earned a pass. The target was met, and the 0% low pass/failure rate was a considerable increase over the past two assessment cycles, where the low pass/failure rates were 14% and 20%.

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 were only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Two MFA exams were taken this year (one in poetry and one in fiction) and neither student received a low pass or failing grade. The poetry exam was awarded a high pass while the fiction exam earned a pass. The target was met, and the 0% low pass/failure rate was a considerable increase over the past two assessment cycles, where the low pass/failure rates were 14% and 20%.

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: Finished
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: Finished
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)

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: Finished
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: Finished
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M.F.A. Exams | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge
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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

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)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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)

Change MFA thesis assessment from a 5 point range to a 6 point range
MFA theses are presently assessed like the Literature theses, using a 5-point scoring range. This was determined by the Literature concentration because there are not many theses that are immediately ready for publication, in contrast to the PhD dissertation. But the MFA is a terminal degree, and the quality of work is expected to be comparable to the PhD. Therefore, the Creative Writing faculty would like to use a 6-point scale so that they can indicate outstanding ranking for those theses that are ready for publication.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Distinguish between primary and secondary exams on MFA exams
To provide more information about the exam results for the MFA, primary exam results will be distinguished from secondary exam results.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to the Graduate Director
Set a target of 5.0 out of 6.0 for the criteria on thesis assessment sheet

A new target of 5.0 out of 6.0 will be set for all the criteria on the revised (6 point) thesis assessment form.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No new procedures were put into place in the assessment cycle. This year, we are going to make three changes to the process: the MFA thesis form will have six possible rankings instead of five; the MFA exam results will distinguish between primary and secondary exam, an explanation of the rankings will be created for the thesis assessment form, and the mission statements and goals will be revised to reflect the particulars of this graduate program.

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

The MFA thesis results were very encouraging as they met all the targets. The exam results were also positive as these targets were also met; consequently, no programmatic changes are necessary for the next assessment cycle.

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in English is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which 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, the mission of the MED English program 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. 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.

**Goals**

**G 1:** Are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12

Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

**G 2:** Are professional educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to teach English Lang. Arts in grades 6-12

Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

**G 3:** Are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learnin

Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learning of their students.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Candidates have knowledge and understanding of English grammars, the history and evolution of the English language, the foundations of reading and writing processes, an extensive range of literature, and a wide range of literary theories. (Key
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 1 (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 1 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of English grammars and the history and evolution of the English language.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of English grammars and the history and evolution of the English language.

#### M 2: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 2 (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes.

#### M 3: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 3 (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of an extensive range of literature, including US literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of an extensive range of literature, including US literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

#### M 4: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 4 (O: 1)
A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
**Target for O1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in the teaching of literature. 0% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in this area.

**M 5: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 5 (O: 2)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials (including non-print media and technological tools) to support writing instruction and the teaching of literature.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials (including non-print media and technological tools) to support writing instruction and the teaching of literature.

**M 6: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 6 (O: 2)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in planning for instruction based on their knowledge of the subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in planning for instruction based on their knowledge of the subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**M 7: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 7 (O: 2)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 7 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in creating learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in creating learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.

**M 8: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 8 (O: 2)**

A portfolio rating for Standard 8 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in viewing teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect
a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a basic level of knowledge and skill in viewing teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. 0% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in this area.

### M 9: Professional Dispositions (O: 3)

Students will be rated on their professional dispositions using the Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Dispositions**

100% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.

### M 10: Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Portfolio Standard 9 (O: 4)

A portfolio rating for Standard 9 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in using a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

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

**Target for O4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on P-12 students**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in using a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

### 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

**Content Knowledge of Literary Theories Action Plan**

While the number of graduates in the program for 2010-2011 was quite small (N=1), our action plan is based on not achieving a goal for at least 40% of our graduates to achieve a proficient level of content knowledge of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy. We plan to continue our emphasis in the EDLA 7550 course to teach students the theories so that secondary English language arts students might also understand these theories.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: The English Education Faculty
- Additional Resources: N/A

**Professional and Pedagogical Skills with Teacher Research and Collaboration**

While the number of graduates in the program for 2010-2011 was quite small (N=1), our action plan is based on not achieving a goal for at least 40% of our graduates to achieve a proficient level of competency in viewing teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. We plan to continue our emphasis throughout all of the courses specific to English Education (EDLA 7150, 7440, 7460, 7480) that include components of research and inquiry within the activities assigned to students. The requirements in all of these courses provide opportunities for students to collaborate with their colleagues as means for developing their thinking, writing, and teaching philosophies. Likewise, we also advise our students in both the spring and fall terms during our Professional Advising Week about opportunities to attend...
conferences, courses for further development of their professional goals, as well as discussions about their programs of study. The program of study for the MEd degree includes a research methods course that comes with two options: an introduction to research methods (EPRS 7900) and action research (EPRS 7910), a course that specifically engages in understanding teacher inquiry. Given the performance on this measure, we will advise students to consider taking the EPRS 7910 option when possible, and continue to foster communities of inquiry and scholarship within our courses so that students can have opportunities to use research methods throughout their coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: The English Education Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
This year we set different targets for our assessments. That is, we developed targets that seek to show a higher level of proficiency, knowledge, and development among our students. To this end, rather than looking only to see if 100% of our students passed each objective at the basic level, we now seek to see if, in addition to 100% showing performance at the basic level, that at least 40% of the students also show that they can achieve levels at a proficient, or more expert level, than we have in the past. Our shift in looking for a higher level of performance yielded two objectives not being met: content knowledge of literary theories, and pedagogical and professional skills with teacher inquiry, collaboration, and professional development. As we move into the coming academic year, we plan to continue to maintain the expectation that students will perform at a higher level.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
We carefully review the assessment data each year. Since our students do so well on the majority of our objectives, we only need to fine tune our courses to ensure that students are achieving strong understandings of literary theories and professional skills related to inquiry, development, and collaboration. We will use this data to further support students’ learning in the English Education courses (EDLA 7150, 7440, 7460, 7480) so that they may continue to achieve the objectives not only at the basic level, but beyond that to show that they are becoming experts in their field. This support will come in the explicit inclusion of activities for students to use literary theories, collaborate with their colleagues, conduct inquiry projects in areas of language, literature, reading, and composing; as well as in specific advising from the faculty to students about the methods of research courses to help them understand their teaching experiences a spaces for further reflection, research, and scholarship.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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: Content knowledge for teaching English Language Arts**
Candidates are informed educators who have knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

**G 2: Knowledge, skills, & dispositions to teach English Language Arts**
Candidates are professional educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

**G 3: Impact on student learning in English Language Arts**
Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learning of their students.

**Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the content needed to teach English language arts. (Key Assessments - GACE performance and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum)

**O/O 2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (G: 2) (M: 3)**
Candidates demonstrate their knowledge and skills through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods and curriculum materials for teaching English language arts. (Key Assessment - Planning: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction)

**O/O 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 4)**
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Key Assessment - Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)

**O/O 4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) (G: 2) (M: 5, 6)**
Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials. (Key Assessment - Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge): Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

**O/O 5: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 7)**
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Content Knowledge GACE Scores (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate performance on GACE tests for English Language Arts, forms 020 and 021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Content knowledge**

100% of candidates will pass the required GACE II tests for English language arts education.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

GACE Scores are still pending as of 5/5/2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content &amp; Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Content knowledge**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English language arts content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English language arts content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. On the four categories for content knowledge, a minimum of 58% and a maximum of 65% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Planning performance (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The following results are for each area: Contextual Factors: 97% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 88% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Goals: 97% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 95% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Assessment Plan: 94% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 96% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Design for Instruction: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 89% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning). This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 71% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 88% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Environments: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 35% scored at the effective level
level (Score 4 or higher). On both subcategories of classroom management and classroom environment, 35% scored at the effective level, while 87% scored at the effective level for communication. Further analysis also shows that 46% scored at the effective level in an overall score regarding their skills and professional knowledge with learning environments. Assessment: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 22% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 36% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)

M 6: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)

Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
The following results are for each area on the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 62% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 67% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Assessment: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 55% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 65% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Professionalism: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 60% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)

M 7: Dispositions (O: 5)

Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O5: Dispositions
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Among the five categories assessed for dispositions (Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful and Purposeful Vision), candidates scored 99% of candidates demonstrated an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and a minimum of 68% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).

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 to determine 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge GACE Scores</td>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge GACE Scores</td>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Planning performance | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student 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

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

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

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

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: Content Knowledge via Coursework | Outcome/Objective: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
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: Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

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)

Mid-point teaching evaluation
In order to raise scores on the two lowest levels of this assessment: classroom management and learning environments, we are devoting more attention to these topics in our first methodology course, EDCI 6600, offered in the summer semester. Presently, students create classroom management plans including designing an effective learning environment. We will include more classroom management strategies and practice scenarios. We will also invite classroom management experts, special education professors and practicing teachers, to visit our methodology classes to offer advice and practical solutions to the students during the other methodology courses. A classroom management module during the students' practicum experience is being developed.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Clinical Practice at Midpoint | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English faculty and the Office of Student Teaching in MSIT

Score explanation
Scores are unavailable at this time.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Content Knowledge GACE Scores | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

Implementation Description: Faculty will obtain scores from data manager.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: English education faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
We have made two major changes. First, we have adapted four department-wide assessments to measure our students' learning and...
dispositions: The GACE content knowledge examination; Planning: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Teacher Work Samples; Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge): Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric); and the Dispostions Survey.

Secondly, we have embedded the Standards into our four methodology courses with accompanying assignments. As a result, our portfolio has become more of a capstone assignment synthesizing students' theoretical and pedagogical knowledge and skills in a teaching philosophy narrative and a listing and a description of artifacts reflecting these beliefs. Based on our assessment results, we are implementing the inclusion of more classroom management and learning environment strategies into our methodology classes. In addition, we will provide more information on the English GACE Content Examination.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We carefully review the assessment data each year. Since our students did so well on the four key assessments, we only had to finetune our work with the GACE Content Examination and the results from the mid-point teacher evaluation. We are increasing our attention to classroom management in our graduate classes and student practicum experiences. The Office of Student Achievement is preparing classroom management modules for the students to complete. Also, we will include more information about the GACE Content Examination in our methodology courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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 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, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

Goals
G 1: Assure Mastery in Content Knowledge
In addition to knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, movements, and critical approaches in American, British, and world literatures, students in the M.A program in literary studies 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.

G 2: Scholarly Engagement with Theoretical Frameworks
The department will strive to produce M.A. students in Literary Studies who demonstrate 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 Communications
The department will strive to produce M.A. students in Literary Studies who can demonstrate effective written communication skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
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)**

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 (see attached assessment form). In previous years, students were instructed to take the Pro-Seminar during their second semester. Now, they are allowed to choose between their second semester and their third semester. Because of that, only a small number (4 students) took the Pro-Seminar in the spring of 2011, and we anticipate a large group will consequently be enrolled in the fall 2011 class or classes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge**

In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The four students in this year's pro-seminar class averaged a 5.0 (out of 5) in this outcome related to knowledge of major figures, genres, periods, movements, and critical approaches, meaning that the target was met. This represents an improvement over scores for this outcome from the previous 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 (4.6 and 4.8 respectively).

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Language**

In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for the students in this year's Pro-Seminar was a 4.5 (out of 5) for this outcome related to the understanding of the history, structure, and/or social implications of language. This score met the target but it represented a slight deduction when compared with the scores of 2009-2010 and 2008-2009, which were 4.7 and 4.9 respectively.

**Target for O3: Scholarly vocabulary**

In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for the students in the Pro-Seminar this year was a 5.0 for this outcome related to the use of scholarly vocabulary. This met the standard and was an improvement over the score for this outcome from the past two years' of 4.9.

**Target for O4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature**

In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average for the students in the Pro-Seminar this year was a 4.5 for this outcome related to the knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature. This meets the target. It also is an improvement over the 2009-2010 score of 4.4 but a decrease from the 2008-2009 score of 4.8.
### Target for O5: Skills of inquiry
In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for the students in this year's Pro-Seminar was a 5.0 for this outcome related to the ability to formulate effective questions, which exceeds the target and represents an improvement over the last two years where the scores for this outcome were a 4.8 and 4.4 respectively.

### Target for O6: Effective Communications Skills
In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The average score for the students in this year's Pro-Seminar was a 4.0 for the ability to communicate effectively in written and spoken communications. The instructor indicated that this score was lower because one of the four students had to take a medical withdrawal and was not able to turn in the final products. This score does not meet the target; it is also lower than the 4.8 and 4.4 earned by students in the Pro-Seminar over the past two years.

### Target for O7: Researching Skills
In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the department decided to continue with a target of 4.5 in all areas on the Pro-Seminar assessment form.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The average score for students in the Pro-Seminar this year was a 4.0. According to the instructor, this was because one student had to take a medical withdrawal and was not able to complete the final products for the course. This score does not meet the target and it is lower than the scores of the past two years, 4.8 and 4.6 respectively.

### M 2: M.A. Thesis in Literary Studies (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7)
The literature theses have been assessed since 2009-2010. During that first year, only 5 theses were assessed because the department did not yet have a fully working system in place. During 2010-2011, that problem was sorted out and 21 theses were assessed. According to the system, students who finish their thesis are assessed collectively by their thesis committee members who fill out a form (with a 5-point scale) that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes (see attached assessment form). It their are dissenting opinions about the scores, those different scores can be indicated on the assessment form. The committee chair is responsible for making sure that the assessment form is completed and turned into the assitant to the Graduate Director after the thesis work has been submitted. A student cannot 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
Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The average score for the 21 theses assessed was a 4.45 for this learning outcome related to knowledge of figures, genres, periods, and movements. This score is a bit below the target, and therefore the target was not met. In the 2009-2010 assessment cycle, this outcome earned a 4.6 instead.

### Target for O2: Knowledge of Language
Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average for the 21 theses assessed this year was a 4.55 for this outcome related to knowledge of language, meaning that it did meet the target. This score was also a slight improvement over last year's average score of 4.4.

### Target for O3: Scholarly vocabulary
Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The average for the 21 theses assessed this year was a 4.38 for the use of scholarly vocabulary, which was below the intended target. In 2009-2010, this outcome earned a 4.6 instead.

### Target for O4: Knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature
Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
The average for the 21 theses assessed this year was a 4.35 for the outcome related to critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and cultural contexts. This is the lowest score for all six outcomes. Similarly, in the 2009-2010 assessment, it was on the lower end of the results with a 4.4 score.

**Target for O6: Effective Communications Skills**

Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average of the 21 theses assessed this year was a 4.9 for this outcome related to effective written communications. This exceeds the target. It is also an improvement over the 2009-2010 score for this outcome which was a 4.4.

**Target for O7: Researching Skills**

Last year, the department decided to set a threshold of 4.5 out of 5.0 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 21 theses assessed this year was a 4.69, which exceeds the target and represents a slight improvement over the 2009-2010 score which was a 4.6.

**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:** In-Progress
- **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:** Terminated
- **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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

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

Measure: Assessment of work in the Pro-Seminar | Outcome/Objective: Skills of inquiry

Implementation Description: The Scheduling Committee will make sure that the Pro-Seminar is offered each fall and spring semester. Faculty assignments will need to allow for this adjustment.

Projected Completion Date: 01/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Chair of the Scheduling Committee, Randy Malamud, in coordination with the Graduate Director, Calvin Thomas

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator in conjunction to the Assistant to the Graduate Director

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain the target of 4.5 out of 5 for criteria on thesis and Pro-seminar

The targets used for the criteria on the MA thesis and Pro-Seminar will be repeated in next year's assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Revise the mission statement and goals

Faculty associated with the Literature M.A. program will revise the mission statement and goals so that they reflect the particular concern of the M.A. in this concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Director of the Graduate Program

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Literature M.A. program has not changed its procedures since last year's assessment cycle. It will make two changes this year: creating an explanation sheet for the ranking used to assessment the thesis and writing a new mission statement and goals for this M.A. concentration.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Students in the MA Pro-seminar generally did well on the criteria used to assess their performance in this class. Their scores on five of the seven learning outcomes exceeded the target of 4.5 out of 5.0. Two areas--effective communications skills and researching skills--fell below the target, but the instructor for this class reasoned that this low score was due to the fact that one of the four students in the class had to take a medical withdrawal and was not able to turn in the final product. Given these circumstances, the department is going to continue tracking the success rate in the Pro-Seminar rather than creating any action plans right now in response to these missed targets. Scores in the Pro-Seminar over the past three years have been quite high, so the assumption is that this set of scores represents an exception rather than a norm. In the assessment of the MA thesis, scores on the three learning outcomes related to skills (use of language, effective communication skills, and researching skills) met the target of 4.5 out of 5.0 while the scores on the three outcomes related to knowledge (content knowledge, scholarly vocabulary, and theoretical approaches) did not quite meet the target of 4.5 out of 5.0 (4.45, 4.38, and 4.35 respectively). Since the thesis is still a relatively new assessment tool, the department would like to continue tracking these scores for right now to see if programmatic changes need to be made in the future. The explanation sheet for the rankings on the thesis which will be created and implemented this year may help to bring about greater accuracy in this assessment process.
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 2008, 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
In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Two M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to knowledge of rhetorical practices (in particular the thesis genre) was a 4.5, meaning that it met the target.

Target for O2: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric
In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Two M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to knowledge of the history of rhetoric was a 5.0, meaning that it met the target.
### Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to knowledge of the theories of rhetoric was a 5.0, meaning that it met the target.

### Target for O4: Effective Written Communications

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to effective written communications was a 5.0, meaning that it met the target.

### Target for O5: Researching skills

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target of 4.5 out of 5.0 was set for all learning outcomes assessed in the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Two M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to researching skills was a 5.0, meaning that it met the target.

### 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2011

**Consider making English 8120 (Writing for Academic Publication) into this concentration’s Pro-Seminar class**

The English 8120 class (Writing for Academic Publication) essentially functions as a pro-seminar for the Rhetoric and Composition M.A. students. The faculty members will consider making this class the Pro-Seminar for students in this concentration.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rhetoric and Composition Faculty

**Create an explanation sheet for the rankings on the MA Thesis**

Faculty members in Rhetoric and Composition will create an explanation sheet for the five possible rankings on the MA thesis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 10/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rhetoric and Composition Faculty

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes in process were made since the last assessment cycle. This year, the Rhetoric and Composition faculty will do the following process changes: create a new mission statement and goals, create an explanation sheet for the rankings of the thesis, and consider turning the English 8120 class into a Pro-Seminar class for their concentration.

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

The targets were all met for the M.A. thesis in Rhetoric and Composition, so there will be no changes to the curriculum or courses this year. If the faculty decide to turn the English 8120 class into a Pro-Seminar, that change will go into effect at the beginning of next year.
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. (See the attached assessment form for the Creative Writing dissertation.) 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, and an action plan is formulated and presented to the entire faculty at an early fall department meeting.

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
In the 2009-2010 assessment report, a 4.7 target out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to content knowledge.
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: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communications
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: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Faculty in Creative Writing will revise the mission statement and the goals
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 PhD 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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of the Creative Writing program in collaboration with the Creative Writing faculty.
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: Finished
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)

Distinguish between scores on primary exams and secondary exams
To get a better understanding of the Creative Writing PhD exam results, the department will distinguish between scores earned for primary and secondary exams.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to the Graduate Director

Maintain the same targets and outcomes in next assessment cycle
The Creative Writing PhD program will use the same outcomes and targets on the assessment tools as were used in the previous assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Poetry will faculty who write secondary exams will hold regular meetings with examinees
Since fiction students often have difficulty with the poetry secondary exam, poetry faculty who writes these exams will be asked to schedule regular meetings with examinees to better prepare them for the exams.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing and poetry faculty

Provide fiction PhD students with examples of successful poetry exams
The Director of Creative Writing will ask the poetry faculty to keep examples of successful poetry secondary exams that can be used as models for students who are taking the exam.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PhD Exams | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Creative Writing and poetry faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 to the assessment process last year, but the Creative Writing faculty will make three procedural changes for the coming academic year: dissertation committees will take into consideration the explanation of the rankings (what outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and inadequate mean in specific terms) when making their assessment decisions; the Creative Writing faculty will revise their mission statement and goals; and the report on the PhD exams will distinguish between primary and secondary exams.

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

The dissertation results for the Creative Writing dissertations in the last cycle were very encouraging as all three dissertations earned the highest possible score of 6.0 for all categories. The exam results were less encouraging as the poetry exams fell below the target while the fiction exams met the target. Upon further examination, it was revealed that the two of the three failures/low passes on the exams were fiction students who were taking their secondary exam in poetry. Creative Writing faculty think that fiction students can have difficulty with this exam because they are not well versed in terminology and concepts related to poetry. To help fiction students prepare for this exam, the poetry faculty who prepare the exams will hold regular meetings with these students in advance of the test and will provide these students with examples of successful secondary exams written by former fiction examinees.
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, global and multi-ethnic literary and cultural studies, pedagogy, critical theory, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as they progress through our programs.

Goals

G 1: Assure mastery 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.

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 master's 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.

**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. (See the assessment form for the literature dissertation as well as the description of the ratings found in the document repository.) 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 and an action plan is formulated and presented to the entire faculty at an early fall department meeting.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies**

A target of 4.7 was set for this learning outcome related to content knowledge.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven literature dissertations were completed in 2010-2011, 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 5.57), 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 5.29), 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 5.29). These averages for the three areas of content knowledge average out to a 5.38, and therefore the target was very successfully met.

**Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory**

In the 2009-2010 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 third of three years during which the department has set this outcome as a rolling target.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven students completed a literature dissertation during 2009-20010, and the average score they received for this outcome was a 5.1, which is considerably above the intended target. During the previous four years of dissertation assessment, this outcome always was ranked with a 4.3 for this criteria. This year, the averages for all the other outcomes included on the assessment form were all between the range of 5.29--5.71, so while there has been considerable improvement on this outcome related to critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and/or historical contexts, this outcomes 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Seven literature dissertations were defended in 2010-2011, and their scores related to the two criteria used to evaluate effective communications skills on the dissertation were very successful. The two criteria are "the dissertation effectively communicates the argument and results of the research" (which received a 5.29 average) and "the oral defense demonstrates mastery of the topics researched and sound defense of the project" (which received a 5.71 average). The combined average of these two criteria related to effective communications was a 5.5, which again was considerably higher than the 4.7 target.

**Target for O4: Effective Researching Skills**

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome related to effective research skills.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score for this outcome on the seven literature dissertations defended in 2010-2011 was a 5.71. This score clearly met the target; in addition, it represented the highest average achieved for this outcome for the past five years of dissertation results.

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

**Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the department decided to continue with a target for all Ph.D. exams which would allow for only 15% or fewer of the examinees to earn a low pass or a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year’s results where only 14% of literature exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

| Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met |
| Exam results in 2010-2011 show that only 9.4% of the 32 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2009-2010 scores where 14% of literature exams earned such scores, but it is also not as encouraging as the low pass/fail rate earned in 2008-2009 which was only 7%. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 90.6%, which also is higher than the same rates gained in 09-10 year (81%) but not as high as those from 08-09 (93%). |

**Target for O2: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the department decided to continue with a target for all Ph.D. exams which would allow for only 15% or fewer of the examinees to earn a low pass or a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year’s results where only 14% of literature exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

| Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met |
| Exam results in 2010-2011 show that only 9.4% of the 32 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2009-2010 scores where 14% of literature exams earned such scores, but it is also not as encouraging as the low pass/fail rate earned in 2008-2009 which was only 7%. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 90.6%, which also is higher than the same rates gained in 09-10 year (81%) but not as high as those from 08-09 (93%). |

**Target for O3: Effective Communication Skills**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, the department decided to continue with a target for all Ph.D. exams which would allow for only 15% or fewer of the examinees to earn a low pass or a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year’s results where only 14% of literature exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

| Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met |
| Exam results in 2010-2011 show that only 9.4% of the 32 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2009-2010 scores where 14% of literature exams earned such scores, but it is also not as encouraging as the low pass/fail rate earned in 2008-2009 which was only 7%. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 90.6%, which also is higher than the same rates gained in 09-10 year (81%) but not as high as those from 08-09 (93%). |

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Exam results in 2010-2011 show that only 9.4% of the 32 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2009-2010 scores where 14% of literature exams earned such scores, but it is also not as encouraging as the low pass/fail rate earned in 2008-2009 which was only 7%. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 90.6%, which also is higher than the same rates gained in 09-10 year (81%) but not as high as those from 08-09 (93%).

**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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **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 college 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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PhD dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Studies Committee

Continue with targets set for previous assessment cycle
The previous targets for the outcomes that are assessed on the PhD exams and the dissertation will remain the same.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Create a prospectus writing seminar for PhD students
The graduate faculty will put together a prospectus writing seminar which will be required of all incoming PhD students in the Literature concentration. This course will be run as a workshop, where students will get feedback on one another’s initial drafts of a prospectus. This course will be taken in the last semester of coursework and before the PhD exams. It is not meant to result in a definitive prospectus; rather, it is intended to teach critical elements of doctoral writing and to emphasize the importance of establishing a clear and convincing critical, historical, or theoretical framework for the dissertation topic. The present plan is to pilot this course in the summer of 2012 and to offer it every spring semester after that.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PhD dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge and Application of Literary Theory
Implementation Description: The Director of the Graduate Program will meet with the Graduate Studies committee to work out the details for this course.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: The Director of the Graduate Program

Distinguish between primary and secondary PhD exams
The reporting on Literature PhD exams in the past has not distinguished between primary and secondary exams. Starting this year, the scores will be broken out based on these two categories so that the department can see if students fare differently on these two exams.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to the Graduate Director

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No procedural changes were made last year. This year, the department will make one change in the Literature PhD assessment by breaking down the exam scores in terms of primary and secondary exams. This distinction will help to students’ competence in the two areas of study that they have selected.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The scores on the Literature PhD dissertations and the PhD exams were very strong as all the targets were met, many of them quite easily. It was especially encouraging that the dissertation target for the knowledge and application of literary theory was finally met, for this has been a rolling target for the past three years. It is still notable, however, that this outcome scored the lowest of all the outcomes (5.1 as compared to 5.38-5.71). Since it is still an area of relative weakness, the department would like to go ahead with the plan to create a Prospectus Writing Seminar for all PhD students in this concentration. The main goal of that course, which will be piloted in the summer of 2012, will be to teach critical skills of doctoral writing, in particular the importance of establishing a theoretical
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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, 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: 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.

G 2: 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era. Students will also specialize in one time frame and area of the discipline (emphasizing, for example, classical rhetorical history or the history of composition pedagogy or professional writing history).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Effective Written Communications (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Researching Skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. (See the attached assessment form for the Rhetoric and Composition dissertation.) 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, and an action plan is formulated and presented to the entire faculty at an early fall department meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric
In the 2009-2010 action plan, a target of 4.7 was set for all outcomes related to the Rhetoric and Composition dissertation.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Five Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. The average score they earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the history of rhetoric was a 5.8 which met the target. This score was a minor decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 6.0.

Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Five Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. The average score they earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the theories of rhetoric was a 5.8 which met the target. This score was a minor decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 6.0.

Target for O4: Effective Written Communications

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The five Rhetoric and Composition dissertations defended this year received an average score of 5.8 for the mastery of academic writing (in particular that of the dissertation genre) and 5.8 for the ability to effectively communicate an argument and results of research. The average of these two scores is a 5.8 for this learning outcome related to effective written communications. This met the target, and represents a slight increase over last year’s score, a 5.7.

Target for O5: Researching Skills

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Five Rhetoric and Composition PhD students defended their dissertations this year. The average score they earned for this learning outcome related to the researching skills was a 5.8 which met the target. This score was a minor decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 6.0.

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Ten Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2010-2011, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This represents a significant improvement over the last two assessment cycles when the rates were 21% in 2008-2009 and 23% in 2009-2010. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 40%, which was also an increase over the 2009-2010 31% high pass rate and in close proximity to the 2008-2009 43% high pass rate.

Target for O2: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Ten Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2010-2011, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This represents a significant improvement over the last two assessment cycles when the rates were 21% in 2008-2009 and 23% in 2009-2010. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 40%, which was also an increase over the 2009-2010 31% high pass rate and in close proximity to the 2008-2009 43% high pass rate.

Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Ten Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2010-2011, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This represents a significant improvement over the last two assessment cycles when the rates were 21% in 2008-2009 and 23% in 2009-2010. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 40%, which was also an increase over the 2009-2010 31% high pass rate and in close proximity to the 2008-2009 43% high pass rate.
Target for O4: Effective Written Communications

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target for Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams was set that 15% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Ten Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2010-2011, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This represents a significant improvement over the last two assessment cycles when the rates were 21% in 2008-2009 and 23% in 2009-2010. On the other end of the scale, the high pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 40%, which was also an increase over the 2009-2010 31% high pass rate and in close proximity to the 2008-2009 43% high pass rate.

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: In-Progress
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: In-Progress
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: Finished
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

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: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Revise the dissertation assessment form so that it offers 6 possible rankings

The Rhetoric and Composition PhD program has previously used an assessment form with only five possible rankings. To make this form comparable to the Literary Studies form, it will be changed to six points to allow for the "outstanding" category.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 since the last assessment report, but this year three changes will be made: the dissertation form will have six possible rankings instead of five; the mission and goals will be revised to reflect the particulars of this
concentration, and the exam results will be broken down in terms of primary and secondary exams.

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

The PhD students in the Rhetoric and Composition concentration met all the targets for the dissertation and the exams; consequently, no changes will be to the program this year.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Executive Doctorate in Business**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST

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

---

### Mission / Purpose

The Executive Doctorate in Business program offered by the J. Mack Robinson College of Business of Georgia State University helps executives develop these capabilities by teaching them how to apply relevant knowledge and research skills to contemporary business problems. It also addresses the lifelong learning needs of intellectually active professional adults who already possess advanced degrees in their fields but wish to continue their education to the highest level.

### Goals

**G 1: Executive Doctorate in Business Goals**

The Ph.D. program of J. Mack Robinson College of Business will develop in graduates a high level of competence in conducting research and in teaching business disciplines by requiring: (1) education in theory; (2) education in general research techniques as well as research techniques specific to a discipline; (3) research experience with faculty members on contemporary research problems and issues; and (4) training on teaching methodology reinforced with active classroom teaching experience.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Seeing the big picture (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The Executive Doctorate in Business will advance the knowledge and expertise required to identify, understand, and successfully tackle the interdisciplinary, big picture issues that characterize global business management today.

**O/O 2: Honing the skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The Executive Doctorate in Business will develop in the student the skills in formal social inquiry required to define and address complex issues and to disseminate knowledge related to their profession in a variety of professional and public outlets “to influence professional activity and public policy.”

**O/O 3: Giving the global perspective (M: 1, 2, 3)**

The Executive Doctorate in Business will give an interdisciplinary, globally oriented perspective that is unavailable in traditional advanced degree programs.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Performance in coursework (O: 1, 2, 3)**

The program will have six content courses to provide students with knowledge about global business leadership and five courses on research practices, design and analysis to equip the students with the understanding required to undertake formal research. Students are expected to maintain a 3.0 average in coursework. Students must earn a C or better in all courses. Students who do not meet these requirements or who are struggling to meet them are counseled out of the program.

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

**M 2: Group projects (O: 1, 2, 3)**

During the second and third semesters, students participate in research projects in groups of two to three people, under the supervision of a senior researcher. Each project will address a contemporary business issue and be conducted with the objective of publishing the results.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 3: Independent research (O: 1, 2, 3)**

During the fourth, fifth and sixth semesters, each student engages in an independent research project under the supervision of a senior researcher. This project addresses a business issue affecting the student's firm. Each student will produce and defend a doctoral thesis with the expectation of publishing it.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
### 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: Safety, Injury Prevention, Emergency Procedures (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

1. Students will be able to identify, describe and demonstrate proper safety techniques, injury prevention, and emergency procedures for those who engage in physical activity and exercise programs.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 2: Program Administration (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 5, 6)**

1. Students will be able to identify the components of effective exercise program administration including quality assurance and outcome assessment procedures.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 3: Case Study (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 7, 8, 9)**

Students will be able to identify critical information from a health history/case study and use this information to determine risk classification, proper exercise test selection and testing supervision

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience,
meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

SLO 4: Exercise Physiology and Related Exercise Science (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 10, 11, 12, 13)
Students will be able to identify, discuss, and apply the concepts of anatomy, physiology, exercise physiology, biomechanics as they apply to the proper conduct of physical activity and exercise programs.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
5.0 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.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 5: Pathophysiology and Risk Factors (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 14, 15, 16, 17)
1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the risk factors that underlie the major chronic diseases.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
5.0 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.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations
1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations
3 Timely graduation

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 6: Health Appraisal, Fitness and Clinical Exercise Testing (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25)
1. Students will be able to properly assess the current fitness levels of apparently healthy individuals as well as those who have controlled metabolic, pulmonary, or cardiovascular disease.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
5.0 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 7: ECG and Diagnostic Techniques (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 26, 27, 28)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss normal and abnormal cardiac rhythms and other ECG abnormalities that may present at rest and/or during exercise.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms. 
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Student promotion and progression

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 8: Patient Management and Medications (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 29, 30)**

Students will be able to identify and discuss the effects major cardiovascular, pulmonary, and metabolic medications and how these are used to manage patients with these diseases.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms. 
5.0 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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Student promotion and progression

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 9: Exercise Prescription and Programming (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 31, 32, 33, 34)**

Students will be able to use assessment data to design scientifically sound exercise programs for apparently healthy individuals as well as for those with controlled cardiovascular, pulmonary, or metabolic disease.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms. 
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
5.0 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.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2. Student promotion and progression

**Strategic Plan Associations**
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

**SLO 10: Nutrition and Weight Management (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 35, 36)**

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss basic nutrition and weight management concepts as they apply to those who will engage in exercise programs.
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 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.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 11: Human Behavior and Counseling (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 37, 38)

1. Students will be able to identify and discuss the application of basic human behavior and counseling strategies as they apply to physical activity and exercise programs.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: First Aid Cpr Certification (O: 1)
CPR and First Aid certification pass rates in KH 3390 Advanced First Aid and Emergency Care
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

M 2: ACSM Domain Score (O: 1)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 3: Practical Exam score KH 3500 (O: 1)
Practical Exam Score in KH 3500 Athletic Training
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 4: Practical Exam KH 4630 (O: 1)
Practical Exam Score in KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 5: KH 4350 Project (O: 2)
Performance on KH 4350 Fitness Center Management Project (CTW)
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 6: ACSM Domain score (O: 2)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 7: KH 4630 Case Study Presentation (O: 3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Domain Score on ACSM Exam (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 10: KH 3650 lab scores (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab scores in KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: KH 3600 Lab scores (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab scores in KH 3600 Biomechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: ACSM Domain Score (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 13: Pre Post Test KH 3650 (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Post test KH 3650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Studies in KH4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Studies in KH4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: KH 4360 Final Exam (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Final Examination in KH4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: KH 4630 Practical Exam (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on practical exam in KH4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: KH 4630 Case Studies (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Study in KH4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Study in KH4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain score on ACSM Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 23: KH (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on lab practical in KH4630 Lab Practical 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 24: KH 4360 Lab practical (O: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 25: KH 3650 Lab assignments (O: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 26: KH 4360 Exam (O: 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 27: KH 4360 Practical Exam (O: 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 28: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 29: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 30: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 31: KH 4630 Case Study (O: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 32: KH 4630 Exercise Prescription Project (O: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 33: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 34: KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Exam (O: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 35: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 36: Exams KH 2520, KH 3000 (O: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 37: KH 4280 Exam (O: 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 38: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

Implementation of new Objectives

During the past academic year (2010-2011) faculty in the exercise science program identified and adopted all new program objectives for the B.S. in Exercise Science program. These new objectives better reflect the knowledge skills and abilities that students must exhibit in order to successfully pass the American College of Sports Medicine professional certification program. Because this was an extensive revision of the current objectives, the process was very time consuming and performance data was not collected during this time period.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: During the 2011-2012 academic year faculty will be determining achievement targets and measures as well as collecting performance data on each objective. This data will be coomplied and reported during the next evaluation cycle.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: KH Exercise Science faculty. Dr. Andy Doyle, program coordinator.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Exercise Science MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The MS degree program in Exercise Science seeks to contribute to the KH Department's mission, which seeks to discover new knowledge and advance the understanding of the role of physical activity in attaining optimal health and well-being, educate members of society and prepare future professionals, and promote healthy lifestyles through life-long activity and learning. This mission includes research and scholarly activity, instruction, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, and health and physical education. The M.S. program in Exercise Science provides academic preparation and continuing education in exercise science while its faculty generate and communicate knowledge and serve the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

Goals

G 1: Knowledge
Students will gain knowledge of Exercise Science.

G 2: Skills
Students will gain skills necessary to be successful in their chosen Exercise Science field.

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science (G: 1) (M: 1, 5, 6)
Students should have a basic understanding of the scientific principles of exercise physiology and related exercise science, including pathophysiology and risk factors and exercise prescription and programming.
Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 1, 2, and 7. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

O/O 2: Apply knowledge to practical situations (G: 1, 2) (M: 2, 5)
Students should demonstrate practical skills related to the knowledge base of the program, including health appraisal, fitness and clinical exercise testing, electrocardiography, and diagnostic techniques.
Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities content matter areas 3 and 4. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

O/O 3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 5)
Students should demonstrate knowledge of basic equipment, facility requirements, absolute and relative contraindications, procedures, and protocols for the exercise test.
Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes (O: 1)

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science**

75% scoring at or above 80% on exam

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students demonstrated success in this measure, with 100% of students scoring at or above 80% on exams/quizzes in the following classes: KH 6280, KH7500, KH7550, and KH8390. 89% and 83% of students demonstrated the necessary content knowledge in KH8830 and KH8870, respectively. Overall, target achievement was exceeded.

#### M 2: Practical Exams (O: 2)

**Target for O2: Apply knowledge to practical situations**

90% of students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students demonstrated proficiency on this measure based on the following courses: KH 7550 and KH 8390.

#### M 3: GXT practical exam (O: 3)

**Target for O3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing**

90% of students will demonstrate proficiency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students demonstrated proficiency in this measure based on results from the following courses: KH 7550 and KH 8390.

#### M 4: Case Studies and Labs (O: 4)

**Target for O4: Understands research and human subjects issues**

90% of the students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students demonstrated success in this measure in the following courses: KH7500, KH7550, KH7620, and KH8830. 95% of the students demonstrated success in this measure for KH280.

#### M 5: ACSM EXAM (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science**

80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

70% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam.
80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

70% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing**

80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

70% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

70% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam.

**M 6: ACSM Exam (O: 1)**

80% of students will pass the ACSM HFS or CES exam.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science**

80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) exam.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

70% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam.

**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:** 12/2011
- **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 2011-2012 period
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011
- **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

**Implementation Description:** Exercise Science Faculty meeting
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011
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
Implementation Description: Exercise Science faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
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
Implementation Description: Exercise Science faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science faculty

Compare ACSM exam content with course content
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Exercise Science faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Two years ago we added to the academic program and assessment measurement the requirement of a standardized national exam developed by the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) 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 discuss the pass rates of the exam due to not meeting our goal of 80% pass rate on the the HFS exam.

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

We have documented a disconnect between our internal academic assessment findings and that of the ACSM exam performance. The Exercise Science faculty is working on identifying courses and course objectives that will remedy these deficiencies.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Implementation of the ACSM exam via the practicum course.

Challenges for Next Year
Tracking ACSM exam sub-category results with specific course outcomes and assessment.
collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication.

**Goals**

**G 1: understand and interpret**
Students will be able to understand and interpret ideas presented in media involving moving images.

**G 2: identify structures**
Students will be able to identify 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: understand and interpret (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and interpret ideas presented in media and can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: narrative structures (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify and discuss various narrative structures in media using moving images employed for story delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: prod/post-prod concepts (G: 3) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scene, editing and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: spectator/textual pleasure (G: 4) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to recognize and articulate a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: writing assignment (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: understand and interpret**

70% of students will score 3 or above on the writing rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: descriptive writing assignment (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: narrative structures**

70% of the students will score a 3 or above on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: mise-en-scene (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: spectator/textual relationship (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.)

---

**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-scene, 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
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)

---
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**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, our graduates 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-Fall2010: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Fall 2010 and "Exhibit 1b-Spring2011: Direct Assessment of Course Performance" for findings from Spring 2011. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2011: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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.

**Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

Median scores shall be at or above 70 percent, which we believe indicates a sufficient level of proficiency to effectively engage in financial decision-making.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn 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 3-2011:Educational Testing Service (ETS) Results", which can be found in the Document Repository.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O3: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills**

Students should achieve at the 90th percentile in Finance, Accounting, International, and Quantitative.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Analyzing recent and long-term performance, finance majors are achieving this target fairly consistently in the areas of Finance and Accounting. Performance in International and Quantitative have fallen below desired target levels.

**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 2-2011: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. We have recently created for student viewing several video recordings of leading Atlanta-based financial executives discussing their careers and job functions as well as identifying student pathways for similar success.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- Measure: Representative questions from courses  
- Outcome/Objective: The development and application of technical skills  
**Implementation Description:** continuous
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 Jonathan Godbey and Pete Eisemann
Additional Resources: student assistants

Practical training

The field study in finance course "FI4391" has been found useful for providing BBA-Finance majors with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). This has become increasingly important given the global recession and the decline in employment in the financial and non-financial sectors of the economy. We will continue to seek and partner with participating corporations to provide students the opportunity to acquire worthwhile and relevant practical experience.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Enhance student practical training | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

Implementation Description: continuous
Responsible Person/Group: Professors Rich Fendler and Pete Eisemann

Action Plan re ETS Findings

Initiatives have been put in place to raise math requirements of all BBA students and to increase emphasis on the development of quantitative skills in FI 4000, which all finance majors must take. Increased offerings of our international finance course FI 4040 should increase the exposure of finance majors to international issues.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: National performance indicator: ETS | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills

Implementation Description: Immediate
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012

Analysis Questions and Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

During the 2010-2011 academic year, there were no significant changes made in the assessment process since last year's assessment report. Still, 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. Finally, the Department recently completed its Academic Program Review and the development of the Action Plan for it may yield potential changes in our assessment process.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

A) The Department recently completed its Academic Program Review (APR) and is in the process of preparing the associated Action Plan. It is anticipated that one item will be to conduct a curriculum review of our BBA program. B) Despite the economic downturn, employers continue to seek those students who are well-trained in finance and have a strong appreciation for working with and understanding real world financial data. In 2010 we obtained a substantial university student technology fee grant to purchase financial market data for incorporation into undergraduate classroom assignments and projects. C) We have improved and expanded opportunities for students to participate in the finance society student association as well as on the student portfolio management team. D) Three faculty members (Professors Richard Fendler, Craig Ruff, and Milind Shrikhande) have 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 study 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 been shared with the course coordinator (Professor Jonathan Godbey) as well as the instructors teaching this course who are predominantly GTAs.
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
The Department has in place several faculty overseeing each critical action plan component: Professor Rasha Ashraf and Genna Brown 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. Of note, for the careers component in FI 4000, we have begun to build a library of video interviews with CFOs and other high level executives of leading Atlanta based corporations. These executives discuss the finance function within a corporate organization and discuss various career paths for students interested in finance. Also in FI 4000, the Department has reduced the maximum class size from approximately 60 to 40 students. The course coordinator is working with all instructors in this important required class to increase the focus on building finance quantitative skills. To increase the effectiveness of our critical thinking through writing initiative in FI 4020, during the recent academic year, the Department has reduced the maximum class size from 45 to 30 students.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
As a whole 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 this year’s review, we will try to find out why finance student performance on the ETS exam fell in some of the non-finance subject areas. Since much of the instruction in these areas is outside the direct control of the Department of Finance, we will pursue this with the RCB’s Undergraduate Program Committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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. Our main strategy for improvement during the coming year will be to use the findings of the recently conducted Academic Program Review (APR) to develop an action plan for improving the effectiveness of our BBA program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Finance MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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 Fast-Track Master of Science in Finance provides participants the opportunity to gain these skills in a cohort format for preparing for careers in senior level financial 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.
### 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 2-2011: Direct Assessment of Course Performance I (Fall 2010)" for findings from Fall 2010 and "Exhibit 1b-2011: Direct Assessment of Course Performance II (Spring 2011)" for findings from Spring 2011. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2011: 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

#### Target for O1: The development and application of foundation knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O2: The development and application of technical skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O3: Analytical, conceptual, integrative finance skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that students are continuing to learn at the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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 3-2011: MS Exit Survey". In addition, we have conducted a course satisfaction survey for the Spring 2011 Fast Track MS-Finance courses. These results are presented in "Exhibit 4-2011: Fast Track MS Course Survey (Spring 2011)" and indicate an encouraging response from students.

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 2-2011: 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)

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### 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.
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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 2010-11 at approximately 635, based on a sample-study of students admitted to the program. To maintain and improve upon these gains in student quality, there is need to refine certain aspects of the program based on 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. In response, we have most recently added two courses: FI 8350 "Corporate restructuring and workouts" and FI 8260 "Hedge funds and their trading strategies." These two courses have been successfully taught now for 2 cycles and are among our most popular courses. Looking forward to the 2011-2012 academic year, we will continue to review the curriculum and 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 both 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

In 2009 we believed that there was a potential executive audience for the Fast Track MS-Finance program who desires a strong cohort formal with an emphasis on academic training in corporation finance. In response, we initiated plans to launch such a program beginning in January 2010 and after a successful offering began a second cohort in January 2011. In addition, we will continue to bring to 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. In January 2011 we changed the name of the program to Fast Track MS in Finance.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Professors Milind Shrikhande and Alfred Mettler

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

During the 2010-2011 academic year, there were no significant changes made in the assessment process of the flex MS-Finance program since last year's assessment report. Still, with each academic year, there is the likelihood that new and/or different faculty will instruct those graduate 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. Beginning in Spring 2011 we added a new assessment tool for the Fast Track MS-Finance program wherein course effectiveness surveys of students were conducted for Spring courses. We anticipate that such surveys will be implemented each semester going forward. Finally, the Department recently completed is Academic Program Review and the development of the Action Plan for it may yield potential changes in our assessment process.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on
Students shall demonstrate the following abilities:

1. to understand French when spoken by a proficient speaker on general and non-technical topics at normal conversational speed;
2. to speak French with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy;
3. to read and comprehend general and non-technical materials written in French;
4. to equip them to function as global citizens;
5. to prepare them, through the various majors in modern languages, for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business;
6. Students shall demonstrate the ability to critically interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literatures written in French.

### Goals

**G 4: Knowledge of French and French Literature**

Student shall demonstrate the following abilities:

1. to understand French when spoken by a proficient speaker on general and non-technical topics at normal conversational speed;
2. to speak French with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy;
3. to read and comprehend general and non-technical materials written in French;
4. to equip them to function as global citizens;
5. to prepare them, through the various majors in modern languages, for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business.

**G 5: Outcomes for the current period**

The previous assessments was completed successfully, but 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, it was decided at that time to limit the focus on general goal 6. For the current period, the French section of the Department decided to focus on more goals important to the degree program and add Goals 3, 4, 5 to the previous assessment restricted to Goal 6. This assessment was made in the Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts, an introductory course required for all French majors before they take more advanced literature courses. 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%).

**G 6: Target**

Students shall demonstrate the ability to understand French when spoken by a proficient speaker on general and non-technical topics at normal conversational speed; to speak French with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy; to...
read and comprehend general and non-technical materials in this language and to write in French with clarity and grammatical accuracy. Students shall also demonstrate a general acquaintance with French cultures and the ability to critically analyse and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Knowledge of French Literature (G: 4) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student shall demonstrate a good command of the French language, a general acquaintance with target language literatures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: paper (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 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%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Knowledge of French Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hope that students will be able to achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature. However, because Goals 3-6 assessment is relatively new, it has not been possible to identify accurately at this time important trends and localize areas of weakness and strength. For this reason and to get more precise and relevant information, the Department will continue with this single focus for the Academic Year 2011-2012. The results of these 3 years will then be compared and analyzed, areas of weakness and strength identified, and corrective actions taken for each criteria, and a decision will be made whether to assess a larger number of goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

2 courses of French 3033 (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts) were taught during this period. Students majoring in French achieved a result of 8.4 and 8.3.

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

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of France and French speaking countries, and to provide them with 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.

### Goals

**G 1: Goals for 2010-11**

In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work; seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and show appropriate writing conventions and formats.

SLO 2: Research and Data Collection Skills (M: 1)
Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)
Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

SLO 4: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1)
Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Thesis, Pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
A committee of French professors will use the thesis, pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in French. The written exam consists of three questions based on three areas from French literature and/or civilization reading list as well as on students' coursework.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

Adding Courses
The French section has added one new course for the new concentration in French Studies, and more are under consideration

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Planned
Responsible Person/Group: French Faculty

Mission / Purpose
The Geography BA in 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.

Goals

G 1: Concepts
Students will learn concepts and methods of geographical research

G 2: Thinking Skills
Students acquire thinking skills to understand and apply knowledge of environmental patterns found in the world around them

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 4: Foundation Knowledge (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Student demonstrates knowledge of key geographical concepts, theories, methods, and facts

SLO 5: Communication-Written (M: 1)
Student communicates effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Senior Seminar Portfolio (O: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student assembles a portfolio comprised of writing assignments, practica exercises (mapping), book reviews, research papers and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Foundation Knowledge**

We assess on scale of 1-5: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year, average finding was 3.9 out of 5.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Communication-Written**

We assess on a 1-5 scale: 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); and 5 (strongly agree). Target is 4 or greater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The finding was an average of 3.9. This is close to target of 4.0. No actions necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Critical Thinking Question formulation #1.**

Assess on a 1 to 5 scale: 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); and 5 (strongly agree). Target is 4 or greater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding is 3.9 which is close to target. No actions recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation**

We assess on a scale of 1 - 5: 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); and 5 (strongly agree). Target is 4 or greater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score is 3.9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Contemporary Issues - Diverse Disciplines**

Students assessed on a five point scale (1-5): 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); and 5 (strongly agree). Target is 4 or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding is a 3.9. Target partially met. No actions warranted.</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**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 – Quantitative 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

Actions

Geosciences is proposing to combining B.A (GEOG) and B.S. (GEOL) degree programs. All new assessment will be developed reflecting goals and outcome of a new combined degree B.S. degree program. The 3.9 is lower than we want for this particular measure but is close to target; no change in approaches are warranted for this outcome.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Senior Seminar Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Foundation Knowledge

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department of Geosciences is now merging all of its programs and is in the process of updating its assessment procedures. The faculty will be tasked with revising reevaluating and revising our learning outcomes, measures, and targets. We expect to derive a new action plan to be implemented for 2012.

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.

Mission / Purpose

Our mission is to provide our students the opportunity to go beyond the memorization of geological facts in order to critically evaluate the major concepts related to Earth Science.
**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.

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

**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.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Department of Geosciences is now merging all of its programs and is in the process of updating its assessment procedures. The faculty will be tasked with revising reevaluating and revising our learning outcomes, measures, and targets. We expect to derive a new action plan to be implemented for 2012.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Geology BS**

As of: 12/13/2016 04:11 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Mission/Purpose The Department of Geosciences at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in instruction and research in the Earth Sciences. 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
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Constitution of the Earth (G: 1) (M: 1)
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.

SLO 2: Earth Processes (G: 1) (M: 1)
Each graduate will understand the processes driving changes inside the earth and on the earth's surface.

SLO 3: Earth History (G: 1) (M: 1)
Each graduate will have an understanding of the historical development of the earth.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition (G: 1) (M: 2)
Student demonstrate knowledge of key geological concepts.

SLO 5: Communication-Written (G: 1) (M: 2)
Student communicates using appropriate writing conventions.

SLO 6: Critical Thinking - Evidence Collectino (G: 1) (M: 2)
Student collects appropriate evidence.

SLO 7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 2)
Student evaluates claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

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
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Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
LOESS not administered.

Target for O2: Earth Processes
The overall performance on the LOESS exit survey by the student group will be at least 80%.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
LOESS not administered.

Target for O3: Earth History
The overall performance on the LOESS exit survey by the student group will be at least 80%.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
LOESS not administered this cycle.

M 2: Environmental Geology writing assignment (term paper) (O: 4, 5, 6, 7)
Students write a professional paper (8-10 page). Paper is graded equally on content, structure, sources, and grammar. Students submit paper end of March for revisions. Revisions are due mid April. If corrections are made satisfactorily, then an increase of grade is given.

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

Target for O4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition
Students rated on a 1-5 scale where 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4(agree) and 5 (strongly agree).
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Twenty one papers were graded. Overall grade is 4. Several paper (6 were graded in the 90+ and are given a 5). Only one paper was considered neutral.

Target for O5: Communication-Written
Students rated on a 1-5 scale where 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Twenty one papers were graded. Overall grade is 4. Several paper (6 were graded in the 90+ and are given a 5). Only one paper was considered neutral.

Target for O6: Critical Thinking - Evidence Collectino
Students rated on a 1-5 scale where 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Twenty one papers were graded. Overall grade is 4. Several paper (6 were graded in the 90+ and are given a 5). Only one paper was considered neutral.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation
Students rated on a 1-5 scale where 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Twenty one papers were graded. Overall grade is 4. Several paper (6 were graded in the 90+ and are given a 5). Only one paper was considered neutral.

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

Revise Assessment Plan
Geosciences department has recently reorganized and has agreed to establish one set of assessment goals for the entire department. The new departmental assessor will be working with faculty across the department to establish new goals and discuss forms of assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Seth Rose and Department as a whole

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Geology MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Quality of Non-thesis Project
Non-thesis projects should be well conceived (good research idea) and executed satisfactorily.

SLO 2: Quality of Thesis Research
Thesis research (for students enrolled in the thesis option) should be of high quality (i.e., well written, sound data, and sound interpretation, discussion and conclusions).

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 3: MS Degree in Geology (quality of thesis)
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).
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 4: MS degree in Geology (non thesis project)
Non-thesis project is assessed in terms of quality of the work (topic, data collected, interpretation and discussion) by either the faculty member directing this non-thesis project, the graduate director, or department chair.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 5: MS Degree in Geology (Quality of Thesis)
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).
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 German BA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students majoring in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literature and culture of German speakers, to promote their interest and involvement in international exchanges through study abroad programs, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching, business, translation and interpretation and other areas.

Goals
G 4: 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 German 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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
One Course of German 3311 (Reading German Literature) was taught during this period. Students majoring in German achieved a result of 8.5.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 German MA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in German the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the German language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Germany and German speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in German, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of German literature and culture, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

Goals
G 1: Goals for 2010-11
In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Effective writing, communicating and editing (M: 1)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills and follows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

SLO 2: Research and data collecting skills (M: 1)
Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.

SLO 3: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)
Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

SLO 4: Acquisition of knowledge (M: 1)
Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Pedagogical project or research paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
A committee of German professors will use the pedagogical research project, and/or research paper to evaluate mastery of the skills and learning outcomes of the M.A. candidate in German.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Health & Physical Education BSED
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)
Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the Bachelor of Science Program in 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. The program emphasizes broad pedagogical knowledge in health and physical education. 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.

Goals
G 1: Goal 1: Professional Knowledge and Skills
HPE students will understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and opportunities to develop physically educated individuals based on state and national standards.

G 2: Goal 2: Planning
HPE students will plan a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals based on state and national standards.

G 3: Goal 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
HPE students will understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social and emotional development of students in physical activity.

G 4: Goal 4: Clinical Practice
HPE students will demonstrate reflective practices by evaluating the effects of their actions on others and seek opportunities to grow professionally.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Goal 1: Professional Knowledge and Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
Objective #1: Candidates will demonstrate effective task presentation as determined by the following criteria: a. Teacher uses refinement and extension tasks throughout the lesson to build student skill. b. Teacher uses application tasks after students have developed adequate knowledge, skill and performance. c. Teacher addresses safety concerns or potential problems. d. Teacher uses multiple teaching strategies for delivering the unit. e. Teacher generalizes important concepts for the unit to other activities.

SLO 3: Goal 3: Effects on P-12 Student learning (M: 3)
Objective #1: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to develop appropriate assessments for each domain (cognitive, affective, psychomotor) of learning. Objective #2: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to develop assessments consistent with the corresponding instructional model. Objective #3: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to use assessment data from each domain to alter lesson emphasis and/or unit plans.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Goal 2: Planning (M: 2)
Objective #1: Students will demonstrate ability to develop a contextual analysis and rationale for their physical education and health units as determined by the following criteria: a. Teachers will select instructional models based on in-depth understanding and thoughtful reflection. b. Teachers will demonstrate a thorough understanding of the model, its strengths and limitations. c. Teacher will select activities that are developmentally appropriate and lead to student success and learning. Objective #2: Candidates will demonstrate ability to plan block and individual lesson plans as determined by the following criteria: a. Teacher shows relationships of activity to those areas with related concepts. b. Teacher develops a lesson that someone unfamiliar with the lesson could use the plan and know the exact expectations for the students. c. Teacher bases lesson modifications on personal research of teaching effectiveness. d. Teacher develops models based plans consistent with associated benchmarks.

O/O 4: Goal 4: Clinical Practice (M: 4)
Objective #1: Candidates will demonstrate the ability to write reflections based on data obtained from assessments used during the lesson. Objective #2: Candidate reflections will center on the impact their performance had on student learning. Objective #3: Candidate reflections will provide suggestions for improving the delivery of lesson content to enhance student learning.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Goal 1: Professional Knowledge and Skills (O: 1)
The key assessment for this goal and corresponding objective is the student's task presentation. This assessment is evaluated in KH 4520 and again in KH 4710. In KH 4520 task presentation is evaluated by the course instructor. In KH 4710, task presentation is evaluated by the student's cooperating teacher as well as their University Supervisor responsible for observing the student teacher during their student teaching placement. A rubric is used by all faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of the student's task presentation. This evaluation is ongoing throughout both Kh 4520 and 4710. During KH 4710, task presentation is evaluated at a minimum of once every two weeks by the University Supervisor and more frequently by the student's cooperating teacher. An average is calculated across all evaluations and is reported for this key assessment.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Target for O1: Goal 1: Professional Knowledge and Skills**

80% of HPE students should achieve a rating of 4 or above on the HPE Key Assessment Rubric equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Explanation of How Task Presentation is Used in the HPE Program Task presentation is used as a measure of competence in the ability to demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in teaching. PCK is the ability to combine content knowledge with pedagogical knowledge to effectively instruct specific groups of learners in schools. This assessment is broad covering pedagogical skills in the teaching of content that is developmentally and functionally appropriate. Rubric for Scoring Task Presentation Unsatisfactory 1 point Needs Improvement 2 points Satisfactory 3 points Very Good 4 points Outstanding 5 points Lesson progressions use no refinement and extension activities to develop skill. Lesson consists mostly of informing and application tasks. Lesson progresses use few refinement and extension activities to develop skill. Lesson consists mostly of informing and application tasks. Care is taken to present information sequentially so that students can build on prior knowledge when asked to complete more complex tasks. Teachers check for understanding to make sure students are ready to move into more difficult content. Assessments in the lesson measure student learning to determine if students are ready to attempt more difficult skills. Identify important concepts for the unit selected. Activities selected for the unit emphasize the content knowledge related to these concepts. Use refinement, extension and application tasks throughout the lesson to build student skill. Application task are used only after students have developed adequate skill and performance will not be compromised. Safety concerns are addressed on the lesson plan. Multiple teaching strategies proposed for delivering the unit to the majority of students. Generalizes important concepts for the unit to other activity areas. Teacher shows relationships of activity to those areas with related concepts. Use meaningful refinement, extension and application tasks throughout the lesson to build student skill. Application task are used only after students have developed adequate skill and performance will not be compromised. Safety concerns are addressed on the lesson plan and potential problems are noted. Multiple teaching strategies proposed for delivering the unit to accommodate all types of learners. Generalizes important concepts for the unit to other activity areas. Teacher shows relationships of activity to those areas with related concepts. Analysis of Task Presentation A total of 78% of candidates demonstrated very good or outstanding performance in task presentation in KH 4520 (see Table 2F). In the equivalent graduate Non-T4 class (KH 7250) 60% of candidates were very good or outstanding in task presentation. This may reflect differences in both the quality and quantity of practice teaching received between these two groups of students, with undergraduate HPE candidates receiving more practice teaching than non-T4 candidates. However, task presentation scores improved after student teaching by 3% for undergraduate candidates and by 12% for graduate candidates. A total of 81% of candidates following student teaching were very good or outstanding in their task presentation skills. These findings emphasize (a) the importance of the opportunity to work with an experienced teacher in the field of physical education, (b) the increased knowledge of learners’ characteristics (e.g., emotional, physical, mental, cultural and ethnic), their needs, abilities and interests obtained by candidates through student teaching, which enabled them to improve their pedagogical content knowledge, and (c) the improved ability to relate and/or apply the task presentation to the instructional model being used.

**M 2: Goal 2: Planning (O: 2)**

Key assessments for this Program Goal and respective Objectives include: Contextual Analysis and Rationale, Block and Lesson Plans and Learning Goals and Objectives. These key assessments are incorporated into a written project completed by all HPE students during two classes (KH4520 and KH4710). Students are required to select an instructional model by which to teach HPE content to a P-12 class. As part of their models assignment, students have to write a contextual analysis describing the model they chose, which another model as well as analyze those features and characteristics of the model that impact the instructional model selected. Students then have to write learning goals and objectives for their P-12 students based on pre-assessment of student’s present level performance and develop block and lesson plans to guide the teaching of HPE content in accordance with the model selected. Models projects in KH4520 are evaluated by the course instructor. Models projects for KH 4710 are evaluated by a pair of HPE faculty. A rubric is used by all faculty across both courses to guide the grading of the model's projects.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target for O2: Goal 2: Planning**

80% of HPE students should achieve a rating of 4 or above on the HPE Key Assessment Rubric equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Explanation of How Planning Assessments are Used in the HPE Program A meaningful contextual analysis, quality block and lesson plans and developmentally appropriate and challenging goals and objectives enable the HPE faculty to determine the degree to which candidates: Have a readiness to teach and a confidence and clarity to meet their teaching goals. Are successful in stimulating their students. They do so because their lesson plans move carefully and thoughtfully from one idea –step-by-step to another idea and in good sequence of content development. Invite student participation. Limit managerial (non-learning) time. Use a variety of procedures. Ensure continuity of learning from lesson to lesson. Provide for individual differences. Strive to adapt learning material to the needs of the students. Can summarize and check outcomes Rubric for Scoring Planning Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Unsatisfactory 1 point Needs Improvement 2 points Satisfactory 3 points Very Good 4 points Outstanding 5 points Content of unit (activity) may not match instructional model selected. Students then have to write learning goals and objectives for their P-12 students based on pre-assessment of student's present level performance and develop block and lesson plans to guide the teaching of HPE content in accordance with the model selected. Models projects in KH4520 are evaluated by the course instructor. Models projects for KH 4710 are evaluated by a pair of HPE faculty. A rubric is used by all faculty across both courses to guide the grading of the model's projects. Content of unit (activity) may not match instructional model selected. Teaching model selected is appropriate for the context in which it will be delivered. Takes into account the number, age, and skill level of students. Instructional model was selected based on understanding and reflection. Teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the model, its strengths and limitations. Activities are developmentally appropriate and lead to student success and learning. Instructional model was selected based on in depth understanding and thoughtful reflection. Teacher candidate demonstrates a thorough understanding of the model, its strengths and limitations. Activities are developmentally appropriate and lead to student success and learning. Block & Lesson Plans Goal for the unit are superficial and/or target extraneous topics. Unit is focused on keeping students busy rather than meaningful learning concepts. Lesson content is the same for all students, regardless of skill levels. Goal for the unit are superficial and/or target extraneous topics. Unit is focused on keeping students busy rather than meaningful learning concepts. Lesson content is the same for all students, regardless of skill levels identifies important concepts for the unit selected. Activities selected for the unit emphasize content knowledge related to these concepts. Lesson modifications are developed for students with special needs. Makes references to important concepts for the unit to other activity areas. Teacher candidate shows relationship of activity to those areas with related concepts. Identifies important concepts for the unit selected. Activities selected for the unit emphasize content knowledge related to these concepts. Lesson modifications are based on research done by the teacher candidate. Modifications for special needs students are based on research done by the teacher candidate.
M 3: Goal 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

Key assessment for this goal and corresponding objective is the analysis of student learning. As part of their models project in KH 4520 and KH 4710 students are required to use multiple types of assessments to determine P-12 student’s learning of HPE material. GHU students are required to retrieve, analyze their assessments and describe the changes they will and/or did make to their teaching to address the findings of their assessments. HPE candidates do very well on these assessments due to the design of the overall program (see Table 2D and 2E). The design is integrative in nature: HPE candidates start early in their curriculum in planning from unit plans to lesson plans and daily lesson plans. This is due in large part to the heavy field based series of courses that combine theory and practice starting in the junior year and are completely field based in the senior year. Thus, HPE candidates have multiple opportunities throughout the program to develop their skills in writing effective curriculum plans, unit plans, daily lesson plans, and IEP (Individual Education Plans). These plans are broad in scope across the P-12 curriculum in health, physical education, and adapted physical education. Each of the three assessments comprising planning is addressed below: Contextual Analysis and Rationale. Data from this key assessment show that 84% and 88% of the BSED and Non-T4 candidates, respectively, were very good or outstanding in writing a contextual analysis and rationale prior to student teaching. After the completion of the first half of student teaching HPE candidates had a 7% increase in the number of students obtaining a rating of very good and/or outstanding on the quality of their contextual analysis and rational for their teaching model selected. Over 91% of HPE candidates are proficient in writing a contextual analysis by the end of their course related experience in Block and Lesson Plans. Data from this key assessment show that 92% and 77% of the BSED and Non-T4 candidates, respectively, were very good or outstanding in writing block and lesson plans. The difference between these two groups reflects, in part the difference in the number of lesson plans developed, with the BSED candidates preparing a greater number of lesson plans than Non-T4 candidates in the respective classes. Consideration needs to be given to ways to increase opportunities for Non-T4 candidates to gain additional experience developing block and lesson plans. There was a 7% increase in the number of candidates obtaining very good and outstanding ratings in their block and lesson plans prior to student teaching and after student teaching. The extensive experience planning lessons full time for full classes of students has had a positive impact on the preparation of candidates in this area. Learning Goals and Objectives. Data from this key assessment show that 85% and 54% of BSED and Non-T4 candidates rate very good or outstanding in the writing of learning goals and objectives prior to student teaching. Examination by the HPE faculty needs to be given to the lower rating in this assessment by MEd Non-T4 candidates prior to student teaching. Performance in the very good and outstanding categories fell 11% after student teaching to 75%. The difference in the numbers of candidates obtaining ratings of very good and outstanding is reflective of three possible issues (a) failure to address goals and objectives in the affective domain, (b) failure to adjust the learning goals and objectives to match the lesson content and/or (c) failure to write objectives that were observable and measurable. The HPE faculty will address these issues by (a) examining how effectively we are teaching candidates to write observable and measurable goals and objectives to address all domains of learning and (b), making adjustments to the student teaching lesson plan assignment to better articulate the expectations for writing lesson plan goals and objectives.

Target for O3: Goal 3: Effects on P-12 Student learning

80% of HPE students should achieve a rating of 4 on the HPE Key Assessment Rubric equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Explanation of How Analysis of Student Learning is Used in the HPE Program Prior to student teaching, candidates complete a field-based course (KH 4520 for BSE, KH 7250 for Non-T4) that requires them to analyze their ability to positively impact P-12 students’ learning. All candidates in the program complete one (Non-T4) or two (BSE) instructional models project/s during student teaching. The models project is a comprehensive instructional unit that includes pre- and post- assessments of major learning outcomes for P-12 students. By comparing learning gains across the span of the unit, candidates determine and analyze how they impact the student learning. It is important to recognize the impact to the novice level of understanding and using assessments. In addition, the types, and amount of assessments chosen and used are linked to and differ for by the type of instructional mode selected and the anticipated outcomes for that model. Rubric for Scoring Analysis of Student Learning Unsuccessful 1 point Needs Improvement 2 points Satisfactory 3 points Very Good 4 points Outstanding 5 points Instruction is based on personal agenda or interests of the teacher. Instruction is based on a preset agenda rather than by sampling student learning Teaching candidate can correctly interpret whether students were successful in meeting learning goals in the unit. Interests of post assessment correctly Alters block plan based on results from selected assessments. Changes in lesson emphasis are based on assessment results. Alters block plan based on results from daily assessments. Changes in lesson emphasis are based on assessment results. Analysis of Findings of Key Assessment #5

Effects on P-12 Student Learning KH 4520 was the first class students were required to conduct an analysis of student learning. A total of 64% of candidates scored very good or outstanding on their ability to demonstrate their impact on student learning (see Table 2G). KH 7250 serves as the first class in which graduate HPE non-T4 candidates completed this same assignment. Here to, 65% of candidates received a score of very good or outstanding (see Table 2G). HPE candidates completed an analysis of student learning in KH 4710 as part of their student teaching requirements. At this time, 41% of candidates received a score of very good or outstanding. This is down 23% from KH 4520 and KH7250. After analyzing the scores for students in KH 4710 it was determined that the decrease on scores could be due to several factors: KH 4520 had one evaluator, the course instructor, while KH 4710 had 4-6 evaluators (all faculty involved in student teacher supervision). The faculty has begun to take efforts to ensure reliability among raters by working in pairs to collaboratively discuss and score candidate’s projects prior to scoring projects independently. While the content of the assignments between KH 4520 and KH
4710 is similar, it is not the exact same assignment. Similarly, the expectations for the two courses may have differed as students are expected to have had previous experience with the assignment by the time they get to KH 4710. KH 4520 tends to be the only course students are enrolled in during the 4 weeks of this block. Thus, students can dedicate full time effort to the workload for this course. While students also complete KH 4710 as the only class that semester, it is 7-8 weeks long and the assignments completed as part of this course are done in conjunction with the responsibilities required of full time teaching. It is possible that this assignment, along with many other requirements of full time student teaching, may have lessened the candidate's attention on the evaluation of student learning thereby reducing the amount of effort and importance placed on this component of the project. It is also likely that candidates found themselves with limited time and other resources to gather high quality data on student learning, due to the many constraints found in physical education school settings (e.g. large classes, shortage of time, inadequate equipment, school system's schedule for standardized testing).

M 4: Goal 4: Clinical Practice (O: 4)
The key assessment for this goal and objective include lesson reflections. As part of their requirement in KH 4710 (student teaching), GSU students are required to complete several different types of reflection assignments. These assignments are both incorporated into the models project and extend beyond the models project. Students have to complete a written reflection for each lesson plan they complete during student teaching, including the lessons taught as part of their models project. GSU students also have to write a final reflection paper summarizing what they learned about themselves as teachers and what they would do differently. The HPE key assessment rubric is used by all faculty to evaluate student's reflection papers.

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

Target for O4: Goal 4: Clinical Practice

80% of HPE students should achieve a rating of 4 on the HPE Key Assessment Rubric equating to a qualitative rating of very good/outstanding.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Explanation of How Lesson Reflections are Used in the HPE Program Lesson reflections are used to determine the degree to which candidates: (a) develop an ability to engage in self-evaluation in assessing strengths as well as areas of need; (b) provide reexamination of personal goals and values in view of the complex demands of teaching and (c) analyze and assess personal characteristics related to teaching (e.g., perception of self and others, classroom behaviors, attitudes about children/teens and teaching, knowledge and skills), which are deemed prerequisite for becoming a successful teacher. Rubric for Scoring Lesson Reflections Unsatisfactory 1 point Needs Improvement 2 points Satisfactory 3 points Very Good 4 points Outstanding 5 points.
these assessments e.g., goals and objectives, has been used, where appropriate and relevant to adjust assignment directions and the grading rubric for the models project conducted during the second half of student teaching this Spring 2011. Changes planned for the preparation program. The current plan is to maintain the assignment selection and to review the expectations and directions for each assignment to ensure candidates are given clear guidelines. The HPE faculty will continue to work on a content matrix for the MEd program including the non-T4 candidates to ensure candidates across the two programs are gaining similar quality and quantity experiences. The content matrix will help ensure improvements of both HPE candidate performance and the preparation program in general. To this end, efforts are currently underway to revise the MEd non-T4 program to include a full 16 weeks of full time student teaching in place of the current 8 weeks of student teaching. Non-T4 candidates, who are not currently employed by a school district, will do two student teaching placements at the elementary and middle or high school, similar to that done by BSEd candidates. Several changes for the BSEd program go in effect Fall 2011 which are anticipated to improve candidate performance in the areas of pedagogical knowledge and skills. These changes include: (a) moving KH 3420 to the fall semester to be taught with KH 3200, (b) having KH 3020, 3030, and 3040 taught by full time HPE faculty, and (c) having teacher education requirements completed prior to taking courses in area G. Lastly, the HPE faculty plan to maintain and monitor the disposition data yearly to maintain current levels and will implement PDP’s where necessary to help candidates improve their performance in this area. Impact on Student Learning Summary of principal findings. Data for this assessment are taken from an instructional models project, a major unit involving planning, teaching and assessing student learning. HPE candidates scored well on this assessment with 91% of candidates obtaining a rating of satisfactory, very good or outstanding at the end of student teaching suggesting that candidates are able to alter their plans based on results from daily assessments. Steps taken to use information from assessments. Any immediate action with regard to this assessment would have had negative and detrimental effects on the performance of candidates currently in their second half of student teaching. Steps to use this information going forward are outlined below. Changes planned for the preparation program. While the assignment itself is a meaningful exercise in combining planning, teaching and assessment, the HPE faculty will have to revisit the expectations for this assignment as well as the explanations for project completion to ensure that candidates demonstrate their best and most thorough work and to better evaluate the impact on student learning. Additionally, the expectations for assessing P-12 student learning must be reviewed to better reflect the real constraints of teaching physical education in schools.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: The HPE faculty as a group are responsible for ensuring the goals and objectives are met and the recommended changes are put in place.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance
See description of the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance discussed in the Planned section.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since last years assessment reports, the HPE program has made the following changes: 1. We created a document revising goals and specific measurable objectives for HPE initial teacher education certification students 2. We linked key assessments from two courses to each of the goals and objectives (these two courses were in large part dictated by NCATE. Faculty had to choose a course prior to student teaching and then at the end of the program). 3. We developed a rubric to evaluate each key assessment (the 5 point scale was a requirement of the COE). These changes were made to better link and illustrate what we do in the HPE program to the NCATE report requirements for the College of Education. In the coming year, the HPE faculty will continue to revise the instructions and expectations for the respective key assessment assignments and adjust the criteria in the rubric to best reflect the expectations of the faculty.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data obtained illustrate the strength of the HPE program in terms of both its faculty and its content (see analysis reports provided). Changes and improvements are also outlined in the Use of Assessment Results report included and focus on both improving areas that are currently strong and strengthening areas that are weaker such as assessment of P-12 student learning.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
What have you learned from your assessment this year? What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Changes made from last years assessments include: 1. Revision of Goals and Objectives for the HPE program 2. Clearer identification of Key assessments to document student learning 3. Development of a rubric to assess student competence on key assessments Other curriculum type changes included: 1. Requiring HPE faculty to teach classes designed for HPE students 2. Better identification of content to be taught in selected HPE classes 3. Developed a cohort to better guide students through the HPE curriculum 4. Resequecing the order in which classes are required/offered

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Based on this years assessments, the HPE faculty have learned the following: 1. The assignment selection is meaningful and appropriate reflection of student learning and performance 2. We need to continue to monitor the order in which content classes are offered to ensure the best sequence and application of HPE material 3. We need to revisit the assignments and/or assignment requirements relating to Assessments of P-12 student learning to better ensure students understand not only how to assess but also how to report their findings and use the data to improve teaching.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 3:
The HPE faculty will work together as a group over the summer to revise selected assignments for implementation in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. Small improvements are expected in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. We would expect to see larger improvements within 2 years. This time lag is due to the fact that students entering Fall 2011 will have already completed an assessment class in which changes may be necessary to better prepare students for the requirements of student teaching assignments. The small changes in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 will be anticipated due to changes in the assignment instructions and expectations rather than in curricular knowledge.
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### Mission / Purpose
The Health and Physical Education Program seeks to develop competent leaders who provide and promote Health and Physical Education in P-12 schools.

### Goals

**G 1: should be committed to increasing student learning and development**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be committed to increasing student learning and development.

**G 2: should be able to use their content knowledge and expertise to help their students learn and grow**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to use their content knowledge and expertise to help their students learn and grow.

**G 3: should be able to work with colleagues in order to increase their content knowledge and appreciate the professional association**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to work with colleagues in order to increase their content knowledge and appreciate the professional associations as beneficial to their learning.

**G 4: should be able to manage and assess student learning**
Candidates that graduate from this program should be able to manage and assess student learning. Using assessment results, candidates should be able to make appropriate adjustments to their teaching to enhance student learning.

**G 5: should be able to reflects on & learns from professional experience**
After teaching, candidates should be able to reflect on their lessons, seeking ways to improve teaching effectiveness. Drawing from content and pedagogical knowledge, candidates should be able to continually seek to increase their knowledge and teaching effectiveness.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan (G: 2, 4) (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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional PriorityAssociations**
2 Student promotion and progression

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

**SLO 4: should be able to plan and teach using a variety of HPE instructional models (G: 1, 2) (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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2 Student promotion and progression
Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

SLO 5: should be able to conduct research & synthesize the findings in a written document (G: 3) (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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

Strategic Plan Associations

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: should be able to demonstrate the ability to teach, reflect, and make appropriate modifications for improving teaching (G: 1, 2, 4, 5) (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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

O/O 3: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers (G: 3, 5) (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.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: KH 7240 Unit plan (O: 1)

Students are required to plan a unit of instruction. The plan should contain the teaching settings, 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

75% of our students met the achievement target on the original KH 7240 indicator.
### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
In Sp 2011 the model project portion of the course was 40 points. Student needed to score at least 30 points in order to be placed within the established target of 75% on this particular item. All 10 students enrolled in this class in Sp 2010 scored higher than 30 points on this assignment. Therefore, target was met.

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
In summer 2011 we had 9 students enrolled in EDUC 8360. The major supervision project was the live supervision project (worth 30 points). I had 5 students that earned 25 points and higher on this assignment and 4 others that earned anywhere between 20 and 24 points. Making this semester as 5 out of 9 students that met the 75% target that was set.

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
80% of our MED program completers scored at least 30 out of the 40 available points on the KH 7250 models project assignment.

### 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.

### 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
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. Gurvitch (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. Gurvitch
Additional Resources: none

Refine supervision project
I will go back to the course assignment and refine the supervision assignment to reflect a better supervision project that allows more students to be successful in completing it.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Project to demonstrate supervision competence | Outcome/Objective: should be able to systematically supervise other teachers

Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Lund
Additional Resources: none
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Mission / Purpose
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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.

Goals
**G 1: Provide CAHME specified competency areas**
Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical and medical issues affecting health care organizations.

**G 3: Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment**
This relates to the 1st domain of the HLA competency model

**G 2: Business skills and knowledge**
This relates to the 2nd domain of the HLA competency model

**G 5: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills**
This is the 3rd domain of our hybrid HLA competency model

**G 4: Develop leadership knowledge and skills**
This is the 4th domain of our hybrid HLA competency model

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas (M: 1, 2, 9)**
Normal 0 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.

**SLO 2: Competency in Business skills and knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Apply basic and complex business analyses to the healthcare sector. Seven subcompetency areas are identified.

**SLO 3: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment (M: 2)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The ability to describe components of the healthcare sector and their relationships, and the ability to explain the implications of those relationships for leadership and management. Nine specific subcompetency areas are identified.

**SLO 4: Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills (M: 2)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Competency in areas of 1) Communication, both oral and written; 2) motivating and empowering others; 3) group participation and leadership; 4) change management; 5) physician and other clinical relationships

**SLO 5: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills (M: 2)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Competency in the areas of 1) self-awareness and confidence; 2) self regulation and personal responsibility; 3) honesty and integrity; 4) public service; 5) life-long learning.

**SLO 6: Develop real world experience in the HA field (M: 2, 6, 7)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 One of only 6 CAHME accredited programs in the U.S. providing healthcare management administrative residency program.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: GPA of each HA student (O: 1)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 GPA of each HA graduate student
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Provide CAHME specified competencies areas**
minimum 3.0, with 90% exceeding 3.3

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
95 percent of HA students met the target.

**M 2: % CAHME educational content areas provided (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 % 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.**
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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**
Normal 0 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**

| 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, internshp, 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:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Student evaluation of H.A. program | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
**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. HA has further refined our competency model for our CAHME accreditation. It consists of 4 domains, 26 competencies, and about 80 benchmarks for these competencies. AY 11-12 is our self-study year. A capstone case course HA 8680 is being implemented MayMester 2012

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

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

- **Measure:** % CAHME educational content areas provided | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills
- **Measure:** Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** GPA of each HA student | **Outcome/Objective:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2010 target for CAHME competencies in IHA.
Marketing of MHA and MSHA program

Many potential students are not aware of the MBA, PMBA and MS programs at GSU.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: % CAHME educational content areas provided | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment
- Measure: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment
- Measure: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment
- Measure: Student evaluation of H.A. program | Outcome/Objective: Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment

Projected Completion Date: 07/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
NA

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

HA has further refined our competency model for our CAHME accreditation. It consists of 4 domains, 26 competencies, and about 80 benchmarks for these competencies. AY 11-12 is our self-study year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on our assessment findings, particularly our HA Advisory Board and preceptors, we have planned for our curriculum a 3 semester hour capstone case course - HA 8680. Concomitantly, we have reduced the residency requirement by 3 semester hours.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Based on our assessment findings, particularly our HA Advisory Board and preceptors, we have planned for our curriculum a 3 semester hour capstone case course - HA 8680. Concomitantly, we have reduced the residency requirement by 3 semester hours.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Based on our assessment findings, particularly our HA Advisory Board and preceptors, we have planned for our curriculum a 3 semester hour capstone case course - HA 8680. Concomitantly, we have reduced the residency requirement by 3 semester hours.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

HA has further refined our competency model for our CAHME accreditation. It consists of 4 domains, 26 competencies, and about 80 benchmarks for these competencies. AY 11-12 is our self-study year. Based on our assessment findings, particularly our HA Advisory Board and preceptors, we have planned for our curriculum a 3 semester hour capstone case course - HA 8680. Concomitantly, we have reduced the residency requirement by 3 semester hours.

Georgia State University
### 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 1: Knowledge of Research Techniques**
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are entry-level researchers who have knowledge of research techniques needed to interpret and conduct nutrition research.

**G 2: Effective Communication Skills**
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are highly effective educators whose communication skills are appropriate for advanced practitioners in the field of nutrition/dietetics.

**G 3: Advanced Knowledge of Nutrition**
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are informed practitioners who have advanced knowledge of nutrition needed to meet the needs of clients and patients.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Candidates demonstrate entry-level competence in the design, interpretation, and ethical conduct of nutrition research.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Effective Oral and Written Communication Skills Appropriate to Field of Nutrition/Dietetics (M: 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 2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Candidates demonstrate technical and scientific oral and written communication skills through the use of current and emerging technologies to enhance the practice and delivery of nutrition care in a professional and ethical manner.

**SLO 3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes (G: 3) (M: 3, 4)**
Candidates will comprehend the interrelationships between macro- and micronutrient intakes as they impact human health in normal and disease states.

**SLO 4: Design, Interpret, and Conduct Ethical Research (M: 6)**
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.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 10: Graduates Develop Competencies for More Advanced Study (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: Research Proposal Assignment (O: 1)**
SNHP 6000 (Research Methods for Health Professionals) – Research Proposal Assignment
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research**
Of the total points available, 25% of students will receive a score of >90% and 75% of students will receive a score of >80%

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
22 of 22 students (100%) scored >90%

**M 2: Research Presentation (O: 2)**
NUTR 6012 (Orientation to Practice) – Research Presentation
### Target for O2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

Eighty percent of student groups will receive an evaluation of “exceeds expectations” or “meets/exceeds expectations” on all presentation evaluation criteria by the majority of the evaluators.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

3 of 5 groups (60%) received an evaluation of exceeds or meets/exceeds expectations on all presentation criteria by the majority of evaluators.

### M 3: Macronutrients Final Exam (O: 3)

NUTR 6104 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Macronutrients) – Final Exam

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

**Target for O3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes**

Of the total points available on the exam, 25% of students will score >90% and 75% will score >80%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

3 of 5 groups (60%) received an evaluation of exceeds or meets/exceeds expectations on all presentation criteria by the majority of evaluators.

### M 4: Macronutrients Quizzes (O: 3)

NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Macronutrients) – Five quizzes are given during the semester

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

**Target for O3: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes**

Of the total points available on the quizzes, 10% of students will score >90% and 50% will score >80%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

4 of 13 students (30%) scored >90%; 19 of 13 students (23%) scored >80%.

### M 6: Thesis Proposal Evaluation (O: 4)

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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students involved in thesis research must successfully complete the CITI Training including the Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research Course 1., Basic Course module.

### M 8: Portfolio Evaluation (O: 2)

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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students are evaluated by a minimum of 2 faculty members to ensure competence in the areas of written communication skills appropriate to the field of nutrition and dietetics. Students in the portfolio in the past year have all met the proficiency goal.

### M 12: Successful Admission into Advanced Study Degree Program (O: 10)

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% .......

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Indeed 85%
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Additional Reviewers and Criteria**

Only 3 faculty reviewers were available to evaluate the students’ presentations. A greater number of reviewers will be recruited in the future. An additional criteria (response to audience questions) will be added to the evaluation form to evaluate understanding of the project and ability to provide a response.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Research Presentation | **Outcome/Objective:** Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2012

**Assignment Change**

The Research Proposal Assignment will be changed from a group project to an individual project to ensure that all students gain experience with all components of the research proposal process.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Research Proposal Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:** Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011

**Continue to Monitor**

This is a new measure. NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition - Micronutrients) is a required and very challenging course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Macronutrients Final Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

The volume of new scientific information being created in the field of nutrition and dietetics is constantly expanding. It is impossible in the context of a masters degree program to provide students with all of the information currently in the field. Therefore, we have accepted the idea that it is important to help students understand how to access, evaluate, and use this constantly evolving new information in nutrition practice settings.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

All faculty teaching graduate courses have incorporated writing assignments into the required curriculum. All double listed courses (undergraduate/graduate) have been evaluated to assure that the graduate students in the class have higher level writing expectations than the undergraduate students. These activities all support the goal of improving writing skills in our graduate students.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

At least 2 faculty members, including our graduate program director (Dr. Anita Nucci), attended workshops offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning. The information that they acquired at these workshops have been shared with the nutrition faculty as a whole.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?**

We continue to emphasize the importance of writing skills throughout our graduate curriculum, and continue to look for ways to help graduate students achieve ever higher levels of writing competence. Students, particularly those from foreign countries, who have poor writing skills are increasingly being referred to the English as a Second Language (ESL) program to help assure graduate level writing competence prior to graduation.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year

Students have written business plans with the Sweet Auburn Market to improve their marketing strategy and with the Student Center to expand the lactation facilities on campus. The Division of Nutrition is now working with the GSU Child Development Center (CDC) to assist with meeting the national nutrition benchmarks for child care facilities. Nurse Practitioners from the Emory Children’s Center (ECC) Developmental Progress Clinic approached the Division of Nutrition to request assistance with nutrition assessment strategies for their population. Students began supervised practice experience at the ECC in May 2011 and a student will begin thesis work with the ECC in fall 2011.

Challenges for Next Year

Three new faculty will be joining the Division of Nutrition in fall 2011, as replacements for existing faculty lines. An additional (4th) faculty position will also be added with 2CI funding in the area of obesity research. These faculty will need to be oriented to the policies and procedures related to the division and students as well as to courses related to their areas of interest.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes

None.

Modifications in Measurement Methods

We continue to incorporate new standards of professional practice from the American Dietetic Association into the supervised practice syllabi (e.g. long-term care), which is an integral part of our graduate coordinated program in dietetics.

University-wide Committee Participation

Graduate faculty are active on the Senate and on other university committees including Administrator Evaluation, Search committees, Radiation Safety, and Biological Safety.

Publications and Presentations

Both faculty and students have had numerous refereed journal publications and presentations at scientific meetings.

International Activities

Several faculty (Dr. Vijay Ganji, Dr. Dan Benardot, Dr. Anita Nucci) have given presentations at international conferences. Two students completed a supervised practice rotation in India. The students observed traditional medicine practices for 2 weeks and then worked with a physician assisting with nutrition assessments for an additional 2 weeks. Dr. Murugi Ndirangu continues to conduct research on HIV and food security in Kenya.

Contributions to Student Retention

We have a remarkably high rate of student retention in the graduate program. Coordinated Program graduate students have the opportunity to have supervised practice experiences in one or more areas of personal interest.

Service to the External Community

Faculty hold numerous committee positions in professional organizations including The American Dietetic Association, The Georgia Dietetic Association, The American College of Sports Medicine, The United States Olympic Committee, U.S. Figure Skating, The national Center for Human Performance and The American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. Dr. Jana Kicklighter served as a leader for the 2011 Future Connections Summit on Dietetic Practice, Credentialing, and Education. Barbara Hopkins is now a site reviewer for the Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE) and is working with the Commission on Dietetic Registration (CDR) as a test writer. Barbara Hopkins is also the incoming President Elect of the Georgia Dietetic Association (GADA).
Cathy McCarroll was awarded the Outstanding Dietitian of the Year and is the Chair of the nominating committee for GADA. Dan Benardot serves on the Sports Medicine and Sports Science Committee of US Figure Skating.

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2010-2011 History Assessment of Core**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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.

**SLO 2: Historiography**
Students, knowing that History entails the critical interpretation of data, demonstrate awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same data.

**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

**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

**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.

**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.

### 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.
### 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:** Finished
- **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**

**2010-2011 History BA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Description: The Department of History at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge through the study of various aspects of humanity’s recorded past. Some members of the department explore the rise and fall of empires, while others describe the everyday lives of men and women. The department is interested in every period of the past and all parts of the world. The department also seeks to advance knowledge by examining the principles and theories that influence the...
writing of history, seeking to understand the forces that have structured human life and the ideas that have shaped the way people perceive and experience their worlds. The department is concerned with change and continuity within societies, and interactions among cultures. The department pays particular attention to the effect of perspectives and values because the discipline of history involves the interpretation of findings, not just the collection of facts. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2009-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008

### Goals

**G 1: Professional skills and values**
The history department works to ensure that its majors know how to access, use, and evaluate various kinds of historical evidence to determine relative worth, while teaching students professional values regarding fidelity to sources and how to build upon the scholarship of others.

**G 2: Interdisciplinary and Comparative Perspectives**
The history department is committed to helping students develop an awareness of historiography -- that is differing interpretations or debates over particular historical questions -- while encouraging interdisciplinary and comparative approaches to the past.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Professional Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**
The history student is able to evaluate the relative worth of different types of evidence (textual, material, media, oral, visual, quantitative and statistical); to listen to and learn from others while exchanging information and ideas; to evaluate and critique different historical perspectives and explanations; to present arguments persuasively within a conversational setting as well as a written format; and to write clearly, economically, imaginatively and persuasively about historical facts, issues, and interpretations. The history student is able to use effectively sources that come from libraries, archives, and oral interviews, and to document sources properly while demonstrating computer skills appropriate to the discipline.

**SLO 2: Historiography (G: 2) (M: 1)**
The history student, knowing that history asks questions of evidence, can demonstrate an awareness of how differing questions result in conflicting interpretations of the same evidence over time.

**SLO 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness (G: 2) (M: 1)**
The history student understands the benefits of interdisciplinary approaches to studying the past by recognizing contributions from such fields as anthropology, archaeology, art history, economics, geography, literature, philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology and statistics.

**SLO 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective (G: 2) (M: 1)**
The history student is able to compare historical developments and problems across cultural and geographical boundaries, while appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.

**SLO 5: Professional Values (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Aware of the debt all historians have to the scholarship of others, the history student engages in historical research and discourse that maintains fidelity to evidence while being tolerant of alternative approaches to obtaining, interpreting, and applying historical knowledge.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: capstone course seminar paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

During 2011, the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee evaluated 18 final research papers written for the Department of History Capstone Course Hist 4990 taken from classes offered in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. The papers were evaluated on a 1-4 scale with 1 meaning no evidence of outcome, 2 meaning some evidence of outcome, 3 meaning met expectations, and 4 meaning exceeded expectations. Five Standard Learning Outcomes were assessed with 1LO being professional skills, 2LO being historiography, 3LO being interdisciplinary awareness, 4LO being comparative/global/transnational perspective, and 5LO being professional values. The results are listed under 2010-2011. For 2010, 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. Each paper was evaluated on a one to four scale for the five outcomes/objectives, with one meaning no evidence of this outcome, two meaning some evidence of the outcome but below expectations, three meaning met expectations, and four meaning exceeded expectations.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Professional Skills**
The department's target is for 70% of our graduating students to score three (met expectations) or four (exceeded expectations) in this area.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In the assessment of 1LO (professional skills), 13 out of 18 papers either met or exceeded expectations. The remaining 5 all showed some evidence. Therefore for 1LO, the department set a target of 70 percent of students either having met (#3) or exceeded (#4) this goal and with 13 out of 18 papers doing so (7 at #4 exceeded and 6 at #3 met), we've hit the target.

**Target for O2: Historiography**
The department's target for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
In the assessment of 2LO (historiography), 10 out of 18 papers either met or exceeded expectations. The remaining 8 all showed some evidence. Therefore the department set a target of 60 percent of students either having met (#3) or exceeded (#4) this goal and with 10 out of 18 papers doing so (3 at #4 exceeded and 7 at #3 met), we've just barely hit the target.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
In the assessment of 3LO (interdisciplinary), 10 out of 18 papers either met or exceeded expectations. Of the remaining 8, 7 showed some evidence but 1 showed none. Therefore for 3LO, the department set a target of 60 percent of students either having met (#3) or exceeded (#4) this goal and with 10 out of 18 papers doing so (6 at #4 exceeded and 4 at #3 met), we've just barely hit the target.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
In the assessment of 4LO (comparative/global/transnational), 9 out of 18 papers either met or exceeded expectations. Of the remaining 9, 7 showed some evidence but 2 showed none. Therefore for 4LO, the department set a target of 70 percent of students either having met (#3) or exceeded (#4) this goal and with 9 out of 18 papers doing so (4 at #4 exceeded and 5 at #3 met), we've fallen short of our target.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
In the assessment of 5LO (professional values), 16 out of 18 papers met or exceeded expectations with the remaining 2 showing some evidence of doing so. Therefore for 5LO, the department set a target of 70 percent of students either having met (#3) or exceeded (#4) this goal and with 16 out of 18 papers doing so (4 at #4 exceeded and 12 at #3 met), we've hit the target in the bull's eye.

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:** 03/2010
- **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:** 2008-2009
- **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

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

Re-evaluate assessment tool as appropriate measurement for desired outcome

While Hist 4900 is designed as the department's capstone course, it is set up as a research class whose subject is determined by the individual faculty member assigned to teach it each semester. The rough parameters of the course require the student to do work in primary sources and then write a research paper arguing an original thesis about a subject chosen through conversations between the student and the professor. The course and the paper's subject might or might not include a Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. Given the need to use archival sources in the Atlanta area, some professors design their Hist 4900 classes around American topics that do not engage Comparative/Global/Transnational themes, thereby making the subjects of the student papers from these classes poor products for assessing student understanding of a Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective. Consequently some other method of measurement needs to be developed or this Learning Outcome changed.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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: Histiography
The student shows awareness of existing arguments and historical literature – empirical, methodological, and theoretical – pertaining to a specific project or problem of historical research.

O/O 3: Interdisciplinary Awareness
The student is aware of the relations between historical research/writing and work in the other disciplines, especially those in the humanities and social sciences, and is able to employ theories and methods from these disciplines where appropriate to enrich historical research/writing.

O/O 4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspectives
The student can situate historical developments/problems across cultural/geographical boundaries, appreciating how temporal, cultural, and spatial dimensions affect historical responses.

O/O 5: Professional Values
Students must become aware of and internalize professional standards for research, argumentation, and use of secondary works. This involves, among other questions, defining and recognizing plagiarism and the unattributed use of the work of colleagues and students.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assessment Instrument (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

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

General Examinations
During academic year 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
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the program of graduate education in History of Georgia State University is to prepare students at the PhD level for professional activities in History and related fields. This involves not only the mechanics of research, teaching, and writing but developing such personal qualities as accuracy, honesty, thoroughness, and evenhandedness. The Department demands active learning, involving the student in reading and participation in seminars, in research and analysis of primary sources, and in the presentation of the resulting findings in written and verbal formats that adhere to recognized professional standards. Graduates of GSU graduate History program are prepared not only to be competent historians and teachers but also to function successfully in the larger community, both within and outside the academy.

Goals
G 1: Prepare students to research, write and teach history
G 2: Learning
Assist students in becoming active, interdisciplinary learners
G 3: Academic Honesty and Integrity
Nuture in students the qualities of honesty and accuracy
G 4: Global Perspective
Help students understand the links between history and the larger world

Outcomes/Objectives
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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The end of Spring semester 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Committee

---

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

### Mission / Purpose

What do students need to learn to prepare for careers in the hospitality field? Students are expected to understand the business processes essential to profitable, sustainable operations. Every hospitality course incorporates quality service principles including service to internal and external stakeholders and continuous improvement principles. Because this is a labor-intensive industry, there is a dedicated Hospitality Human Resources course and HR processes are covered in most hospitality courses (Hospitality Law - employment law; Cost Control and Financial Analysis - employee productivity; for example). Every hospitality course incorporates ethical decision-making and business practices. Technology is also a fundamental in the courses in terms of understanding how technology is used in any industry segment from hotels to restaurants to venues and event management. Technology applications that support the delivery of quality service are the focus. Marketing in the hospitality curriculum focuses on marketing principles for services rather than tangible goods. Industry specific courses (hotel management, restaurant management, event management, private club management, tradeshows and meetings management, for example) cover the trends and issues of that segment as well or organizational structure, functional areas, metrics used and service standards. 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.

Prior feedback on assessment reports has stated that the reports try to cover too much and are difficult to understand. The focus of the 2010-2011 report will relate to three overall, general programmatic goals and the outcomes that are directly connected to these goals. These outcomes are linked to the School of Hospitality’s senior-level courses, HADM 4100 (Cost Control and Financial Analysis) and HADM 4800 (Hospitality Strategic Management.) Since the lower-level courses are pre-requisites to HADM 4100 and HADM 4800, it is logical to expect the lower-level outcomes will have been achieved and will be built upon in HADM 4100 and HADM 4800. HADM 4100 and HADM 4800 require a composite of knowledge and skills reflecting the other five hospitality courses.

**PLEASE NOTE:** I have tried repeatedly to delete the measures of 4, 5 and 6 and have not been successful.

### Goals

**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 1: 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: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**

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 2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3)**

Students will be able to apply concepts and principles of financial analysis including cost control techniques and evaluate their
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Projects (O: 1, 2)

Students are assigned an industry-based project in "Hospitality Strategic Management" (HADM 4800). This project is designed to integrate key competencies across the major functional business areas including human resources, law, marketing, finance and operations. HADM 4800 has a prerequisite of completing 12 hours in hospitality courses so the expectation is that students have the foundation to strategically think and plan in a real-world business environment. The project for fall 2010, which will be what is included in this assessment, involved an analysis of the vacating Commerce Club space. Student groups did several walk-throughs of the space, analyzed the room dimensions and set-up capacities, reviewed financial records and did a competitive analysis of the area. The groups did a formal presentation at the end of the semester including a SWOT analysis of the space, environmental scanning, recommendations for short-term and long-term use. The expectation was that the feasibility pre-work was clearly tied to the resulting SWOT and environmental analysis and the recommendations including cost analysis.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Apply strategic management principles in hospitality operations

80% of the class will demonstrate understanding of the components of strategic planning including a comprehensive analysis of current business performance and projections for the future based on factual data.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Approximately 88% of the students in the course demonstrated the application of business analysis skills in evaluating the current performance of the operation (the Commerce Club), the changing operating environment (appeal of a club/restaurant/event venue in this section of downtown), competition, demographic changes of target customers/guests. This information was effectively used in formulating a strategic plan, including designated components, that was incorporated into presentations to the University on possible uses for the space.

Target for O2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results

At least 80% of the students will incorporate financial analysis components into the strategic planning process including present and future data.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Approximately 85% of the students demonstrated the ability to analyze the financial performance of the involved operation and make sound fiscal recommendations for future uses of the space.

M 3: Business Computerized Simulation (O: 2)

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 O2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results

75% of the class will demonstrate application of the material on financial analysis and cost control in effectively operating the simulated restaurant and achieving profitability or demonstrating analytical skills of how to turn their unprofitable restaurant into a profitable operation. The simulation allows the tracking of student groups who achieved profitability and those who operated restaurants who were not profitable. The corresponding written analyses of what improvements/corrections to make are equally as important.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In Spring 2011, the semester targeted for assessment for this course 80% of the class demonstrated the application of analytical skills in finance and cost control with the simulated restaurant project. This included the groups who achieved profitable results as well as those who identified what needed to change to turn their operation into a profitable one.

M 4: Work Experience Portfolio

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

M 5: Employer Evaluation of Work Experience

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
M 6: Food Safety/Sanitation Certification

HADM 3401/3402 (Food Production Lab) requires that all students complete a standardized food safety/sanitation exam during the semester of that course.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

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 2011 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 2012.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
- 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: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Debby Cannon

Curriculum Review Process
During the 2011/2012 academic year, 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. These topics were discussed at the annual hospitality faculty retreat on 8/19/11 but a more in-depth and longer session is needed.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Debby Cannon to facilitate but all faculty would be involved.

Hospitality Business Simulation
The business simulation exercise used in HADM 4100 will be evaluated and most likely replaced with a newer, more industry-based version. The professor currently teaching HADM 4100 will retire in June 2012 so the new faculty member will be involved in this decision.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Business Computerized Simulation
  - Outcome/Objective: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Dave Pavesic

Utilization of Smith Travel Research Data
Smith Travel Research data has been purchased to be incorporated into specific hospitality courses including HADM 3010, HADM 3310 and HADM 4100. Faculty will be trained in how to use these data and integration into courses will start fall 2011 and will expand in spring 2012.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: Medium
- Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Diana Barber, Paul Breslin, Soon-Ho Kim

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

There have been no significant changes in the assessment process from last year’s report. We did hold more meetings and had more discussions between faculty teaching different sections of the same course to build more consistency in course content.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The data indicate that our majors do not perform as well in quantitative courses. This was reflected in HADM 4100 - Cost Control and Financial Analysis. The School purchased an excellent learning resource this past spring from Smith Travel Research (STR). It provides extensive hotel quantitative data (average rates, occupancies, RevPar, etc.) that can be incorporated into a variety of hospitality courses. The faculty have discussed using the STR data in courses that are taken prior to HADM 4100 in order to start building the quantitative knowledge base. STR data will be used in HADM 3010 (Perspectives of the Hospitality Industry - a required course) as well as HADM 3310 (Hotel Management, an elective) as well as HADM 4100.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
1) More meetings between faculty teaching different sections of the same course to develop more consistent learning objectives and course content.
2) Review of syllabi to determine necessary course content overlap, unnecessary overlaps and gaps in content.
3) Identification of teaching resources such as the data-based Smith Travel Research tools to use in classes. Determination that overlap is needed for quantitative knowledge base between HADM 3010, HADM 3310 and HADM 4100.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
1. Similar to the previous year in terms of quantitative courses.
2. Still issues with writing skills and great variance between written assignments within and between different courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
1) Revamping some of the quantitative-based course content to introduce in earlier courses, i.e. HADM 3010.
2) Purchase and initiation of data-based teaching tools from Smith Travel Research.
3) Introducing multi-step writing processes for projects and lengthy assignments including submitting the title and having it approved, submitting topic outline, submitting annotated outline, submitting draft of paper, submitting final paper. This will help structure written projects and will also eliminate any possible cheating or purchasing of papers.
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 (G: 4) (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.

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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
62% of HR/MS 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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
66% of MS/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) in inadequate 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
62% of MS/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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
66% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

71% of MS/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 Falls 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

64% of HR/MS 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

52% of MS/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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Faculty rating of 1.6/3.0 51% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**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: 1. In MGS 8390 add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering. 2. In MGS 8390 provide a written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.
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.

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.

Added Case Example
Provide sample of case analysis with issues, laws, and conclusions. Evaluate after next offering.

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.

Compensation Class Content Change
Add one hour class time to review competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.
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)

Add language skills for international students
Continue with action plan items from last year, but in addition refer international students with language problems to the University assistance office for additional training. Revisit and reevaluate to see if training affects student performance in compensation.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation | Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design

Implementation Description: Refer students who need additional language skills to University Center for help.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All HR instructors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Check coverage of topics in all HR core classes
Ensure job analysis and job description are taught in all HR core classes and covered at a minimum of one hour in each class. Give students more practice in all classes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Job Analysis and Description | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment

Implementation Description: Check coverage of topics in all HR core classes.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All core course instructors.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue emphasis on topic in MGS 8360
Continue emphasis on topic in MGS 8360. Since several different instructors have taught the course recently, not all are including the topic. Check syllabi to ensure coverage.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Behavioral Interview Questions | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment

Implementation Description: Check coverage of topic across instructors to be sure it is being emphasized in all classes.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of MGS 8360
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue in-class exercises
Continue to use in-class exercises and critiques of policy statements written in class. Give immediate feedback and opportunity for correction and additions.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements | Outcome/Objective: Employment Law

Implementation Description: Continue to use in-class rewrite exercise on policy statement formulation.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors in all core HR classes.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Expand use of components to all core HR classes
Reinforce performance measurement processes by including in all HR core classes and emphasizing usage and linkages to all aspects of HR in each class. Not all instructors are covering this topic in detail.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Help international students with language skills
Continue to apply CTW practices to the MGS 8320 course and work with international students and others who need basic language help. Refer students to University Center for help on basics. Continue to require rewriting in MGS 8320.

Increase class time on topic
Add 30 minutes to lecture on integrating components, including addition of short in-class activity.

Increase lecture time in MGS 8300 on performance management
Instructors in MGS 8300 will increase class lecture time by 30 minutes on performance management tools and techniques. The class time will be taken away from lecture materials that are adequately covered in the text.

Performance Management Improvement
Add 15 minutes to lecture in MGS 8300, evaluate results in the next cycle.

Provide individual feedback about behavioral interviewing
Students in MGS 8360 will be provided examples and in-class activities concerning selection measures, including behavioral interviews. Class time will be spent giving feedback to them about the quality and legality of their behavioral interview questions and related scoring system.
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Behavioral Interview Questions | **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehensive Employee Recruitment

**Implementation Description:** Instructor of MGS 8360 will prepare an in-class activity requiring students to design behavioral interview questions and a scoring system. Student work will be compared and class time used to critique student products.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of MGS 8360.

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Work from check sheet for Compensation projects**

Instructor of MGS 8390 will provide to students three weeks before due date a check sheet for compensation term projects (design of a compensation system). Class time will be spent reviewing the components and requirements.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

**Measure:** Integration of All Compensation Components | **Outcome/Objective:** Compensation System Design

**Implementation Description:** Instructor of MGS 8390 will prepare a check sheet for all items to be included and discussed in the term project (design of a compensation system). Students will work from this check list and items will be discussed in class.

**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of MGS 8390

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We included more PTI’s in our assessment processes. We adjusted class times and activities to better focus on our objectives rather than just trying to cover all the topics in class. We discussed at greater length how we might use some of the techniques used in CTW courses in our courses to help us achieve our objectives.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

We tried to steer students into elective courses that would help us reach our objectives instead of allowing them to take courses that are somewhat removed from the degree program (e.g., Personal Financial Planning). We adjusted class times and assignments to be sure that repetition and overlap was constructive and appropriate rather than wasteful. We set out plans to offer HR Field Study in the fall and discussed how we could best prepare students for that class in our other HR classes.

---
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**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.

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.

SLO 3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.

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.

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.

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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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

Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.
### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

### Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

### Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

### Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

### Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

### Findings 2010-2011 - 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.

### Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

### Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

### Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

### Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

### Findings 2010-2011 - 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.

### 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue to Monitor Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established in Cycle: 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status: In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: All faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings** |
| Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors. |
| 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 |
| Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development |
| Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning |
| 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 implement our add-on certificate program in online education. |
| 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 continue exploring the possibility of a certificate program in expectation that the state will approve a teaching certificate in instructional technology. |
| 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) |

| **Online Degree Program** |
| In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this degree program. |
| 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 |
Virtual Presentation of Exit Portfolio
Students create their exit portfolio and virtually present it to the instructional technology faculty and their peers

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
Implementation Description: Use of learning and communication resources such as Elluminate and uLearn.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Our students consistently demonstrate a high level of competency across all standards. In addition, the masters students exhibited a high proficiency in their coursework, portfolios, and comprehensive exams. These related to the action plans, i.e Revise Curriculum to Include Current Content and Continue to Monitor Curriculum.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
By the time students take the comprehensive exam and portfolio, as well as complete their internship, they have demonstrated that they are able to fuse together concepts gathered in the classes taken. They have also demonstrated that they have knowledge on how these concepts can be practically applied in a professional setting.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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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**2010-2011 Instructional Technology PhD**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose

The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

### 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

### 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.

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2</strong></td>
<td>Develops leadership for the profession</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates research expertise</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong></td>
<td>Engages in scholarship</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5</strong></td>
<td>Understands foundations of education</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6</strong></td>
<td>Develops a professional identity</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7</strong></td>
<td>Develops an extended knowledge base</td>
<td>100% of program completers met or exceeded 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>Description</th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O1</strong></td>
<td>Understands and uses technology</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O2</strong></td>
<td>Develops leadership for the profession</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates research expertise</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4</strong></td>
<td>Engages in scholarship</td>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Develops a professional identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Understands and uses technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Develops a professional identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students met or exceeded all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of Ph.D. students will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.
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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Target for O5: Understands foundations of education
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Engages in scholarship</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands foundations of education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Improve Post Completion Jobs

- **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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Increase student monitoring in order to improve graduation rates.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2012
- **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
- Measure: Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Monitor Standards
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 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.

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

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 | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: IT Unit
Additional Resources: Funding for Professional Development
Budget Amount Requested: $3,000.00 (recurring)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Seek External Funding
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
- Measure: Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
- Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Review Program Length
In order to improve time to completion rates and enhance the research skills and marketability of our graduates, we will review the entire Ph.D program with an eye to shortening it overall and including more research experience. Such a change is now possible thanks to recent revisions in college policy.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In-process.
Responsible Person/Group: All Faculty
Additional Resources: none
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements -** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment -** What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs -** What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection -** What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

At this time we have not made changes to the assessment process. Based on last years' findings our process is working efficiently. We will continue to assess in the same manner, but are considering program changes designed to enhance research competency and promote higher matriculation rates.

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

We increased the number of students graduating with their Ph.D. This was directly attributable to our plan for moving students more rapidly through the program and reducing attrition. We are on track to continue this pace for next year. Additionally we began transitioning to a cohort model for the Ph.D. program through once a year admission. This has the effect of 1.) making sure Ph.D. only classes are large enough to make given the university's current standards for class size, and 2), providing a more stable support group for students once they are in the program. We anticipate further revising the Ph.D. program to increase the emphasis on practical research experience and to continue to encourage students to make real and consistent progress toward degree completion.

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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**  
**2010-2011 International Business MS**  
*As of 12/13/2010 04:11 PM EST*  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

### Mission / Purpose

The MIB program is designed for individuals who aspire to organizational or entrepreneurial leadership and/or managerial positions across functional areas in firms with significant presence or activity in international markets. The primary objectives of the MIB program are to: develop an in-depth understanding of the international business environment, build capabilities to deal effectively in international markets, extend functional skills to deal with managerial issues in the global marketplace, demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, develop intercultural awareness and sensitivity, develop team skills to be contributing members of an effective global team, and complete an extended work experience outside of the student's native country.

### Goals

**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: 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 is 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 on 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 Gueldenzoph (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
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, 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)
I M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives I M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 2: Measure 1 (O: 1)
I M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 3: Measure 2 (O: 1)
I M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Mission / Purpose
The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University’s Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students’ oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors, about 840 are Journalism majors.

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)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity

#### SLO 7: Research and evaluate info. (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 3)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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: 1)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve

#### SLO 9: Critical Thinking Competency (M: 2)
Competency is assessed using standardized rubric. See document repository

#### SLO 9: Critically evaluate own/others’ work (G: 2, 3)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Writing Competency (O: 7, 8)
Used a rubric to measure students’ writing competence.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O8: Write correctly and clearly**

students will achieve 75% as calculated from the rubric.... they will score a minimum of 15 out of a 20 point rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
A total of 18 students in an upper-division writing course responded to the prompt “What is the biggest hurdle for writers trying to learn to write professionally?” Students averaged 79.7% based on rubric (15.94/20)

#### M 2: Critical Thinking Competency (O: 9)
Assessment based on Critical Thinking Rubric. See document repository
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O9: Critical Thinking Competency**

students will achieve 75% as calculated from the rubric.... they will score a minimum of 15 out of a 20 point rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Major papers by nine students in an upper-division media and society were assessed using the Critical Thinking Rubric. The average score was 15.11/20 or 75.5%

#### M 3: Research Competency (O: 7)
Assessment based on Research rubric. See document repository
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O7: Research and evaluate info.**
Students will achieve 75% as calculated from the rubric.... they will score a minimum of 15 out of a 20 point rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Assessment based on assignment in an upper-division research class. For the 15 students, the average score was 15.53. That is a 77.6% rate of success (15.53/20)

### 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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **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
- **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
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
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
Implementation Description: Midpoint of fall semester
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty

align outcomes with goals
Revise/increase number of goals to align all eleven learning outcomes with a goal.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
Implementation Description: Instructors will randomly select student work from several assignments for assessment
Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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. While oral communication skills often get the most attention in modern American society, the reality is that written communication is more common, more permanent, and more important. For this reason, we seek to produce law graduates who can communicate in clear written form with clients, the courts and the public. Generally, their written communications are intended to perform three distinct functions: (i) identify relevant legal issues; (ii) identify, explain and analyse the existing law dealing with such issues; (iii) predict resolution of the issues by applying the existing facts to the existing law, or propose legal solutions to deal with them in the future.

**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 take courses in specific areas of the law.

**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 issues by applying the existing facts to the existing law, or propose legal solutions to deal with them in the future.
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 uses the current law to argue for the position of the client the lawyer represents in a lawsuit. Students are assigned to represent one side or the other.

**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

---

**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 more modest goal is simply to say that students who do not achieve this proficiency will not pass RWA. In fact, there is a significant correlation between those students who do not pass RWA the first time (or at least make a C) and those who do not end up graduating from the College of Law. A significant number of students who are excluded for academic reasons at the end of their first year have either failed or done very poorly in RWA.

**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. Since that first experimental year, these methods have been incorporated into that professor's class, and they are being copied by other professors, as well.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Target for O1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing**

The goals of these writing intervention exercises are threefold. First, we want all students to become comfortable with practicing writing exercises. While the point of this practice is to succeed on examinations, such practice is good preparation for work as a practicing lawyer. Second, we want students to become comfortable with self-editing, so that they are capable of both writing good quality papers, but also improving upon them the second or later time around. Third, we want all students to write better final 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 O2: Basic proficiency in advocacy 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
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Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organization in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The Library Media Technology Program prepares students to serve as school library media specialists and information technologists in the Pre-K – 12 school environment. The focus is on administering media centers in modern school settings.

Goals

G 1: 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 teacher.

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 rationale 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

#### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

#### 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.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

#### M 4: Faculty Ratings (O: 4)

Faculty ratings of teacher-librarian candidates who have completed the program. Source of Evidence: STARS evaluation system.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

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

**Action Plan**

Maintain and monitor.

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

**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)

LMT Deactivation In-Progress
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently be deactivated, and students are no longer being accepted into the program. Department faculty are ensuring that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program. See attachments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In-Progress
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Department Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
NA

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.
**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.

**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 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.

**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.

**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

**M 2: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students (O: 1)**

Students will perform in high percentiles on the ETS standardized assessment exam that greatly exceed the percentiles of students in other majors and the RCB student body as a whole.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Student Performance**

Managerial Sciences students should significantly exceed the college-wide percentile in answering Management questions on the ETS field exam. MGS students should score in a higher percentile than students in all other majors in the RCB on Management questions on the ETS field exam.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Revision of MGS**
Managerial Sciences needs to expand and improve its measurements. New measures have to be able to better detect the sources of the disappointing performance that MGS is experiencing relative to other students who are not Management majors. The first step in this will be having the department assessment team attend the daylong assessment workshop that the College is sponsoring on Sept 19th. Subsequently, members of the department assessment team need to apply lessons from that session and quickly develop new measures and ways of measuring. Those measures will then be implemented in the department in the 2008-09 cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:**
  - Oct 15, 2008
  - Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
  - Responsible Person/Group: William C. Bogner

**Challenging Courses**
Evaluate the rigor and challenge of the Department's threshold course for majors, MGS 4000.

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

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
  - Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MGS Teaching Innovation Committee
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $100.00 (recurring)

**Emphasis on Management Skills**
Identify and communicate the value of a Managerial Sciences (MGS) Degree Program, in the context of linking academia to practical application. Gather data for the past 10 years on positions and starting salaries for students graduating with a MGS degree, segmented by career tracks. Track the understanding of the students of the importance of these courses by testing them pre- and post an informational workshop/seminar on MGS career tracks.

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

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
  - Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** The MGS Teaching Innovation Committee
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $100.00 (recurring)

**Improved Instructor Excellence**
The MGS Teaching Innovation Committee will conduct future workshops for full-time, part-time faculty, as well as Ph.D. students to facilitate, cultivate, and enable teaching excellence in the classroom. The goal is to engender a rich skill set that fosters a broad stakeholder perspective.

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

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Performance Relative to Other Schools | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance
  - Measure: Student Performance Relative to other RCB Students | Outcome/Objective: Student Performance

- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MGS Teaching Innovation Committee
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $100.00 (recurring)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Marketing BBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Department of Marketing at Georgia State University at the BBA level is to effectively prepare students for entry level positions in marketing, sales and related fields by helping them acquire the skills they need to: Analyze marketing problems and situations. Develop effective marketing strategies and tactics Clearly communicate their analyses and recommendations.

**Goals**

**G 1: Analysis of Marketing Situations/Problems**
Students will be able to accurately describe and analyze marketplace situations, key issues, problems and decisions facing marketing
Students will be able to accurately describe and analyze marketplace situations, key issues, problems and decisions facing marketing organizations.

**G 2: Applying Quantitative Tools**
Students will be proficient in the use of standard marketing metric tools employed by marketing organizations for situation analyses and development of marketing strategy and tactics.

**G 3: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving**
Students will exhibit critical thinking skills in the process of solving marketing problems and in arriving at logical and feasible solutions/recommendations for marketing organizations.

**G 4: Formulate Marketing Strategy and Tactics**
Students will be able to develop useful and feasible strategies and tactics to address specific marketing situations/problems using the marketing mix.

**G 5: Communication Skills**
Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively in written and oral form.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Identify key marketing problems (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to identify key problems facing a marketing organization.

**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.

### 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.

**O/O 4: Clear concise writing (G: 5) (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate proficiency at clear, logical, business-like writing.

**O/O 5: Oral communication (G: 5) (M: 2)**
Students will be able to engage in clear, meaningful discussion of marketing problems and issues.

### 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’ analyses 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.

**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. For the 2010-2011 Reporting Period Total possible points for this item = 15. Target score average = 12.75

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The average score on this measure was 12.75 out of 15 possible points. This was 85%, of total possible points. Out of 28 usable case studies: 9 students were below target 4 students were at target 15 were above target

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
Average score on this measure was 14 out of 20 points. 3 scores were above the target 0 scores were at the target 25 scores were 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

The average on this item was 78% 9 scores (32%) were above target 5 scores (17.8%) were at target. 14 scores (50%) were below target.

Target for O4: Clear concise writing

A score of 85/100 on items that assess clear, concise writing. Total possible points = 20. Target score is 17.5/20 Logical, coherent structure Concise and accurate language Minimum of spelling and usage errors Well composed tables and graphs (if applicable)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

The average on this item was 84% 14 scores (50%) were above target. 7 scores (25%) were below target. 7 scores (25%) were below target.

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 points and then develops a percentage score for each student. This percentage is then multiplied by the total possible semester points (in this case 300). This becomes the contribution grade for the student for that semester. Percent of total contribution points is the measure we are using for this assessment.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O5: Oral communication

Average of 85/100 total points for in class case discussion.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

On this measure, students, as a group, fell below target with an average score of 79.7. The distribution on this measure was almost perfectly bimodal with 14 students scoring above the target of 85% and 14 students scoring below the target, and 2 students exactly at target. Thus, while the mean score fell below the target, the median score of 84.5 was at target. However, since our original criterion was the arithmetic average of 85% we must conclude that this objective was only partially met.

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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Department 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)

Continued Focus on Marketing Metrics
Our department is continuing its plans to place more emphasis on marketing metrics throughout the undergraduate curriculum. All courses are to include at least one case analysis that includes metrics. At this point, nearly all students in our capstone classes have taken Marketing Metrics prior to the capstone class.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** Case Analysis Write Up | **Outcome/Objective:** Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing.
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
**Additional Resources:** None

**Improve Case Discussion participation**
It is not clear what can be done to improve this measure. It is possible that this year's findings are an anomaly, since case discussion is a required part of the course. One of the instructors of our capstone class will be taking the Harvard Business School seminar on case discussion leadership this (fall) semester. We are hoping that this will lead to new ideas and improved techniques for encouraging case discussion.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** On-Hold
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Case Discussion | **Outcome/Objective:** Oral communication

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011
**Responsible Person/Group:** David Nasser
**Additional Resources:** None

**Increased Case Analysis in Curriculum**
We are implementing a plan to increase the use of case analysis throughout our undergraduate curriculum.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Case Analysis Write Up | **Outcome/Objective:** Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We made no substantive changes for 2010-2011. For 2011-2012 we are planning to include more sections in the assessment process in order to obtain more data and essentially represent all students who have taken the capstone class. We are also beginning the process of developing a list of learning objectives and mapping all undergraduate courses to those objectives. We are hoping that, over the long term, as this plan gets implemented, students will arrive in the capstone class with a common learning set that covers the key concepts and theories in our field.

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

This year’s data has spurred the action described in our response to ADQ 1.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

We used the results to support the recommendations of our Undergraduate Curriculum Task Force. These included (1) The need to prepare our students more thoroughly for analysis of marketing problems by using at least some case analysis in all courses and (2) require all students to take a course in Marketing Metrics as a pre-requisite to the capstone class where the bulk of our annual assessment takes place.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

1. We need to assess more sections of the capstone class. Two sections has been the norm. We will now use our measures on as many sections as is feasible, all if possible. We say this because it is not clear if the decline in targets met is an artifact of data collection or a genuine event demonstrating an actual decline in student skills. We are hoping that a larger number of data points will help us to answer that question.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Other than what has been provided in previous answers, none. We expect that the actions we take will bring us to a point where all targets are met.
Mission / Purpose
The MS in Marketing Program is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to excel in a leadership position in Marketing. The MS in Marketing Program extends the students' previously acquired basic business and marketing skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in a selected area. The MS Program, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as marketing specialists capable of making decisions in an increasingly complex marketing environment.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities (M: 1, 2, 3)
MS-MKT graduate will be able to identify marketing opportunities and problems.

SLO 2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions (M: 4, 5)
The MS-MKT graduate will be able to fashion appropriate and effective marketing solutions.

SLO 3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation (M: 6, 7)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate a customer/client orientation.

SLO 4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information (M: 8, 9)
The MS-MKT graduate will demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret appropriate information for solving marketing problems.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Application of Segmentation Analysis (O: 1)
Application of segmentation analysis
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to the common case assignment.

M 2: Viable Target Markets/Positioning (O: 1)
Development of viable target market(s) and positioning.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to the common case assignment.

M 3: Impact of Competition (O: 1)
Assessment of impact of competition on the firm's actions.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to the common case assignment.

M 4: Solution Consistent with analysis. (O: 2)
Solution Consistent with analysis.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 4 Rubric to the common case assignment.

M 5: Realistic implementation plan. (O: 2)
Realistic implementation plan.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 5 Rubric to the common case assignment.

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 information necessary to address question.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information**
A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric to the common case assignment.

**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: 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**
**2010-2011 Mathematics & Statistics Assessment of Core**
*As of 12/12/2016 04:11 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.

**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.

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Quantitative Literacy quizzes were made available to all Math1070, 1101, 1111, 1113, and 2211 students this past academic year (both at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester). Completing the quizzes was voluntary with bonus points to tests awarded for each correct response. It was thought that this would encourage students to engage the assessment with an honest effort. Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 1111 and 2211 in the fall and spring, partly by Math1113. Many Math1101 (fall 2010) 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

**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 assessment with an honest effort. Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 1111 and 2211 in the fall and spring, partly by Math1113. Many Math1101 (fall 2010) 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.

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

### Improve Response and Success Rates
Better communicate with all instructors (especially GTAs) the importance of providing the students with these QL Quizzes. Instructors should emphasize that students will receive bonus points if they take QL Quizzes. Track students to see how many are progressing from Math1070, Math 1111, 1113 to 2211 to see if “seeing” the quizzes more than once is inflating the success rates of later classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

#### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** PreQL Success Rates
- **Outcome/Objective:** Computation

#### Implementation Description:
Course coordinators will implement their strategies for increasing student participation in the fall semester.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Yichuan Zhao

### Improve Response and Success Rates
Better communicate with all instructors (especially GTAs) the importance of providing the students with these QL Quizzes. Instructors should emphasize that students will receive bonus points if they take QL Quizzes. Check the improvement for increasing the participation after using the strategies.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

#### Implementation Description:
Course coordinators currently implement their strategies for increasing student participation.

- **Responsible Person/Group:** Yichuan Zhao

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

#### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In Fall 2010, the Math1070 has been changed to new teaching model. The assessment of pre/post QL is much easy to access compared to previous year. The response rate and success rate increased much. But, 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 Math2211 and Math1101 (Fall, 2010). In Spring 2011 Math1101 is changed to MyMathLab for online homework, quizzes, pre/post QL, etc. It makes a little better response results. We continue to adopt the new teaching and assessment methods in the coming academic year.

#### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Math1070 adopts new teaching model in Fall 2010. The success rates and response rates of pre/post QL have improvement. Moreover, Math1111 and math1113 have been successful based on the new teaching model. It is helpful for Math1101 and Math2211 to adopt this new model. Also, 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 DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

MATH 1070 adopts new teaching model with 50 minute lecture and at least 3 hour lab work. The response rate and success rate of QL quizzes improved a little with mixed success. We expect that the new MyMathLab will be more successful in the coming year.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
Since Math 1070, 1111 and 1113 have shown the greatest positive changes in success which of the particular pedagogical elements of those classes is contributing to these changes needs to be identified. The obvious differences are the overall redesign of the classes and the use of problem solving activities.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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 course coordinators and the instructors of the all courses will be put in place to try to find good ways to increase the response rates and success rates of QL quizzes, in particular for the Math1101 course.

### Georgia State University

#### Assessment Data by Section

**2010-2011 Mathematics BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Problem-solving</strong> Students will learn to solve practically important problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 2: Knowledge of the discipline</strong> Students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 3: Positions in the discipline</strong> Students will be prepared for positions in the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Technology (G: 1) (M: 4)</strong> The ability to use technology to either solve concrete mathematical problems or present their results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Ability to consult and understand the specialized literature in their major (G: 2) (M: 1)</strong> The ability of the students to consult a mathematical journal and identify a scientific work that addresses their needs; the ability to summarize the main points of the work consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Mathematical proofs (G: 3) (M: 2)</strong> The ability to read, analyze, write and present mathematical proofs, which represent the foundation of mathematics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Review project (O: 5)</strong> Review project designed to measure the student ability to professionally evaluate an article published in a mathematical journal in their field. Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Ability to consult and understand the specialized literature in their major</strong> ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were asked to consult a reputable undergraduate mathematical journal and select an article based on their overall mathematical interests. Then they were asked to write a detailed mathematical review of that article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

The students in Math 4991 were given access via the GSU Library to a reputable undergraduate journal which they browsed based upon their interests. The students selected an article of their choice for review. The students were taught how to write a mathematical review and then were asked to write one for the article they chose. Before the final submission, they were allowed to submit a preliminary version of their work to get feedback. Out of 17 students, all but one completed this task successfully.

**M 2: In-class presentations (O: 7)**

In-class presentations designed to measure critical thinking, oral, and writing skills necessary for reading, analyzing and presenting mathematical proofs.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target for O7: Mathematical proofs

ALL students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were asked to give two in-class presentations on a topic from the textbook involving mathematical proofs, and the other on a research topic.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

In Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), the first presentation, done in a classroom setting, was 30 minute long. It was on a chapter form a mathematical textbook containing a multistep analytical proof. The second, research, presentation was on a topic individually chosen by each student. It was 20 minute long. All students completed successfully these requirements, with the majority of students scoring B or better on these two assignments. Out of 17 students, only one student did not score C or better, and this was on the research presentation.

M 4: Technology Projects (O: 3)

Technology Projects designed to measure the student ability to use Mathematica, Matlab, or Maple for solving mathematical problems of general interest, as well as their ability to use LATEX in preparing mathematical presentations.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O3: Technology

In Spring 2011, all students in the capstone course, Math 4991 (Senior Seminar), were required to learn how to use Mathematica to solve practically oriented problems. All students were required to learn how to use LATEX and use it, together with BEAMER, in a research presentations.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Math 4991 (Senior Seminar) was taught in a classroom with computers and projectors. The computers had the most recent version of Mathematica and also Latex. All students completed successfully a Mathematica project that required them to show understanding on the most common applications of the program. The Latex project was to prepare in BEAMER a research presentation on a top of their choice and present their work in front of the class.

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

Engagement of the Undergraduate Mathematics Commit

Undergraduate Mathematics Committee will play an active role in the development of the assessment program for Math BS in AY 2011-2012. Members of the committee will discuss effective ways to perform assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: AY11-12
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Enescu (the chair of the Undergraduate Mathematics Committee)

Improvement of student proof writing skills

We continue 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. That will help our students to succeed in the capstone Senior Seminar (4991) course as well as in their future research and teaching work. In particular, students will be much better prepared to comprehend and perform mathematical proofs.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: In-class presentations | Outcome/Objective: Mathematical proofs
Implementation Description: AY11-12
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
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, Geometry Pad); 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). The Department now has all the necessary resources. Students learn various types of software in Math 4991 as well as in some elective courses. Also the department will continue to actively support Mathematics and Statistics club and an undergraduate research program (RIMMES). Both of these have become a focus of interest among math majors. During the RIMMES final conference students make presentations using LaTeX-Beamer, LaTeX-Proseminar. They perform numerical simulations for their research projects with Matlab and other software.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Technology Projects | Outcome/Objective: Technology
Implementation Description: AY11-12
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
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.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Mathematics Education MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Mathematics Education (MTE) is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which 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, the mission of the MED-MTE program 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. The MED-MTE provides for master’s level study in mathematics education pedagogy and mathematics content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary Mathematics Education (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 (and aligned with the NCTM Standards), 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 mathematics education.

Goals
G 1: Informed and Knowledgeable to Teach
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

G 2: Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

G 3: Highly Effective Educators
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the Mathematics learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of mathematics content and process skills (NCTM Standards), the history and evolution of the mathematics, the philosophical foundations, an extensive range of advance mathematics content. (Goal 1) (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standards 1-4)

SLO 2: Diverse Learning Environments (G: 2) (M: 2, 4)
Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials and view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. (Goal 2) (Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Portfolio Standards 5-8)

SLO 3: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 2, 4)
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Goal 2) (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Portfolio)

SLO 4: Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 3)
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Portfolio Standard 9)

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Portfolio Standard 3 and 8 (O: 1)
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic
cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 2: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 (O: 1, 2, 3)**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

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

**Target for O1: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O2: Diverse Learning Environments**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O3: Dispositions**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 3: Portfolio 9 (O: 4)**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

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

**Target for O4: Student Learning and Assessment**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**M 4: Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11 (O: 2, 3)**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

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

**Target for O2: Diverse Learning Environments**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Target for O3: Dispositions**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
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<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
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**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
- 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 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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- Priority: High
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- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Low
- Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth 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 to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Standard 3 and 8 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David 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 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth 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 to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Standard 5 | Outcome/Objective: Student Learning and Assessment

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David 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 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth 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 to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David 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 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth 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 to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | Outcome/Objective: Diverse Learning Environments

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David 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 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth 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 to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth 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. There were no changes and/or modifications made or planned with assessment procedures. Moreover, program is being deactivated fall semester 2011.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) 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 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth 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. There were no changes and/or modifications made or planned with assessment procedures. Moreover, program is being deactivated fall semester 2011.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A
The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Mathematics is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which 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.

The M.Ed major in Mathematics Education provides for master's level study in Mathematics Education and Mathematics content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary Mathematics (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 Mathematics education.

Goals

G 1: Content Knowledge
The goal of the M.Ed Online Mathematics Education program is to help candidates to be informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

G 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the Mathematics learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrates strong content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students in MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education are expected have strong knowledge and understanding of Algebra, geometry, statistics, problem solving and, history and evolution of mathematics.

SLO 2: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2, 3, 4)
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 3: Understands and uses effective assessment techniques (G: 3) (M: 2)
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program are expected to use a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate students' academic, social and personal development in all aspects of mathematics.

SLO 4: Demonstrates effective dispositions (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program are expected to demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.

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. These sections of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Demonstrates strong 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective by getting at least 2 out of 3.

M 2: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning" (O: 2, 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 impact on student learning and assessment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O2: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 17% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

M 3: Microteaching Video (O: 2, 4)

Students are expected to videotape themselves while teaching and write a reflection about their teaching.

Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

Target for O2: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Students are expected to get 7 out of 10 to achieve this goal.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective.

M 4: Portfolio Section "Teacher Preparation and Connections" (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. These sections 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: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: 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 2010-2011 - 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 5: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric (O: 4)

Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Demonstrates effective dispositions

Students are expected to get at least 7 out of 10.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective.

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

Action Plan: Clinical Practice

Data show that all students met the expectation after one or more resubmissions of the assignment. Students will be provided a sample video to make sure that they have a clear understanding of the expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Action Plan: Dispositions

All students met this requirement. We will continue working closely with students to make sure they understand the standard well and work accordingly.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates effective dispositions
Implementation Description: During regular advisement sessions, students will be informed about the requirement and encouraged to work accordingly.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Action Plan: Effects on P-12 Learning

Data show that 83% of the students met the expectation and 17% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. Although the portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. In order to make sure that students have a clear understanding of the standards, more emphasis will be given to the portfolio standards during the advisement sessions that we hold once every semester.
Action Plan: Impact on Student Learning
Data show that 83% of the students met the expectation and 17% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction and EDMT 7360-Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning" | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Action Plan: Mathematical Preparation
All students met this requirement after one or more revisions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of MATH 6301-College Geometry, MATH 6435-Linear Algebra and MATH 6547-Mathematical Statistics I.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio section "Mathematical Preparation" | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates strong content knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Action Plan: Microteaching Video
All students met this requirement. Clear instructions were helpful for students to meet this expectation. However, sample teaching video will be provided to help students to have a better understanding of the expectation.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Microteaching Video | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Action Plan: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
Data show that 50% of the students met the expectation and 50% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. More emphasis will be given to the portfolio standards during the advisement sessions that we hold each semester to make sure that students have a clear understanding of them.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching for M.Ed in Mathematics Education (Online)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Action Plan: Teaching Preparation and Connections
Data show that all of the students met the expectation after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio Section "Teacher Preparation and Connections" | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?  
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?  
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?  
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?  
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
The goals, outcomes and measures for the program were modified to align with key assessments for the program.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**  
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.  
Based on the data, we will do a curriculum change to provide more opportunities to extent their knowledge on curriculum and assessment techniques in mathematics education. The curriculum change will require to develop a new mathematics education methods course to address those issues.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**  
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?  
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**  
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?  
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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**  
**2010-2011 Mathematics Education--TEEMS MAT**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*  
*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)*

**Mission / Purpose**  
The mission of the Master of Arts in Teaching program for Mathematics is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which 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, the mission of the TEEMS program in Mathematics 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.

**Goals**  
**G 2: Commit to Achievement of Urban Students**  
The teacher candidate in MAT Mathematics Education program will be committed to the achievement of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students in urban environments.

**G 4: Commit to the Learning Community**  
The teacher candidate will believe that all students can learn and being community-oriented educators, they will continue to pursue professional development.

**G 1: Become Content & Pedagogical Knowledge Experts**  
The teacher candidate will be knowledgeable in mathematics content areas, have the pedagogical knowledge to create effective
teaching environments, and to include the use of innovative technology as a part of their instruction, curriculum, and reflective practices.

**G 3: Facilitate Learning in Urban Environments**
The teacher candidate will be knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners and be able to facilitate learning in such settings.

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher candidate demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge in Mathematics with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs (G: 2) (M: 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher candidate possesses a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners (G: 3) (M: 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher candidate creates a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn (G: 2, 3) (M: 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator (G: 2, 4) (M: 5, 9, 10, 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The teacher candidate demonstrates an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career. |

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 1. |
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 2010-2011 - Target:** Met |
90% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 2. |
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work |
**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 2010-2011 - Target:** Met |
95% met target. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
90% met target.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
95% met target.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
95% met target.

M 6: INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2, 3)
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 6.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
95% met target.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
90% met target.

M 7: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 7.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% met target.

**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.
setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
95% met target.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
90% met target.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
95% met target.

**M 9: INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

A portfolio rating for standard 9 will be derived from each teacher candidate's written and oral rationales, explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competencies.

### Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

90% met target.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

95% met target.

**M 10: INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio (O: 3, 4, 5)**

Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 10.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

90% met target.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

95% met target.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

95% met target.

**M 11: KA#1: Georgia Content Test (O: 1)**

The GACE content tests is a requirement for certification and completing the master’s degree.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**

90% of candidates will pass the GACE content Tests [#022 & #023]

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% met target

**M 12: KA#2 Content Knowledge (O: 1)**

The content knowledge of the candidates is enhanced when they complete 5 or more content courses for the master's degree.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**

90% of candidates will meet the target of successfully completing 5 content courses.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% met target.

**M 13: KA#3 Planning (O: 2, 3)**

Evidence of planning will be demonstrated in the livetext portfolio.

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**

90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

95% met target.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will meet this standard in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning (O: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: KA#6: Dispositions (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% met target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

### Increasing mathematics proficiency for teaching
Faculty members will focus on developing and enhancing teachers proficiency for teaching mathematics. Two courses are being developed to address this national and local concern in light of student learning. In the meanwhile the program is being maintained and monitored.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Two courses are being developed and must be sent for approval before implementation.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mathematics Education Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** NA
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Maintain and Modify Syllabi
Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2010-2011 academic year and beyond.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
- **Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

### Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
- **Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

### Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs
  - **Measure:** KA#1: Georgia Content Test
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
  - **Measure:** KA#2 Content Knowledge
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
- **Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

### Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
- **Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

### Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator
- Measure: KA#3 Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners | Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs
- Measure: KA#4: Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners | Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge | Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs | Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
- Measure: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners | Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs | Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
- Measure: KA#6: Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

Modified Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
- Demonstrates the Attitude of a Reflective Educator | Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn

**Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.

**Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?**

Major accomplishment is that we maintained the students’ achievement of passing the GACE II exams (100%) and completing all content requirements for certification as previous years.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?**

Students came into the program with several misconceptions of how to teach, classroom management skills, and within content knowledge. Towards the end of student teaching students have cleared up most, if not all, of their misconceived ideas.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**

While there is still room for improvement in all areas, two areas are of immediate concerns: (1) Creating Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners and (2) demonstrating pedagogical content knowledge. Assistance needed would be efforts to reconstruct the program to include a course that facilitates pre-service and in-service teachers’ creativity for producing better learning environments for diverse learners and demonstration of effective pedagogical content knowledge.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?**

Within the pedagogical methods courses, faculty has initiated and integrated efforts of facilitating pedagogical content knowledge. However, those efforts need to be more elaborate to be more effective.

---

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Several assessments are in livetext to gather data from our courses. These assessments are working effectively. The targets were revised to demand reaching higher levels in the courses and program.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

The impact of the data obtained from assessment findings has been positive. The pedagogy courses in the program will be revised for greater impact.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

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

N/A
as creative, scientifically literate citizens.

### Goals

**G 1: Assess graduate curriculum and learning outcomes**

Develop and assess learning outcomes for the program using specific outcomes for courses and thesis work.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills. (M: 5, 8, 11)**

Graduates should demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills. This includes the ability to see connections across fields within mathematics and statistics as well as the ability to see applications of mathematics and statistics to other disciplines. Students should develop a mathematical intuition about “how things work” in one or more field within the discipline. This also includes the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems. Students should be able to extend solution methods to problems not exactly like in the book, both in a theoretical and applied setting.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate communication skills, oral and written (M: 6, 15)**

Graduates should demonstrate communication skills, both oral and written. This includes the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate Analytical Skills (M: 1, 5, 8)**

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)**

Graduates should demonstrate advanced quantitative reasoning and problem solving ability. This includes numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Demonstrate numerical competency. (O: 3, 4)**

Students demonstrate numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 2: See connections across fields. (O: 5)**

Students the ability to see connections across fields within mathematics and statistics as well as the ability to see applications of mathematics and statistics to other disciplines.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 3: Understand research problems. (O: 5)**

Students show the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 4: Show an appreciation for history of mathematics. (O: 5)**

Students should have an appreciation for the history of the subject, and the sequence of results that has led to the current state of development of one or more areas of mathematics and statistics.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 5: Extend solution methods. (O: 1, 3, 4)**

Students should be able to extend solution methods to problems not exactly like in the book, both in a theoretical and applied setting.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 6: Expain ideas to nonspecialists. (O: 2, 5)**

Students show the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**M 7: Develop a mathematical intuition. (O: 5)**

Students should develop a mathematical intuition about “how things work” in one or more field within the discipline.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (M)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 8:</td>
<td>Draw conclusions from data. Students show the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9:</td>
<td>Show the ability to solve problems. Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems.</td>
<td>Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11:</td>
<td>To formulate research hypothesis. Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13:</td>
<td>Know the update knowledges in statistics. Students should be able to apply the most up-to-date information and knowledges in the field of statistics.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15:</td>
<td>Show effective written communication. Students should be able to write technical reports or articles.</td>
<td>Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Evaluation at thesis defense.**
For each thesis student, the thesis committee will evaluate all seven measures of achieved student program outcomes on a 5 point scale.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of final exams for each semester.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Thesis advisor for each student.

**Evaluate learning Outcomes Math 8110**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8110 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 8110

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8120**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8120 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 812-

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8200**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8200 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Instructor of Math 8200

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8220**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8220 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of Math 8220

**Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8610**
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8610 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
Evaluate learning outcomes: Math 8620
At the end of each semester, the instructor of Math 8620 shall evaluate the extent to which each student has fulfilled each learning outcome for the course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of Math 8620

Evaluation at thesis defense.
An evaluation form should be used to evaluate each student’s thesis.

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
Fair
Good
Very Good
Excellent
Outstanding
1. Is the thesis/dissertation clearly written and well organized? 9 3 Comments: Most of the theses/dissertations are clearly written and well organized. But some of them still need improvement 75% 25% What is the main contribution of the thesis/dissertation research? 1 8 3 Comments: 25% of the theses proposed novel mathematical/statistical methods. But most of the theses were based on simulation and data analysis results 8% 67% 25%. Does the candidate have comprehensive knowledge on the thesis/dissertation research? 2 5 5 Comments: Majority (84%) of the students have comprehensive knowledge on the thesis/dissertation research 16% 42% 42% 4. Is the thesis/dissertation technically sound and the main result justified? 3 4 5 Comments: Majority (75%) of the theses had sound results. But some of the theses results still need simulation/theoretical justifications. 25% 33% 42% 5. Are the results in the thesis/dissertation published or publishable in a research journal? 5 3 4 Comments: 58% of the results in the thesis/dissertation are publishable in research journals after some revisions. 42% 25% 33%. What is the overall quality of the thesis/dissertation? 3 3 8 Comments: The overall quality of the theses/dissertations is very good to excellent. 25% 25% 50% 7. Thesis/dissertation committee’s recommendation: [ Pass / Fail ] 12 passes Comments: This assessment is based on 12 observations of thesis/dissertation defense results in 2011 Spring semester and Fall semester. The observed data indicate that the overall quality of the theses/dissertations is very good to excellent. But some improvements like the publication rate are still needed.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We are going to continue to measure students’ achievements by assessing their theses/dissertations, research papers and publications. We expect that students will be more productive in publications We are going to use Math 8200 (Advanced Matrix Analysis) to assess (1) students' command of basic mathematical skills needed for advanced math studies and research, (2) the students’ ability to present mathematical ideas in logical, well organized fashion, (3) the students’ ability to apply matrix theory to solve concrete problems.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 MBA/MHA and Concentration in Health Administration MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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 AACS and CAHME (The Commision on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education), the MBA is ranked 7th and MHA is ranked 34th nationally (USNEWSWR, 2009). The mission is to prepare graduates to assume managerial and leadership positions in health sector organizations through • A leading-edge curriculum that integrates business and health care knowledge, • The engagement in scholarly inquiry related to the improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of health care services and the health care system, and • Providing and promoting professional service to the academic and health care communities.

Goals
G 1: Provide CAHME specified competency areas
Identify, analyze, and interpret economic, social, political, environmental, ethical, and medical issues affecting health care organizations.

G 2: Business skills and knowledge
This relate to the second domain of the HLA competency model.

G 3: Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment
This related to the first domain of the HLA competency model.

G 4: Develop leadership knowledge and skills
This is the fourth domain of our hybrid HLA competency model.
### G 5: Develop professionalism knowledge/skills
This is the third domain of our hybrid HLA competency model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SLO 4:** Provide CAHME specified competency areas  
  This consists of the 4 domains, 26 competencies for CAHME. |
| **SLO 5:** Competency in Business skills and knowledge  
  This is the business competency in the MBA/MHA |
| **SLO 6:** Competency and Knowledge of the healthcare environment  
  This competency deals with the healthcare sector. |
| **SLO 7:** Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills  
  This competency is in the area of communication, motivation, empowerment, group participation and leadership, change management, and physician and other clinical relationships. |
| **SLO 8:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills  
  Competency in the areas of self-awareness and confidence; self-regulation and personal responsibility, honesty and integrity, public service, and life-long learning. |
| **SLO 9:** Develop real world experience in the HA field  
  This competency is to ensure that MBA/MHA students have real world experience. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measures, Targets, and Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **M 1:** GPA of each HA student  
  GPA of each HA student  
  Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) |
| **M 2:** Percent CAHME educational content provided  
  Percent CAHME educational content areas provided in specified courses and administrative residencies  
  Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program |
| **M 3:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA  
  Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA  
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |
| **M 4:** Student evaluation of HA program  
  Student evaluation of HA program  
  Source of Evidence: Evaluations |
| **M 5:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas  
  Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas  
  Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation |
| **M 6:** Preceptor evaluation of residency performance  
  Preceptor evaluation of residency performance  
  Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project) |
| **M 7:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty  
  Assessment of residents by HA faculty  
  Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation |
| **M 8:** Student assessment of residency  
  Student assessment of residency experience/learning  
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other |

**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 Summer, and all other HA faculty/staff

**Faculty referred to Center for Teaching and Learning**

Faculty member was referred to Center for Teaching and Learning for improvement. The faculty totally revised the course, changed texts and course format

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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

HA has further refined our competency model for CAHME accreditation. It consists of 4 domains, 26 competencies, and about 80 benchmarks for these competencies. AY11-12 is our self-study year.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

Based on our assessment findings, particularly our HA Advisory Board and preceptors, we have planned for our curriculum a 3 semester hour capstone case course - HA 8680. Concomitantly, we have reduced the residency requirement by 3 semester hours.

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Overall Program Objective**

Reflect current knowledge and projected needs concerning counseling practice in a multicultural and pluralistic society. Students who are preparing to work as clinical mental health counselors will demonstrate the professional knowledge, skills, and practices necessary to address a wide variety of circumstances within the clinical mental health counseling context.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling (M: 1, 2, 3)**

Students in the Mental Health program will gain an understanding of ethical and legal considerations specifically related to the practice of clinical mental health counseling.

**SLO 2: Characteristic and behaviors that influence the counseling process (M: 4)**

Students will gain an understanding of the counseling process in a multicultural society, including counselor characteristics and behaviors that influence helping processes.

**SLO 3: Diversity and competence multicultural counseling (M: 5)**

Students will gain an understanding of the cultural context of relationships, issues, and trends in a multicultural society, including theories of multicultural counseling, identity development, and social justice

**SLO 4: Effects of crises, disasters and other trauma-causing events (M: 6)**

Students will gain an understanding of the nature and needs of persons at all developmental levels and in multicultural contexts, including effects of crises, disasters, and other trauma-causing events on persons of all ages.

**SLO 5: Group Work in Mental Health Counseling (M: 7)**

Students will be provided both theoretical and experiential understandings of group purpose, development, dynamics, theories,
methods, skills, and other group approaches in a multicultural society, including group leadership or facilitation styles and approaches, including characteristics of various types of group leaders and leadership styles.

**SLO 6: Principles of Mental Health Counseling including Advocacy in a Multicultural Diverse Society (M: 8)**

Students will gain knowledge of the principles of mental health, including prevention, intervention, consultation, education, and advocacy, as well as the operation of programs and networks that promote mental health in a multicultural society.

**SLO 7: Human Growth and Development (M: 9)**

Students will gain an understanding of the nature and needs of persons at all developmental levels and in multicultural contexts, including theories of individual and family development and transitions across the life span.

**SLO 8: Addiction and Addictive Behaviors (M: 10)**

Students will gain knowledge of theories and etiology of addictions and addictive behaviors, including strategies for prevention, intervention, and treatment.

**SLO 9: Diagnosis (M: 11)**

Students will gain knowledge of human behavior, including an understanding of developmental crises, disability, psychopathology, and situational and environmental factors that affect both normal and abnormal behavior.

**SLO 10: Crisis Intervention and Assessment (M: 12, 13)**

Students will gain knowledge of crisis intervention and suicide prevention models, including the use of psychological first aid strategies.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)**

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

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

**Target for O1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling**

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who were taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.

**M 2: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)**

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

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

**Target for O1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling**

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who completed CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.

**M 3: Four 3R Assignments (O: 1)**

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

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

**Target for O1: Ethical and legal issues applied to mental health counseling**

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who are taking CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments. The purpose of this assignment is to differentiate between various aspects of Mental Health law and the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of students enrolled in the Mental Health Counseling Program and who completed CPS 6010 (Ethics and Professional Identity in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.
Identity in Mental Health Counseling] earned a minimum cumulative score of 80% on four 3R assignments.

**M 4: Performance Video (O: 2)**

100% of all Mental Health Counseling Students enrolled in CPS 6410 (Basic Counseling Skills) will achieve a minimum score of 25 on the final performance video.

*Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)*

**Target for O2: Characteristic and behaviors that influence the counseling process**

All students (100%) in the Mental Health Counseling program who enroll in CPS 6410 (Basic Counseling Skills) will achieve a minimum score of 25 on the final performance video.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of all Mental Health Counseling Students enrolled in CPS 6410 (Basic Counseling Skills) achieved a minimum score of 25 on the final performance video.

**M 5: Group Cultural Presentation (O: 3)**

Students who are enrolled in CPS 7340 (SocioCultural Issues in Counseling and Psychological Services) must earn a minimum of 80% on the group presentation. This assignment requires a synthesis of multicultural models and developmental theories specific to a diverse community.

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

**Target for O3: Diversity and competence multicultural counseling**

Students who are enrolled in CPS 7340 (SocioCultural Issues in Counseling and Psychological Services) must earn a minimum of 80% on the group presentation. This assignment requires a synthesis of multicultural models and developmental theories specific to a diverse community.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All Students enrolled in CPS 7340 (SocioCultural Issues in Counseling and Psychological Services) earned a minimum of 80% on the group presentation.

**M 6: Midterm and Final Examination Multiple Choice Questions (O: 4)**

90% of all Mental Health Students enrolled in CPS 8470 (Crisis Intervention) will earn a minimum score of 80% on the midterm AND final examination.

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

**Target for O4: Effects of crises, disasters and other trauma-causing events**

90% of all Mental Health Students enrolled in CPS 8470 (Crisis Intervention) will earn a minimum score of 80% on the midterm AND final examination.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

More than 90% of all Mental Health Students enrolled in CPS 8470 (Crisis Intervention) earned a minimum score of 80% on the midterm AND final examination.

**M 7: Participation in 9 75-minute Experiential Groups (O: 5)**

All Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling Systems) will complete a group assignment by attending ALL 9 75-minute experiential-based, personal growth groups.

*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

**Target for O5: Group Work in Mental Health Counseling**

All Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling Systems) will complete a group assignment by attending ALL 9 75-minute experiential-based, personal growth groups.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 6450 (Group Counseling Systems) completed a group assignment by attending ALL 9 75-minute experiential-based, personal growth groups.

**M 8: Research Project and Presentation (O: 6)**

All Mental Health Counseling students in CPS 7000 (Consulting, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum of 85% of the research project and presentation. These assignments will be related to a specific aspect of the Mental Health Profession.

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

**Target for O6: Principles of Mental Health Counseling including Advocacy in a Multicultural Diverse Society**

All Mental Health Counseling students in CPS 7000 (Consulting, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) will earn a minimum of 85% of the research project and presentation. These assignments will be related to a specific aspect of the Mental Health Profession.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All Mental Health Counseling students in CPS 7000 (Consulting, Advocacy, and Leadership in Mental Health Counseling) earned a minimum of 85% of the research project and presentation.
M 9: Midterm and Final Examination CPS 7500: Individual and Family Over the Lifespan (O: 7)
90% of all students who take CPS 7500: Individual and Family Over the Lifespan will earn a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examination.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O7: Human Growth and Development
90% of all students who take CPS 7500: Individual and Family Over the Lifespan will earn a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
90% of all students who take CPS 7500: Individual and Family Over the Lifespan earned a minimum score of 80% on both the midterm and final examination.

M 10: Midterm and Final Examination (CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) (O: 8)
90% of all students taking CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) must earn a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O8: Addiction and Addictive Behaviors
90% of all students taking CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) must earn a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
More than 90% of all students taking CPS 8460 (Biopsychosocial Aspects of Addiction) earned a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

M 11: Midterm and Final Examination (CPS 8100: Psychobehavioral Diagnosis) (O: 9)
90% of all Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 8100 will earn a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O9: Diagnosis
90% of all Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 8100 will earn a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Greater than 90% of all Mental Health Counseling students enrolled in CPS 8100 earned a minimum of 80% on the midterm and final examination.

M 12: Suicide Assessment (O: 10)
All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O10: Crisis Intervention and Assessment
All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All Mental Health Counseling students successfully completed a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention

M 13: Suicide Assessment (O: 10)
All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O10: Crisis Intervention and Assessment
All Mental Health Counseling students will successfully complete a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All Mental Health Counseling students successfully completed a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All Mental Health Counseling students successfully completed a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention
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### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Arts in Teaching program for Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which 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, the mission of the TEEMS program in Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledgeable, and reflective practitioners; • 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.

### 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 students who are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; knowledgeable in Language Arts and Social Studies content areas, including the use of innovative technology; are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners; believe that all students can learn and are community-oriented educators who will continue to pursue professional development.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner (M: 3, 4, 5)**

Possess a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students.

**SLO 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge in Language Arts and Social Studies with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

**SLO 3: Learning Environment (M: 3, 4, 5)**

Create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

**SLO 4: Professional Community Oriented Educator (M: 3, 4, 5, 6)**

Demonstrate the belief that a) all students can learn and b) an efficacious attitude as a global and community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: GACE II Content Area Exam Language Arts and Social Studies (O: 2)**

Students must have a minimum of 12 credit hours in English coursework and 12 credit hours in Social Studies coursework and must pass the GACE II content test in Middle Level Language Arts and Middle Level Social Studies before being recommended for certification.

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

**Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts/Social Studies program will pass the GACE II content exams.

**M 2: Content Knowledge Demonstrated in Teaching (O: 2)**

Content Knowledge rubrics in the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Data for the key assessment of Content Knowledge are taken from the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument. The midpoint evaluation takes place prior to clinical practice, at or near the end of the Practicum I (field experience). The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum III (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student's mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors. The Teaching Evaluation rubrics are used twice during each student's program - at the midpoint of the program (before clinical practice) and at the end of the program (at the end of clinical practice). The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework, and the portion of the rubric that is used to assess Content Knowledge addresses the following Conceptual Framework standard: CF 1.2. Data generated from reports of student performance in the area of Content Knowledge are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in preparing students who have a strong background in the areas of Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies.

Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

**Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong content knowledge by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument used to assess their pedagogical content knowledge via teaching.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The achievement target was met with students attaining 81% at the "Effectively Demonstrated" level and 18% at the "Adequately Demonstrated" level in the overall assessment of content knowledge. The second assessment of the year
showed a slight decrease in success thus prompting analysis of students' opportunities to demonstrate/practice their content knowledge in the first semester of student teaching. Content Knowledge Assessment Midpoint: Subject Specific Content/Concepts GA-GSTEP-1 22 (100%) Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) GA-GSTEP-1 22 (100%) Content Connections GA-GSTEP-1 22 (100%) Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge GA-GSTEP-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 21 (100%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not demonstrated Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR) Content Knowledge Final Assessment: Subject Specific Content/Concepts GA-GSTEP-1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) GA-GSTEP-1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Content Connections GA-GSTEP-1 19 (86%) 3 (13%) Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge GA-GSTEP-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not demonstrated Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR)

### M3: Teacher Work Sample: Planning (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below) Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

### Target for O1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Respresentation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 16 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of TechnologyElement 6 (27%) 16 (72%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety 1 (4%) 17 (77%) 18 (81%) Clarity 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Appropriateness for Students 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Alignment with Local, State and National Standards 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

### Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Respresentation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 16 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of TechnologyElement 6 (27%) 16 (72%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety 1 (4%) 17 (77%) 18 (81%) Clarity 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Appropriateness for Students 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Alignment with Local, State and National Standards 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

### Target for O3: Learning Environment

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Respresentation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 16 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of TechnologyElement 6 (27%) 16 (72%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety 1 (4%) 17 (77%) 18 (81%) Clarity 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Appropriateness for Students 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Alignment with Local, State and National Standards 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary
Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students' clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students' clinical practice). Rubrics are instruments based on the Georgia Standards and are used to assess students' performance on the Georgia Standards. The instrument is used in the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the students' semester. During this semester, which is typically spent on the same middle school campus, the teacher candidates gradually take on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

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

Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (60%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Representation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (66%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 16 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of Technology Element 6 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety 1 (4%) 4 (17%) 18 (78%) Clarity 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Appropriateness for Students 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Alignment with Local, State and National Standards 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

Target for O1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students' Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1, 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Resources & Technology GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1, 3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-
Target for **O2**: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students' Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Resources & Technology GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1 3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-GSTEP-6, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR)

Target for **O3**: Learning Environment

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students’ Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Resources & Technology GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-GSTEP-6, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR)

Target for **O4**: Professional Community Oriented Educator

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students’ field work.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students’ Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Resources & Technology GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-GSTEP-6, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR)
the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**Target for O2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**Target for O3: Learning Environment**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**M 6: Professional Dispositions (O: 4)**

The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Students are not required to submit specific assignments for this assessment. Prior to Fall 2010, a different rubric was used. The older rubric, which was linked directly to the 10 INTASC standards, was replaced by an instrument that could be more clearly linked to the PEF unit's rearticulated conceptual framework outcomes. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies TEEMS programs, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target for O4: Professional Community Oriented Educator**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate high levels of professionalism by obtaining a rating of "Exceptional" or "Acceptable" on the rubric used to assess students' professional dispositions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Professional Dispositions data demonstrates achievement goal has been met. EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's point of view; believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can't or won't GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2 19 (86%) 3 (13%) POSITIVE VIEW OF SELF: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of self; possesses a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; has positive expectations of self GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) AUTHENTICITY: Able to be open and genuine; self-discloses and melds personal uniqueness with culturally responsive interactions; does not feel one must play a role to be effective GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) MEANINGFUL PURPOSE AND VISION: Focused on the long range; is visionary and reflective as a professional; commits to growth for all learners; cares about what is really important GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4 19 (86%) 3 (13%) Exceptional Acceptable Marginal Unacceptable
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students’ work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being introduced in the Fall semester of student teaching - Practica I and will be supported both in a methods course and in Practica I. The methods course that houses the content “Planning” has been moved to the long semester when the students are conducting their field work and should provide for better support/practice in developing their skill as effective and impactful lesson designers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MLE TEEMS LA/SS Faculty
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Effect on Student Learning
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students’ work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being introduced in the Fall semester of student teaching - Practica I and will be supported both in a methods course and in Practica I. The methods course that houses the content “Analysis of Student Learning” has been moved to the long semester when the students are conducting their field work and should provide for better support/practice in developing their skill as effective and impactful educators.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MLE LA/SS Faculty
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Planning
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students’ work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being introduced in the Fall semester of student teaching - Practica I and will be supported both in a methods course and in Practica I. The methods course that houses the content “Planning” has been moved to the long semester when the students are conducting their field work and should provide for better support/practice in developing their skill as effective and impactful lesson designers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MLE TEEMS LA/SS Faculty
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

CTW Reflection Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Program faculty have refined the use of the Teacher Work Sample, lesson planning, and assessment to better support our students in these efforts. These changes were made based on prior year’s data and while some progress has been made, data this year demonstrate there is still some progress to be made. A few low assessments from a couple of students indicate that we still have work to do in clarifying the lesson design / implementation / assessment process. Our goal is for all students to master this process.
Program faculty have realigned coursework to better match with field work and continue to improve work with lesson design (using Wiggins & McTighe as well as the Teacher Work Sample) as well as improvement with assessment processes and systems for the classroom.

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

Program faculty use the assessment of student strengths and weaknesses to pinpoint areas of improvement in coursework. We have realigned courses for this year to better match methods and fieldwork. We continue to revise and improve curriculum with regards to the lesson design / implementation / assessment cycle.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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**

**2010-2011 Middle Grades Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT**

*As of 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*

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

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) in Middle-level Math-Science is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which 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, the mission of the MAT Middle-level Math-Science program is to prepare educators 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.

### Goals

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
1. Candidates will be seen as more knowledgeable others in their classrooms, in their schools, and in their communities with regard to their understandings of the content and ways of knowing within the disciplines of math and science.

**G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions**
2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 4 - 8 math and science classrooms.

**G 3: Impact on student learning**
3. Candidates will be reflective professionals with the capacity to analyze the effect that their teaching practices have on the learning of the students in their grades 4 - 8 math and science classes.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.

**SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Candidates will be able use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.

**SLO 3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)**
Candidates will be able to coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.

**SLO 4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (G: 2) (M: 4)**
Candidates will be able to create engaging learning environments where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are
Measures, Targets, and Findings

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 6)
Candidates will be able to design and utilize a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners and support learners in engaging in the process of self-assessment.

SLO 5: Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)
Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

SLO 7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (G: 3) (M: 7)
Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 6)
Candidates will be able to design and utilize a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners and support learners in engaging in the process of self-assessment.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge (O: 1)
There will be three sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. The candidates' performance on the GACE Middle-level Mathematics and Middle-level Science tests. 2. Supervisor ratings on the Standard 1: Content Knowledge components of the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Reviewer ratings on the content and curriculum standard in the final e-portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
1. For the GACE tests, the target is for 100% of the candidates to pass both the Middle-level Math and Middle-level Science exams. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
1. The GACE scores had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report. 2. With regards to the mid-term and final evaluation rubrics, the target was met for the overall rating of students in the area of content knowledge. However, the overall score on the Content Connections element was a 3.35, with 3 of the students receiving a score of partially demonstrated. This is clearly below the target set for the individual participants. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2)
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Learning Goals and Design for Instruction assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by supervisors on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation related to this area 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge
1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 17 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target was met, with all but one student achieving a 17 or better and less than 25% of the students receiving a rating of 2 or below. 2. For the Design for Instructions assignment, the target was met (26.7 average overall), although there were 5 students with scores below 26. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Rubrics, the target was met as the average was 3.55 for all students and no student received a rating of 2 or 1.

M 3: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (O: 3)
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Design for Instruction and Instructional Decision Making assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessment 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the section of the e-portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences
1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 13 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a
For the Design for Instructions assignment, the target was met (26.7 average overall), although there were 5 students with scores below 26. For the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the target was met with only two students scoring below the desired average of 13.2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Rubrics, the target was met as the average was 3.55 for all students and no student received a rating of 2 or 1. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (O: 4)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluations of the Contextual Factors assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluations by the reviewer of this section of the electronic portfolio

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

**Target for O4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments**

1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 21 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target was met as the overall average was well over 21; however, there were 6 (out of 29 students) who scored at or below that average. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the overall assessment on the Learning Environments section was a 3.57, meeting the specified target; however, it needs to be noted that the average score on the Classroom Environment element was 3.42 and on the Classroom Management element was 3.39. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions (O: 5)**

There will be two sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Ratings by the supervisor on the Dispositions Key Assessment 2. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

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

**Target for O5: Professional Dispositions**

1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the target is for the candidates to average a of 18 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

1. For the Dispositions Key Assessment, the candidates achieved an average well over the target of 18 overall, with only 2 students receiving a score below the average. Further, the average per element was 3.57 indicating that most ratings were either Exceptional or Acceptable (only 6 ratings of Marginal were assigned and no ratings of Unacceptable were assigned). 2. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (O: 6)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

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

**Target for O6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment**

1. For the Assessment Plan assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

1. For the Assessment Plan assignment, the target was met with the overall average for the set of candidates being a 22.66 on this assignment. Nonetheless, 9 of the 29 candidates did score below this average, some considerably so. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the set of candidates scored just below the target mark of 3.5 (with the average for all students being 3.48). However, it should be noted that all students received a rating of Adequately or Effectively Demonstrated this proficiency, with no students receiving a rating of Partially Demonstrated or below (indicating that the target may have been too high). 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (O: 7)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

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

<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>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>09/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Program faculty; field experiences director</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>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content Knowledge Action Plan

In the mathematics and science methods courses, there needs to be a stronger connection to other disciplines. While the mathematics and science connections are made fairly easy, there needs to be more integration of other academic disciplines. All candidates take EDRD 7630, so it might be prudent for students to further utilize some of the strategies introduced in that course. Additionally, there needs to be more integration of other subjects that are also aligned to the standards. Further, pre-service teachers need to explore multiple ways to bridge “school” content knowledge with the world outside of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods Courses
In the mathematics and science methods courses, there is a need to have assignments that speak to the issue of classroom learning environments. These issues should be inclusive of classroom management issues. Scholarly readings from practitioner and research journals will be shared with cohort members for discussion and practice in their practicum placements. In addition, guest speakers (preferably those teaching in urban spaces) will be invited to a classroom management/learning environments session to help pre-service teachers develop action plans for their developing their own plans as it pertains to learning environments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments

Refined TWS/Rubrics
The implementation of the TWS is a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments that also impact student learning. As it stands, there are refined rubrics for assessments to provide better structure to the TWS for pre-service teachers and university supervisors alike. These refined rubrics also make the expectations clear for students as it pertains to impacting student learning and assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

Revised TWS/Rubrics
Our degree program had some changes institutionalized made based off of last year’s action plan. We implemented a revised version of TWS as a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments. During the practicum I, students chart their goals with specificity. During practicum II and III, students delve deeper into these goals and use their stated goals to meet the needs of learners. We also refined the rubrics for assessments to provide better reliability among the supervisors performing the ratings of students’ learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our degree program had some changes institutionalized made based off of last year’s action plan. We implemented a revised version of TWS as a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments. During the practicum I, students chart their goals with specificity. During practicum II and III, students delve deeper into these goals and use their stated goals to meet the needs of learners. We also refined the rubrics for assessments to provide better reliability among the supervisors performing the ratings of students’ learning outcomes.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

During this academic year, we will make several improvements to the degree program. First, we will ensure that there is a better
integration between assignments in the methods courses and the TWS assignments. This will allow students to understand more fully
the objectives of the assignment and will allow students to develop deeper insights about the assignments. Next, we will ensure that
students understand mathematics and science curricula. We will do a better job of connection state and national standards. This will
result in better instructional strategies that address learning goals and objectives in curriculum planning. This will also result in better
lessons that build on students’ experiences and that are simultaneously linked to the standards. Finally, there will be more of a focus
on different forms of assessment as a means of creating a more holistic picture of individual and group learning. Moreover, there
were no course changes made in the program during this academic year.

**Administrative Dept Question 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you
take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

**Administrative Dept Question 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

**Administrative Department 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 B.S.E. Middle Level Education program is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which 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, the mission of the B.S.E. Middle
Level Education program is to prepare educators 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. The B.S.E. teacher education program in Middle Level Education is one of eight teacher certification
programs offered through the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT). The program is
based on current research in teacher education and support planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to
excellence in education. The program also includes major, in-depth practicum / teaching experience at the middle grades level.
Graduates have a well developed content knowledge in two fields (language arts, mathematics, reading, science, or social studies).
Successful completion of this program and the appropriate GACE Content Assessment tests leads to a recommendation for licensure
for grades four through eight in the two areas of concentration. This program leads a Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.E.)
degree and a level T-4 Georgia teaching certification.

**Goals**

G 1: Candidates are Informed Educators with Expert Content Knowledge
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge in two content fields in middle level education.

G 2: Candidates are Inform Educators with Necessary Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions for teaching Middle
Level Students
Candidates are informed educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching middle level students.

G 3: Candidates are Effective Educators who Impact Student Learning
Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the learning of their students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Candidates Demonstrates Knowledge in their Content Field (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content
in their chosen teaching fields.

SLO 2: Candidates Plan, Implement, and Reflect on Instruction Methods (G: 2) (M: 2)
Candidates plan, implement, and reflect upon a wide range of instructional methods through teacher inquiry.

SLO 3: Candidates Create Meaningful Learning Experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates create meaningful learning experiences that develop all young adolescents’ competence in subject matter and skills.

SLO 4: Candidates Demonstrate Positive Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 4)
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and
meaningful purpose and vision for working with middle level students.
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and reflection practices to plan effective instruction, evaluate processes and products, to monitor student learning.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Student Teaching Evaluation (O: 1)**
Students are knowledge and understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their chosen teaching fields is evaluated by their university supervisors via the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

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

**Target for O1: Candidates Demonstrates Knowledge in their Content Field**
100% of students will receive a score of "3" (adequately demonstrated) or higher on all rubric components related to content knowledge.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
All but one student scored a level "3" or higher in all content area rubric measurements. See report here: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73762?key=9f4d5f10388c5cc64bedf8bc8e2a6cb

**M 2: Action Research Paper 1 Rubric (O: 2)**
Candidates demonstrate their ability to plan, implement, and reflect upon a wide range of instructional methods through teacher action research. They are evaluated via the Action Research Project rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Candidates Plan, Implement, and Reflect on Instruction Methods**
100% of students will receive a score of "2" (proficient) or higher on all rubric components related to action research.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
9% of our students did not score at the "proficient" level or higher for portions of the action research component. More specifically, students struggled with the literature review, research methods, and results sections.

**M 3: Teaching Evaluation Rubrics (O: 3)**
Candidates create meaningful learning experiences that develop all young adolescents' competence in subject matter and skills. During student teaching, they are evaluated via the following rubrics: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric

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

**Target for O3: Candidates Create Meaningful Learning Experiences**
100% of students will score a level "3" or "adequately demonstrated" in the following areas 2-5 of the teaching evaluation rubric: (2) knowledge of students and learning, (3) learning environments, (4) assessments, and (5) planning and instruction.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students scored at a level "3" or "adequately demonstrated" in the all areas 2-5 of the teaching evaluation rubric: (2) knowledge of students and learning, (3) learning environments, (4) assessments, and (5) planning and instruction.

**M 4: Dispositions Assessment Rubric (O: 4)**
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. Candidates dispositions will be evaluated via the Dispositions Assessment Rubric

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

**Target for O4: Candidates Demonstrate Positive Dispositions**
100% of students will score a level "3: acceptable" or higher, while 50% of students will score at a level of "4: exceptional."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students received a score of "3: acceptable" or higher in all sections of the disposition rubric. Between 74% and 94% of students received a score of "4: exceptional" on all components of the dispositions rubric.

**M 5: Action Research Paper 2 Rubric (O: 5)**
Through an action research project, candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, evaluate processes and products, and monitor student learning. Candidates are evaluated via the Action Research Project rubric - 4700

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O5: Candidates Use Effective Assessment and Reflection to Plan and Evaluate Instruction**
100% of students will score at the "2: proficient" level or higher.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
All but one student scored "proficient" or higher in all aspects of the action research report. However, one student (out of 12) scored only "partially proficient" in three areas: literature review, research methods, and results. 100% of the students scored...
at the highest level of “exemplary” in the focus and rationale section of the paper. This is exciting, given that they were able to carefully articulate the reason behind their action research project. 11 out of 12 students also scored exemplary on the conclusions and recommendations portion of the paper, which is also very exciting. This part of the paper exemplifies students’ ability to critically analyze data through written reflection.

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

Focus on action research as a continual process of thinking/being in the classroom
Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient level. We plan to add more instruction related to action research in EDCI 4640, and talk specifically about how this action research process is a way of thinking/being in the classroom, not just a formal research plan to use once in teacher education courses.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Action Research Paper 2 Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Use Effective Assessment and Reflection to Plan and Evaluate Instruction

Implementation Description: Work more carefully with preservice teachers to help them understand action research as a way of thinking/being in the classroom. This instruction/discussion will take place in EDCI 4640.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of EDCI 4640.

Improved instruction related to action research
Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient level. We plan to add more instruction related to action research to EDRD 4600 and EDCI 4640 in order to help students better understand the importance of each required component of action research.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Action Research Paper 1 Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Plan, Implement, and Reflect on Instruction Methods

Implementation Description: The instructor of EDRD 4600 will devote one full class session and two partial class sessions to action research methods.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EDRD 4600 instructor.

Increased content in methods courses
Although almost all of our preservice teachers were rated at a score of "3" or "adequately demonstrated" or higher in their content knowledge, not 100% of the students were rated at this level. In fact, approximately 26% of our preservice teachers received a "3" instead of a "4" or "effectively demonstrated" on pedagogical content knowledge as it relates to instructional methods and planning. Given this, our plan in the coming year is to increase content learning experiences in our methods courses within the BSE MLE program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Student Teaching Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Demonstrates Knowledge in their Content Field

Implementation Description: The BSE MLE program coordinator will work with methods course instructors to add more content into the course syllabi.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: BSE MLE program coordinator and BSE MLE methods course instructors.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?
We have decided to add to our assessment related to "Impact on Student Learning." Students will not only complete an action research project to measure their impact on student learning, but they will also submit a teacher work sample. This new teacher work sample measure, which includes analyzing pre and post assessments, writing unit plans, and reflecting on teaching, will more specifically focus on their impact on student learning.

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

Based on this year's assessment data, we will focus on two course changes. First, we will spend more time providing instruction related to teacher action research. We believe this is an important aspect of undergraduate education, but our students were struggling with literature reviews and data analysis. We will include more readings and instruction related to inquiry in several of our courses. Second, we will increase our focus on content in our preservice teacher methods courses. We anticipate that this will increase student first-time pass rates on GACE II exams.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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.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:** Candidates are experts in their knowledge of the content they teach.

1. Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach their subject to students in grades 4-8.

**G 2:** Candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be successful middle school teachers.

Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching students in grades 4-8.

**G 3:** Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on student learning.

Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the learning of their students in middle level classrooms.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 1: Candidates demonstrate superior content knowledge of the subjects they teach. (G: 1) (M: 1)

1. Candidates have depth and breadth of their content knowledge. They are able to provide an in-depth explanation of the importance for teaching each content area (the two areas in which the teacher is certified), including current thinking and research in the content areas. They give detailed explanations with examples cited to support contentions. (2) Candidates can clearly articulate and provides examples demonstrating how to plan and implement an interdisciplinary lesson and/or unit of study. In their portfolio, they provide a clear explanation with examples cited to support contentions.

#### SLO 2: Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary for teaching middle school students. (G: 2) (M: 2)

- (1) Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the principles guiding assessment and instruction at the middle grades level and can clearly articulate the theoretical connections between using well planned assessments to guide instruction. Students provide artifacts that demonstrate how they have applied these principles in the classroom. (2) Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a wide variety of teaching, learning, and assessment strategies that are developmentally responsive, culturally sensitive, and technologically sound. Students provide artifacts that demonstrate how they have applied this understanding in the classroom. (3) Candidates clearly articulate the need for teaching higher order thinking skills and can demonstrate through their artifacts that they have implemented lessons at the classroom level which address this standard.

#### SLO 3: Candidates demonstrate the dispositions necessary to be successful middle school teachers. (G: 2) (M: 3)

Candidates demonstrate the five dispositions necessary to work successfully with middle level students, colleagues, and other education professionals. (1) EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's point of view; believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner. (2) POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can't or won't. (3) POSITIVE VIEW OF SELF: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of self; possesses a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; has positive expectations of self. (4) AUTHENTICITY: Able to be open and genuine; self-discloses and melds personal uniqueness with culturally responsive interactions; does not feel one must play a role to be effective. (5) MEANINGFUL PURPOSE AND VISION: Focused on the long range; is visionary and reflective as a professional; commits to growth for all learners; cares about what is really important.

#### SLO 4: Candidates demonstrate the ability to make a positive impact on student learning. (G: 3) (M: 4)

Candidates can illustrate how assessment results are 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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Content Knowledge Rubric (O: 1)

MCE Advanced Masters Content Knowledge Rubric in MED MLE portfolio assessment: https://c1.livetext.com/doc/4879240#4879240

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

**Target for O1:** Candidates demonstrate superior content knowledge of the subjects they teach.

100% of candidates will score at a level of 4 (out of a possible score of 5) on this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Of the 3 completers, two (2) scored at a level 5 and one (1) scored at a level four. Thus, the target was fully met on this measure.

#### M 2: Teaching Performance Rubric (O: 2)

MCE Advanced Masters Teaching Performance Rubric in student portfolio for MED Middle Level Education. Link to Rubric: Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O2:** Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary for teaching middle school students.

100% of candidates will score at a level of 4 (out of a possible score of 5) on this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

This measure is divided into three domains: Principles of Instruction and Assessment: On this domain, two students scored at a level 5 and 1 student scored at a level 1. Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies: On this domain, one student scored at a level 5 and two students scored at a level 4. Integrated Higher Order Thinking Skills: On this domain, three students scored at a level 5. Overall, the target was met. However, on the domain of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies, the target was partially met.

#### M 3: Dispositions Rubric (O: 3)

Five Dispositions of Highly Effective Educators - Endpoint of program: Link to Rubric This rubric is used to assess all students in the College of Education/College of Arts and Sciences Professional Education Unit.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O3: Candidates demonstrate the dispositions necessary to be successful middle school teachers.

100% of candidates will score at a level of 3 (Acceptable) out of a possible score of 4 on all five elements for this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 4 (Exceptional) on at least 3 out of 5 elements.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The target was met. 100% of completers scored at a level 3 or higher on all elements (see attached data table), meeting the first part of the target. For the domains of Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, and Meaningful Purpose and Vision, at least 50% scored exceptional (67%, 100%, and 100%, respectively).

M 4: Impact on Student Learning Rubric (O: 4)

Rubric to evaluate student's impact on student learning - in MED Middle Level Education Portfolio Assessment: Link to rubric
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O4: Candidates demonstrate the ability to make a positive impact on student learning.

100% of candidates will score at a level of 4 (out of a possible score of 5) on this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 5.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

For the measure of Impact on Student Learning, two students scored at a level 5 and one student scored at a level 4.

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
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

Focus on teaching strategies

Given that the target for "Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies" was only partially met, we will focus our efforts on increasing students' abilities in this area. We will make sure to include more readings and discussions focused on teaching and assessment strategies in the required course EDCI 7400: Curriculum Issues in Middle Level Education. In class discussions and readings will be purposefully connected with reflections on current teaching practices.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Teaching Performance Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary for teaching middle school students.

Implementation Description: Course will be redesigned to include more focus on teaching, learning, and assessment strategies.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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. This is because this program will be deactivated in Fall 2011.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
This program will be deactivated in Fall 2011. Despite this, we are still devoted to offering courses in this program until all students graduate. Based on the assessment results, we have decided to focus on adding more readings and discussions related to assessment and teaching/learning strategies into our required course, EDCI 7400.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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
2010-2011 Modern & Classical Languages Assessment of Core
As of 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Modern and Classical Languages is committed to the advancement of knowledge about contemporary and ancient languages and, in particular, about the ways in which they impact civilization by molding numerous cultures and shaping their literatures. The Department's excellence in research, teaching and service benefits students and colleagues by broadening their understanding of the world community and strengthening their ability to function in a cross-cultural and multicultural environment, and as a result, contributes to the general betterment of society.

Goals
G 1: Oral communication
The student shall demonstrate the ability to speak the target language with a varied vocabulary, good pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: ORAL COMMUNICATION (G: 1) (M: 1)
Interpersonal communication: task-based activities that require interaction with classmates. This mode will be used to assess comprehension and comprehensibility.

Presentational communication: tasks in which students create spoken language. This mode will be used to assess vocabulary use and fluency.
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, students had to speak (the most developed 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. The interviews were started in Spring 2010 and then, for the purpose of data and semester comparison, were repeated in Spring 2011 in all three most-commonly taught languages--Spanish, French, and German. In Spring 2011, Spanish, the largest of the three programs, also conducted interviews in Span 2002, fourth semester of Spanish. In Spring 2010, it had been determined that 2002 interviews would be a convenient source of exit data, as the fourth semester of Spanish is indeed the last course in Lower Division Spanish. Span 2002 interview results could also provide information on how the program evolves from semester to semester.

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, nonetheless, shows more significant difficulties and challenge to acquiring the target language and knowledge of its related culture(s). Importantly, a student in this range does not meet expectation for the level. RESULTS Table 1. Results by language for Spring 2010 (Language Number of students interviewed in Gosolar for Spring 2010) Percentage of interviewed students Average Four-range average number and percentage that needs improvement French 16/91 17.6% 8.1 Middle (GOOD) 4/91 (4.4%) German 7/28 25.0% 8.5 Middle (GOOD) 2/28 (7.1%) Spanish 13/180 7.2% 9.4 OPTIMAL 0/180 (0%) Table 2. Results by language and by Spanish level for Spring 2011 Language Number of students interviewed Percentage of students interviewed Average Four-range average number and percentage that needs improvement French 2001 16/51 31.4% 8.1 Middle (GOOD) 4/51 (7.8%) Germ 2001 7/29 24.1% 8.5 Middle (GOOD) 2/29 (6.9%) Span 2001 39/168 23.2% 8.7 Middle (GOOD) 10/168 (6.8%) Span 2002 23/116 19.9% 8.9 Middle (GOOD) 3/116 (2.6%) In general, in the two semesters, Spring 2010 and Spring 2011, the results appear as highly positive. No particular skill is identified as in need of more attention (see, for instance, Table 3 below for Spring 2011 results) by the faculty: in every category, the figures are within the Middle (=GOOD) range of the four-range scale. Rather, these figures show (see Tables 1 and 2) that a small but particular number of students are in need of improvement. In Spring 2010, this was the case especially in French (with 4 out of 16 students in the range of 7), who either needed to continue to work (harder) on all the language areas. In Spring 2011, however, the percentages are a lot better balanced at the 2001 level across the three languages (7.8% in French, 6.9% in German, and 6.8% in Spanish), and significantly reduced in Span 2002 (2.6%). Table 3. Results by Categories (Criteria) Spring 2011 Level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Total French 8.1 8.1 8.0 8.1 8.3 8.2 8.1 Germ 8.3 8.7 8.4 8.6 8.4 8.4 8.4 8.4 Span 2001 8.7 8.9 8.6 8.5 8.7 8.7 8.9 Span 2002 8.7 9.1 9.0 8.9 8.9 8.9 8.9 However, there are three areas of concern about the validity of these figures, especially those for Spring 2010. First, though a figure that was representative of the target population was still to be determined for the MCL core course assessment, the low number of interviewed students—perhaps with the exception of German—suggests that the number of students who were interviewed, especially in Spanish and French, may have not been representative of the number of students in 2001. Secondly, these figures appeared to indicate that the core courses in French, German, and especially in such a large program as Spanish, were highly effective, which thus suggested, contrary to the perception of some faculty members, that no improvement or change was 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 worked also made it notoriously hard to find students who could be available at times other than class time. Thus, the Spring 2010 sample may include, especially in Spanish (notice the zero percentage of students in need of improvement in Table 1), only those highly motivated students who routinely scored high in the core courses and who most probably were, or were likely, to become majors and minors. This, unfortunately, would leave out a significant number of non-major, non-minor students who might indeed need to be served more adequately and whose feedback is essential to improve the MCL core curriculum. In Spring 2011, an effort was made to obtain more even numbers and, ideally, as close to 25% of the target population as possible in every level. Still, however, the interviewees were largely students who accepted, on a voluntary basis, to be interviewed. Finally, it is clear that the the students in Span 2002, in Spring 2011, performed a lot better than those in Span 2001 in the same semester, probably a result of a sort of a natural filtering of students, increasingly better prepared, as they progress through the Spanish curriculum. The efforts to interview more students, and obtain a better balance sample of students, in Spring 2011, may be responsible for the increasing number of students in need of improvement in Spring 2011 and for a more accurate assessment of the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

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

Develop fluency

These results will be used to identify the best tasks for the classroom to increase fluency, an aspect often overlooked in first-year classes. It is expected that the information will help develop lessons on formulaic sequences, paraphrasing, and other real language strategies that are usually neglected in the lower-level language classes.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lower Division Spanish instructors

Oral Communication

The Department of Modern and Classical Languages (MCL henceforth) has been implementing some sort of oral communication assessment among students taking first-year Spanish. The assessment requires special considerations since the enrollment limits for elementary Spanish classes is 30-32 students. In a regular fall or spring semester there are 35 sections of first-year Spanish.
An informal survey of oral assessment conducted among colleagues, shows that the most common form used is face-to-face interviews during office hours. Given the special make up of Georgia State students, there are many students who could not meet office hours because they have previous engagements (academic and otherwise) at those times. The second form is to take the last week of classes and conduct interviews during that time. Experience shows that the second modality always presents circumstances that throw off the schedule, aside from the fact that one has to sacrifice class time. Also, the assessment needs to be recorded in order to verify scores, and as evidence in case of grade disputes.

The MCL faculty has agreed to meet during FA09 to discuss possible venues of assessing oral communication on the core. The French and German sections are going to conduct face-to-face interviews, while the Spanish section has yet to determine how oral communication will be assessed. The three sections have decided to use the same type of assessment but due to the number of students (and sections) in Spanish there will be different instruments.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were those changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

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. In the previous cycles, each language (i.e. French, German, and Spanish) would submit separate reports to the Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOA) coordinator, which in turn were also reported on separately. These reports were also based on different assessment tools. Importantly, and this should be considered relevant achievement toward improving the quality of instruction in the Lower Division language programs at MCL, one and only one report is now produced. This report is based on a common effort and assessment tool—i.e. an oral interview at the end of the 2001 level—that is largely a result of team work by the MCL language faculty. This work has also become a sort of gateway to relevant discussion of University and departmental goals—such as a concern about how languages are learned and scientifically taught—and has resulted in new initiatives, such as LAFL Group/Task Force that was just created by the many MCL faculty with expertise and research background in the several aspects of the teaching and learning/acquisition of the several taught at MCL. Today MCL has ten faculty members who are experts in several aspects of this field, with research interests that range from study abroad to heritage language teaching and teaching foreign languages to students in other fields. On the basis of the results obtained in Spring 2010, the LOA coordinator will suggest that the foreign language faculty now focus on the following areas: 1. Ways to ensure a sample population of at least 25% of the students in every language level. 2. To include the 2002 level for French and German starting in Spring 2012. 3. To minimize, and if possible eliminate, the need for the interviews to be done on a purely voluntary basis. For a more reliable assessment of the program, there should be a mechanism that can guarantee a random but reliable sample population. 4. Importantly, to identify innovations and changes to the MCL language program(s) that can reduce the number of students in need of improvement.

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

In Spring 2010 it was found that the following needed improvement in the assessment procedure and tool: 1. Ways to ensure a sample population of at least 25% of the students in every language. 2. To include the 2002 level for French and German starting in Spring 2012. 3. To minimize, and if possible eliminate, the need for the interviews to be done on a purely voluntary basis. For a more reliable assessment of the program, there should be a mechanism that can guarantee a random but reliable sample population. 4. Importantly, to identify innovations and changes to the MCL language program(s) that can reduce the number of students in need of improvement. Of all these areas, 4 is particularly important. There are a number of students who are in need of improvement. According to the figures obtained for Spring 2010 and 2011, about 7% of the student population is in this category in the 2001 level. The MCL faculty now has to determine who these students are—for instance, real beginners, heritage speakers, transfer students,
etc.--, why they are not being served well enough to be in a better position (for instance, should placement test be implemented), and what innovations should be introduced to serve them better (for instance, provide more frequent and close advice to students, provide more basic learning tools [such as study guides before exams], reinstate more in-class direct instruction, etc.). As said, somewhere else on this report, the MCL language faculty will focus on these issues during Fall 2011.
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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 114 students; 40 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. |

| 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. |

**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. |

| 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. |

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

With an N of 31 students, 100% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric. The range was 3-4. The mean score was 3.77.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

With an N of 31 students, 96% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the pupil change project rubric. The range was 2.9-4. The mean score was 3.73.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

With an N of 31 students, 100% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3-4. The mean score was 3.76.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

With an N of 31 students, 96% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the lesson plan rubric. The range was 2.52-4. The mean score was 3.67.

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 is above the 90% target mark for all 4 measures. 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: Finished

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Pupil Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn

Implementation Description: This has been met. Will continue with data collection.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Alberto, MSD Coordinator, and MSD faculty

**No plans indicated**

No plans are indicated for this measure as it came in at 90%. We will continue to monitor the rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Lesson Plan | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plans for instruction.
**Provide sample projects so that students can better understand expectations**
Faculty will continue to 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:** Finished
- **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. This is in place and going well.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program coordinator and course instructor

**Revise rubric**
MSD faculty discussed aligning the P-12 change project rubric with the other P-12 rubrics in EPSE. (See implementation description below).

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Pupil Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn

**Implementation Description:** The MSD faculty aligned the P-12 change project rubric with the other P-12 rubrics in EPSE. This resulted in consistent information across key assessments tagged to the conceptual framework and state rules

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Susan Easterbrooks and MSD faculty

**Comprehensive exam rubric**
Faculty decided to revise the assessment rubric for the comprehensive exams to provide better information.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** MSD and BLD faculty

**Performance observation rubric**
MSD faculty discussed the complexity of the performance observation rubric and it was decided that it needed to be streamlined to generate data in a manner that is useful across the department.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Effectively teaches diverse learners.

**Implementation Description:** Some changes have occurred, but discussion is ongoing

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** MSD and BLD faculty

### Academic Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The WEAVE data continue to be helpful in examining student progress. Collection of Lesson Plan Rubric data was decided to be increased to twice a year to more closely monitor student progress in this area. This year, students met the goal of 90% or above for all 4 goals. For the 11-12 cycle, MSD faculty members will continue to monitor progress and keep the target level of achievement at 90%.

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

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 4 of the 4 goals. This is an improvement from the previous year and the data supports that the educational degree programs are on track. The faculty will continue to discuss the data to determine if any future changes are needed.
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).

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
For the reporting period 117 students were enrolled in Music, Society and Culture. The grade distribution for the given essay were as follows: A - 78 (66%) B - 27 (23%) C - 5 (4%) D - 0 (0%) F - 3 (2%) Of the 117 students, 89% received a grade of A or B. Therefore the target was not met. It is possible that the achievement target of 95% is unrealistically high.

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
SLO 1: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context (G: 1) (M: 2)
Places Western and non-Western music in historical and cultural context

SLO 2: Performs at Advanced Level (G: 1) (M: 3)
Performs diverse repertoire with advanced levels of musicianship in large ensembles, small ensembles, and as a soloist

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.

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.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
Of the 41 students enrolled in Basic Conducting (MUS 2490) 35 (85%) received a grade of B or higher on the Final Conducting Exam. The grade breakdown for this single evaluation was as follows: A+ --> 4 A --> 6 A- --> 4 B+ --> 3 B --> 18 B- --> 5 C+ --> 1 While the target was not met this year, it is likely due to a more rigorous grading system which was implemented in the class. This included a grading rubric for the final conducting exam. It may be that the target of having 95% attain a grade of B or better on the final conducting exam is not a realistic goal. This will be considered.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
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 usually greatly exceeded the required number. 2. Those students who were involved in a large ensemble, small ensemble or applied lessons generally exceeded the required number but always at least met it. 3. Those students enrolled in large ensemble generally met the required number. 4. Those students registered for small ensemble or lessons only, typically did not meet the required number. It is possible that the measurement target should be modified to state that students enrolled in large ensemble AND either small ensemble or applied lessons will meet the number.

M 3: Piano Proficiency (O: 2)
Students demonstrate piano proficiency through the rigorous piano proficiency examination given at the end of the piano sequence
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O2: Performs at Advanced Level
This measure is still being modified but at present we are setting as an achievement target that 95% of the students enrolled in the capstone Piano IV course pass the proficiency.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported this cycle

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

For the reporting year (2010-2011) 27 students were enrolled in Basic Improvisation. 26 of them (96%) received an A on the final improvisation project. The measure has been met.

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
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Conducting Proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Skills
  - Measure: Repertoire Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Faculty, Ad Hoc Assessment committee

Learning Outcomes and Rubrics
Learning outcomes and rubrics for assessment must exist across all areas and programs and offer richer data for ongoing tracking of student progress

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Conducting Proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Conducting Skills
  - Measure: Repertoire Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context
- Implementation Description: This would set the target date after our NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) Accreditation Review and campus visit
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Entire Faculty

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
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Repertoire Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Places Music In Historical and Cultural Context
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Ensemble conductors, area coordinators, applied instructors
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and
improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The large ensemble directors are aware of the need for more rigorous assessment in ensembles. To that end the band program has initiated performance evaluations as part of their ensemble requirements in which each student prepares a portion of his/her music, records it and gives to the conductor for assessment. In this coming year we will attempt to make this type of assessment a comprehensive one with all large ensembles.

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

We will continue to revise the basic conducting curriculum so that more assessments are given throughout the semester. We are considering an increase in contact hours (and credit hours) in order to accomplish this. The ensemble directors/area coordinators/private instructors will meet regularly to discuss repertoire in order to ensure a diverse and comprehensive musical experience for all students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

We made assessment in the Basic Conducting course more rigorous. We planned repertoire meetings in order to ensure a comprehensive musical experience for our students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Perhaps our goals and our measures/findings should be reconsidered.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Other than the improvements that we are making in the area of repertoire and the Basic Conducting class, we believe that it may be time to reassess our goals and measures. We anticipate an improvement in the assessment of the Basic Conducting class and continued improvement in offering a diverse repertoire of music to our students. Other improvements will likely not happen as we reassess.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content**
Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Six students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all six 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Six students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all six 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Six students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all six passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Two students proposed a dissertation for the first time and both were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Two students proposed a dissertation for the first time and both were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Two students proposed a dissertation for the first time and both were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals 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**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 31 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 3.2% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 31 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 3.2% of the students.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 31 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 3.2% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 31 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 3.2% of the students.
Target for Q3: Communication and Collaboration

The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

There were serious concerns with one out of 31 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 3.2% 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

New program with action plan in development
This program is still new and the first cohort of students were admitted in January 2010 with two additional cohorts admitted in August 2010 and 2011. Due to the infancy of this program we are still developing our action plan. In addition to reviewing student performance on their Qualifying exams, and dissertation defense we are working on the following action items:

1. Continued enhanced Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR) training. RCR training is required by the National Institutes of Health and may soon be required by the National Science Foundation as part of graduate student training. This training is designed to expose students to best ethical practices for conducting research. We are teaching our first “official” graduate RCR course (Intro to Graduate Studies) and data collected from this course will verify that we are in compliance with RCR guidelines and can used if we decide to apply for graduate training grants in the future. 2. We have had two cohorts of students take the new Neuroscience PhD qualifying exam. After reviewing the Milestone Evaluation forms we have determined that we will better be able to assess student performance if we separate out the oral exam scores from the written exam scores. We will revise this document in Fall 2011. 3. Using the revised Milestone Evaluation form we will be able to delve deeper into specific indicators of student performance instead of just focusing on overall global scores. Using a more in-depth analysis of data from the Milestone Evaluation forms we will be able to better determine if our students are adequately prepared for the exam as well as determine if assessments used in our Core courses are sufficient in training our students in the scientific process. 4. We propose to implement Professional Development courses and workshops for our students to better prepare them for conference presentations, job interviews, enhancing teaching performance etc. 5. As part of the interdisciplinary nature of our PhD program we worked with the Philosophy Dept. to develop a “Concentration in Neuroethics” that our students can voluntarily participate as a way of enhancing their graduate training.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We did not make any changes in the assessment during the 2010-11 academic year due to the fact that we first admitted students into our program in Jan. 2010. Consequently this is our second report. We do plan on separating our Qualifying Exam Milestone Evaluation form out into two parts (oral and written) for the next academic year to be able to make a more in-depth analysis of student performance.

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

This is a new doctoral program and therefore we still do not have enough data to make changes in our degree based on the small sample size from our assessment findings. We did make an addition to our curriculum and added a revised Intro to Graduate Studies course based on the National Institutes of Health required Responsible Conduct in Research training. We currently have our five new (admitted Fall 2011) students enrolled.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Nursing BS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**O/O 5: Literature Search Activity (G: 2) (M: 6)**
All students enrolled in NURS 3500 Nursing Reserach 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.

**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.

**O/O 7: Exit Survey (G: 3) (M: 8)**
Graduating seniors completing the exit survey will indicate that they felt prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

For Fall 2010, 76.1% (51 of 67) students had an improvement in their total score by the 4th clinical narrative; 15% (10 of 67) students had a decrease in their total score. For Spring 2011, 91% (64 of 70) students had an improvement in their total score by the 4th clinical narrative assignment; 9% (6 of 70) total scores remained the same, none of the total scores decreased. For the 2010-2011 academic year, 84% (115 of 137) 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

For Fall 2010, 92.2% (59 of 64) of students achieved at least the minimum score of 74% on the CTW assignment. For Spring 2011, 98.7% (77 of 78) of students achieved the minimum score. For academic year 2010-2011, 96% (136 of 142) 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

For Summer 2010, 19 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 94% (18 of 19) achieved a score at or above the national average. For Fall 2010, 38 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 89% (34 of 38) achieved a score at or above the national average. For Spring 2011, 66 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 71% (47 of 66) achieved a score at or above the national average. For the academic year 2010-2011, 123 seniors took the standardized critical thinking exam. 80.5% 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 minimal 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 paper 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

For summer 2010, 84% (26 of 31) of students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based practice paper. For Fall 2010, 86% (61 of 71) of students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based practice paper. For Spring 2011 96% (43 of 45) of students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based practice paper. For the 2010-2011 academic year, 88.4% (130 of 147) students achieved the minimum score of 74% on the evidence based paper. This is an improvement over last year’s results. While we are still not at the threshold desired, strides have been made. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Research Article Critique (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Research Article Critique</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students completing NURS3500 will achieve a score of 74% or better on a research article critique.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For Summer 2010, 100% (19 of 19) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For Fall 2010 98% (50 of 51) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For Spring 2011, 98% (59 of 60) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For the academic year 2010-2011, 98% (128 of 130) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Literature Search Activity Paper (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Literature Search Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students achieve at least the minimum score of 74% on the literature search activity paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For Summer 2010, 100% (19 of 19) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the literature search activity paper. For Fall 2010 98% (49 of 51) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For Spring 2011, 98% (59 of 60) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique. For the academic year 2010-2011, 98% (127 of 130) of students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research article critique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of the graduates of the undergraduate nursing program who take the NCLEX will pass on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of graduating nursing students will pass the NCLEX on the first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94.9% (111/117) of students taking the NCLEX exam in Georgia passed the exam on the first attempt. 100% (6/6) students took and passed the exam in other states and passed on the first attempt. 95.12% (117/123) graduates passed the NCLEX on the forst sitting for the year Summer 2010 through Spring 2011. 2 student who graduated during this time are not included. One has not yet taken the exam, and 1 is lost to follow up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Exit Survey (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% of the graduating seniors who complete the exit survey will indicate that they felt prepared to &quot;integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community&quot; (program outcome).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Exit Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Data was obtained from 126 graduating seniors from the 2010-2011 academic year. 98.4% 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. If multiple variables are contained in the same question, revision will occur. The Assistant Director for External Affairs will continue to develop a reliable data base for BFLSON graduates. Once a reliable data base is obtained and the question is reviewed for clarity, a repeat survey can be addressed. The graduates will be encouraged to become and stay engaged with the BFLSON. This will be accomplished by the continued publication of the bi-annual newsletter, and a potential social activity. New graduates will be encouraged to become and stay active with the BFLSON alumni group. For this to happen, an up-to-date reliable data base must be developed.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

*Implementation Status: Planned*

*Priority: High*
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 maximum success on a separate critical thinking exam.

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

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

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

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

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 The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will assess the questionnaire.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Priority: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Exit Survey</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Exit Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: this is the end of the academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 06/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Literature Search Activity Paper</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Literature Search Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 06/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The course administrator for NURS 3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>NCLEX First Time Pass Rate</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 06/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Research Article Critique</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Research Article Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: This is the end of the next academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 06/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Course administrators of NURS 3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical narrative papers generated from NURS2080**

It is commendable that the target was exceeded for Spring 2011. However the target was not met for the Fall 2010 class. This years overall score was significantly improved from the last cycle, for this reason the UG program coordinator has met with the faculty involved in this course and reviewed practices. Continued surveillence will result and

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>CTW NURS 2080</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: CTW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Course faculty will continue to stress the importance of critical thinking through writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator of NURS2080 in conjunction with the UG program coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>CTW</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: CTW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: Course faculty will continue to stress the importance of critical thinking through writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date: 09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator of NURS2080 in conjunction with the UG program coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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

Add weight to the Exit test
The course administrator has added consequences to this test. The students did improve on this measure, yet the goal of 85% has not been reached. The students will continue to have consequences related to this standardized test. The course administrator will continue to make sure the students are aware of the consequences and make sure the consequences are significant enough to warrant attention to this exit activity.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Continued observation of 2080 writing assignment
It is commendable that the target was exceeded for Spring 2011. However the target was not met for the Fall 2010 class. This years overall score was significantly improved from the last cycle. For this reason the UG program coordinator has met with the faculty involved in this course and reviewed practices. Continued surveillance will result and we anticipate continued improvement in this area.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Evidence Based project
The focus of this project has changed slightly to reflect a more direct approach to this end. The expectation now include a review and not a formal paper. The end result of using evidence continues, but the assignment will change beginning summer 2010. This more closely reflects how a nurse would use the evidence in a real world situation.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Summer graduates and plan to increase pass rate

While the overall pass rate far exceeded the goal and exceeded the state and national pass rate, we noticed some interesting information. 3 of the 6 failures for the period of inquiry were graduates from the summer class. This class constituted 19 of the total 123 students. For this reason, we looked at the difference in this group of students or perhaps the way they are taught and evaluated in the summer. The course administrator along with the UG program coordinator and the assistant dean for nursing decided that the summer 7 week session was too short to deliver all the required material. Additionally, the course had no attendance policy, and the students did not attend class with regularity. For Summer 2012, the course will be delivered during a 10 week session as many of the clinical nursing courses are, and the attendance policy will be written in the syllabus and enforced.

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 Credentialling Center (Clinical Nurse Specialists and Nurse Practitioner Certification in Adult Health, Psychiatric Mental Health); National Certification Board of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners; National Certification Corporation for Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing Specialties
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the master's students will demonstrate evidence of ethical and legal practice as demonstrated by evaluation of clinical practicum experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice (G: 3, 4, 7) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4, 8) (M: 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice (G: 4, 6, 7, 8) (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At end-of-program, 80% of the master's students will meet/exceeded the program objective of analyzing various approaches in nursing practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (G: 4, 8) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Participation in Research (G: 7, 9) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the end-of-program, 80% students will indicate that they are prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.) (G: 1, 7) (M: 8, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4) (M: 2, 4, 6, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At end-of-program, 90% students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Practice in Specialty Area (G: 4) (M: 4, 6, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates (90%) of the master's program will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Scholarly Productivity (G: 1, 9) (M: 7, 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni survey results will be involved scholarly activities [participation in research (25%); publications (15%); presentations at professional meetings (50%)] by 5-years post-graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Professional Membership (G: 1, 5, 6) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will report membership in professional nursing organizations (80%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (G: 4, 5, 6) (M: 8, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Analyze Various Approaches to Nursing Practice (O: 1, 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010 data - 78% (28/27) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of analyzing various approaches to nursing practice. (For this academic year data under review. Interpretation and recommendation to follow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

In the end of program evaluation (Spring 2010), 78% (n=21) indicated that they met or exceeded the objective of analyzing a variety of approaches used in the practice of nursing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Practice (O: 2, 4, 5, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2010-2011 - 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 Q9: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In the end of program survey (Spring 2010), 89% (n = 24/27) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**M 3: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice (O: 3)**

Spring 2010 data - 81% (22/27) of the students reported they met/exceeded the criteria that they evaluated concepts and theories as a basis for advanced practice nursing. Data from this cycle under review. Interpretation and recommendations to follow.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for Q3: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

81% (n = 22/27) (Spring 2010) 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)**

Spring 2010 data, 89% (24/27) of the students indicated that they demonstrated caring in nursing practice Data for cycle under review. Interpretation and recommendations to follow.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (O: 6, 9, 9)**

Spring 2010 data - 89% (24/27) 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. (Data from this cycle under review. Interpretation and recommendations to follow).

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 7: Participation in Research (O: 7, 10)**

Spring 2010 data - 96% (25/27) indicated that they were well/very well prepared to implement evidence-based practice; however, only 55% (15/27) had been involved in research activities since graduation. (Data from this cycle under review. Interpretation and recommendations to follow).

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Sciences, Etc.) (O: 8, 12)**

Spring 2010 data - 85% (23/27) 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. (Data from cycle under review. Interpretation and recommendations to follow).

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)**

Spring 2010 data, 78% (21/27) 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. Data from this cycle under review. Interpretation and recommendations to follow.

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)

**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
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
- Responsible Person/Group: Masters Program Committee Coordinator of the Master’s Program; Associate Director for Academic Affairs
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2010-2011 Nursing PhD**
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Research Implementation (G: 1, 6) (M: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the graduating students will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Theory Utilization (G: 2) (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NURS 8040 Theory Construction course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>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>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>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>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>SLO 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (G: 5) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Completion of the PhD Program (G: 6) (M: 3, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of the doctoral students admitted to the nursing doctoral program will successfully complete the requirements for graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Spring 2009, 12 (100%) of the doctoral students enrolled in NURS 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Qualitative Research Implementation (O: 1, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.7% (n=6) of the doctoral students successfully implemented a pilot qualitative research study and analysis during NURS 8012 Qualitative Research Methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Theory Utilization (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Socially Relevant Research Implementation (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three doctoral students successfully implemented socially relevant research projects and graduated in 2008-2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Theory Utilization 2 (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (n=6) successfully completed the NURS 8012 Theory Construction requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Application of Quantitative Research Methods (O: 1, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Nutrition BS
As of: 12/13/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Division of Nutrition at Georgia State University prepares professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and who contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics. Admission to this Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE)-accredited program is at the junior year. The program graduates approximately 30 students each year.

Goals
G 1: Prepare dietetics professionals
The DPD will prepare graduates to be competent for entry into accredited supervised practice programs.

G 2: Make effective use of resources in problem solving
The DPD will promote professional development by emphasizing problem-solving skills, lifelong learning skills, and critical thinking skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Students are able to demonstrate how to locate, interpret, evaluate and use professional literature to make ethical evidence-based practice decisions.
Relevant Associations: Goal 1 and 2

SLO 2: Professional Practice Expectations: beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviors for the professional dietitian level of practice (G: 1, 2)
Students are able to demonstrate effective and professional oral and written communication and documentation and use of current information technologies when communicating with individuals, groups and the public.
Relevant Associations: Goal 2

SLO 3: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and popula (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students are able to use the nutrition care process to make decisions, to identify nutrition-related problem and determine and evaluate nutrition interventions, including medical nutrition therapy, disease prevention and health promotion.

SLO 4: Practice Management and Use of Resources (G: 2)
Students are able to apply management and business theories and principles to the development, marketing and delivery of programs or services.
SLO 5: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice (G: 1)

Learning Outcome: Students are able to use current information technologies to locate and apply evidence-based guidelines and protocols, such as the ADA Evidence Analysis Library, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, National Guideline Clearinghouse Web sites.

Relevant Associations: Goal 1

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.

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.

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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Research Paper (O: 1)

This paper is a component of the capstone Critical Thinking through Writing course (NUTR 4950). It is completed in stages, with two revision cycles. Originally, the paper was a group assignment completed by students in groups of 4-5 students. For 2010, the assignment was changed to an individual research paper since the group paper failed to identify individual progress from junior year to senior year. Students wrote the paper based on their primary research question. The paper had one revision prior to formulation of the final paper. Two components of the evaluation rubric are used for this evaluation: rationale and content. Each of these is evaluated on a scale of basic (0-2), proficient (4), and mastery (6). 90% of students should receive a proficient score on rubric for final draft of the research paper. Rubric is located in depository.

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

**Target for O1: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

There were 19 students in NUTR 4950. The mean score on the rubric for organization class was 5.4 and for content the mean score was 5.2.

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: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and populations**

The expected mean score for the junior class is 75%, and the expected mean score for the senior class is 85%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The mean score for the juniors was 80% and the mean score for seniors was 88%. This related measure will change to reflect the new CADE standards for the DPD program.

**Target for O6: Demonstrate science understanding**
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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.

Revision of Program Goals

Assessment report will be revised to include the required CADE Goals, Knowledge Requirements and Learning outcomes for the program. New Goals: Goal 1: Prepare graduates to be competent for entry into CADE accredited supervised practice programs or entry level nutrition positions. Goal 2: Promote professional development by emphasizing problem-solving skills, lifelong learning skills, and critical thinking skills. Goal 3: Attract and retain well qualified candidates.

Revised Mission / Purpose

Operations Management (OM) focuses on the management of resources and activities that produce and deliver the goods and services for customers. OM can play a critical role in enhancing a company’s competitive position by providing superior products and services.

Goals

G 1: Depth of OM study
One goal of the MS Concentration in Operations Management program is to offer students in depth knowledge related to operations and supply chain management.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Develop a Strategic View of OM (M: 1, 2, 3)
The ability to analyze and evaluate alternative operations strategies for a given business environment and to identify the appropriate facility location, design and technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.
### 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**

**Learning Objective 1:** Strategic View of OM  
Fail Fails to meet standards=1  
Meet Meets standards=2  
Exceed Exceeds standards=3  
Measurable Reasoned Analysis: The student must be 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**  
The students met the standard at the rate of 70% to 75%, while 25% to 30% of the time they exceeded the standard. The failure by some students to attain the "Exceed" standard is due to a lack of adequate integrative thinking in their group projects. The students did not apply in-depth analysis of their process applications to exceed the standard.

**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 Learning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3  
Measurable Integration of recommendations: The student must be 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**  
The students met the standard at the rate of 70% to 75%, while 25% to 30% of the time they exceeded the standard. The failure by some students to attain the "Exceed" standard is due to a lack of adequate integrative thinking in their group projects. The students did not apply in-depth analysis of their process applications to exceed the standard.

**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 Learning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3  
Measurable Performance: The student must be able to: assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. The students are not 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Student findings reflect a 80% level of understanding and monitoring performance levels within their group projects. The level of sophistication regarding analysis is not where we want it and will be an area for improvement, as mentioned previously.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Homework assignments, case analysis and group project executive summaries reflect reasonable to good decision making capabilities. Students need to be reeducated in all steps of rational problem solving techniques.

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. Leaning Objective 3: Develop a Environmental/Substantiality Viewpoint Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 5 Environmental Impact Evaluation The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environmental 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environmental impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Results indicate a partial meeting of this objective.

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

A strategic view of OM

With respect to the first learning outcome, to develop a strategic view of OM, two actions will be taken: - In MGS 8710, add a homework assignment to ask students aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering. - In MGS 8710, add a case about operations making significant difference for a company’s long term growth. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Decision Making Abilities

With respect to the second learning outcome, to develop decision-making abilities, two actions will be taken: - In MGS 8710, ask students to add more analysis in students’ group project. Evaluate after next offering. - In MGS 8710, add several new measures in supply chain and revenue management analysis in accordance with the business environment: increased globalization. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
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.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Ability to organize, developed and advanced a operations management business plan and vision using critical thinking through writing at a business level, as opposed to an academic level. With the use of a well developed rubric for the CTW course, we are able to establish viable outcomes and objectives based on the learning outcomes for the course.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
There is no class in CTW requiring the measurement of attributes involving the development of a thesis and the advancement of the thesis.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Our assessment regarding need for a CTW course for the concentration in Operations Management MS program is that there is no immediate need.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
There has been no changes to date, as there is no CTW course at present.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
The has been minor changes in the evaluation/ assessment process of Operations Management MS regarding the project content requirements, such as, sustainability and Information Technology. The balance of the required and elective course requirements, i.e., two exams and multiple cases have remained unchanged. The basic outline for these courses regarding the assessment process has been deemed successful with the students and faculty.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
There has been no changes to the curriculum, courses or the sequencing of the courses during the past year’s term.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
No changes of significance have been made, despite the addition of new course materials in the MGS 8710 Operations Planning and the selection of a new text. MGS 8760 Quality Management falls into the same category as MGS 8710 as it was reintroduced during the Fall semester, 2011.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
The evaluations and anecdotal comments made by students assure the Operations Management faculty that the courses are being well received and the objectives/ outcomes of the courses are practical and create value for the students.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The OM faculty continues to review updated text that are felt to improve the learning experience for the students. This is an ongoing process. Our current syllabus consisting of two major exams covering 5 to 6 chapters each, weekly case analysis of relevant articles
and cases, and a major team based operations project has been quite successful with our objectives and outcomes developed for these courses.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Organizational Change MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
The MS in Organizational Change is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to be a leader or implementer of organizational change initiatives. The MS in Organizational Change extends the students’ previously acquired basic management and organizational behavior skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in applied change management practices. The MS in Organizational Change, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as change management specialists either as managers or as internal or external consultants. Topics include negotiation, leadership, organizational change, and coaching.

**Goals**

**G 1: Negotiate Agreements**
Goal 1: To graduate students from the MS program with the ability to negotiate agreements that advance the organization’s interests by optimally balancing the simultaneous need to be cooperative and to be competitive.

**G 2: Enhance Leadership Skills**
Goal 2: To graduate students from the MS program with an awareness of how to enhance their own leadership skills over the course of their careers.

**G 3: Managerial Coaching**
Goal 3: To graduate students from the MS program in Organizational Change with an awareness of developing employees through managerial coaching by using the skills and techniques of all facets of managerial coaching.

**G 4: Analyze Change Needs and Construct Plan**
Goal 4: To graduate students from the MS program with the ability to analyze organizational change needs and to construct a change management plan.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Divide Value in Negotiation (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Outcome/Objective 1: Understand and effectively apply the tools necessary to divide value in negotiations. Full Description: The MS graduate will understand the concepts of bargaining zone, anchoring, and walk-away alternatives. They will be able to negotiate agreements that optimize the organization’s interests with regard to the competitive element of negotiating.

**SLO 2: Create Value in Negotiation (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Outcome/Objective 2: Understand and effectively apply the tools necessary to create value in negotiation. Full Description: The MS graduate will understand the concepts of creating value, bilateral concessions, package offers, and contingent elements to the agreement. They will be able to negotiate agreements that optimize the combined total value distributed between both negotiators.

**SLO 3: Prepare Leadership Development Plan (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)**
Outcome/Objective 3: Students should be able to understand and describe their own leadership strengths and weaknesses, and should be able to prepare leadership development plans that will enhance their leadership capabilities. These plans will incorporate appropriate and sound leadership development resources, tools and processes.

**SLO 4: Recognize Coaching Moment (G: 3) (M: 5, 6)**
Outcome/Objective 4: Recognize a coaching moment. Full Description: The MS-Organizational Change graduate will be able to recognize coaching moments that occur in the midst of managing others, and even more specifically when there is any kind of change taking place at an organizational level, a departmental level, or at an individual level such as a change of job position or a required change of attitude.

**SLO 5: Perform Change Management Project (G: 4)**
Outcome/Objective 5: Perform an OD/Change Management Consulting Project

**SLO 6: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan (G: 4)**
Outcome/Objective 6: Recommend an appropriate OD intervention strategy and plan.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Divided Value in Capstone Negotiation (O: 1)**
Measures The value to the buyer or seller of the final deal negotiated in the capstone one-on-one negotiation. Capstone one-on-one negotiation in MGS 8430 is a simulated business negotiation. It involves two parties, a buyer and a seller. A database exists of over 200 agreements recorded from previous sections of MGS 8430 from which to calculate agreement percentiles.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Divide Value in Negotiation**

Meeting or exceeding a value at the 60th percentile of agreements normed on previous sections of MGS 8430. The 60th percentile for buyers is $290,000. The 60th percentile for sellers is $397,500.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

As shown in the attached table, the average was 55.8%. Three of six students met the achievement target. Without the one student who had a percentile of 22%, the average would have met the target average of 60%.

**M 2: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation (O: 2)**

Measures The combined total value obtained by the buyer and the seller in the capstone one-on-one negotiation. Capstone one-on-one negotiation in MGS 8430 is a simulated business negotiation. It involves two parties, a buyer and a seller. A database exists of over 200 agreements recorded from previous MGS 8430 sections from which to calculate agreement percentiles. This particular negotiation is designed so that the combined total can only be optimized when bilateral concessions are used effectively and when contingent elements are effectively included in the agreement.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Create Value in Negotiation**

Meeting or exceeding a value at the 60th percentile of agreements normed on previous sections of MGS 8430. The 60th percentile for the combined total is $639,000.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

As shown in the attached table, the average percentile across 6 students was 44.2%. Of the 6, 2 students reached the achievement target.

**M 3: Leadership Self-Assessment (O: 3)**

Project in MGS 8420 Measures Describes their own leadership strengths and weaknesses.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Prepare Leadership Development Plan**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the following rubric:

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Only 3 students were in the assessment group in this cycle. Although all 3 met the achievement target, this evidence should be treated as preliminary because it comes from such a small population of students.

**M 4: Leadership Development Plan (O: 3)**

Prepare leadership development plans that will enhance their leadership capabilities. These plans will incorporate appropriate and sound leadership development resources, tools and processes.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Prepare Leadership Development Plan**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 2 to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Only 3 students were in the assessment group in this cycle. Although all 3 met the achievement target, this evidence should be treated as preliminary because it comes from such a small population of students.

**M 5: Coaching Scenario Assignment (O: 4)**

Ability to write up a coaching scenario that clearly demonstrates a managerial coaching moment. This comes from the coaching scenario assignment and coaching log book in MGS 8425

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

**Target for O4: Recognize Coaching Moment**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 3 to randomly selected coaching scenarios.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Only one student was in the assessment group in this cycle. Although the one student met the achievement target, this evidence should be treated as preliminary because it comes from such a small population of students.

**M 6: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness (O: 4)**

Ability to respond to think reflectively about their own effectiveness as a coach in the role of coaching others.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Recognize Coaching Moment**

A 2.0 average on the coaching log books. Measurement will be done by applying Rubric 4 to randomly selected coaching log books.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Only one student was in the assessment group in this cycle. Although the one student met the achievement target, this evidence should be treated as preliminary because it comes from such a small population of students.

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

Additional Methods of Creating Value
MGS 8430 instructors will cover additional methods for creating value when that topic is covered in class. A target of 30 additional lecture minutes will be dedicated to these additional methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Create Value in Negotiation

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8430 instructors

Continue to gather data
Because data in this cycle was from only 3 students, we will continue to collect data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Leadership Development Plan | Outcome/Objective: Prepare Leadership Development Plan

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8420 instructors

Current emphasis monitored
Given that the results were based on only 6 students and that half of the students met the achievement target, we are not yet convinced that significant changes are needed. The course instructors will assure that the topic of dividing value in negotiation is taught sufficiently according to the current emphasis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Divided Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Divide Value in Negotiation

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8430 course instructors

Additional Resources: none
**Mission / Purpose**

**MS-PFP PROGRAM MISSION:** The MS in Personal Financial Planning is designed to prepare students to: (1) Enter the field of financial planning at the planner level; (2) Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam; and; (3) Serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm. It will do so by developing students’ technical expertise in the topics of financial planning and their ability to integrate that expertise to help individuals plan their financial lives. The MS-PFP provides a more concentrated and in-depth consideration of financial planning topics than is offered by the MBA-PFP and thus better serves the needs of the those who are certain of their intent to pursue a financial planning career and assume a leadership position in a financial planning firm. RMI DEPARTMENT MISSION/VISION: To be the world’s leader in risk management scholarship and education. Through the collaboration of experts in multiple disciplines, we will be recognized internationally as leaders in: a) the development of integrated applications of economics, law, mathematics, and probability theory to the quantitative and qualitative measurement of risks; b) the selection and design of individual, organizational, and societal strategies for the efficient management of risk; and c) the dissemination of this knowledge.

**Goals**

**G 1: Enter the PFP field as a planner**
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to enter the field of financial planning at the planner level.

**G 2: Pass the Certified Financial Planner exam**
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to pass the Certified Financial Planner exam.

**G 3: Prepare for leadership role**
The MS in Personal Financial Planning will prepare students, upon completion, to serve as the foundation for a leadership role in a financial planning firm.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Technical expertise - overall (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3)**
The MS-PFP graduate will 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%.

**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%.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**M 3: CFP® Exam (O: 1)**

The CFP® Exam is administered three times each year. Many of the program’s graduates take this examination and the CFP Board of Standards reports the results to the Program Director. This examination tests competence to become a CFP certificant. The percentage of our graduates passing the examination will be compared to the national average to assess mastery of the technical and analytical skills necessary to practice as a financial planner. The long-range passing percentage for program graduates will be kept and compared with the most recent performance of the graduates and the national performance averages. Each year, the Program Director will analyze the data received from the CFP Board. The Program Director also will use his or her best efforts to monitor the frequency, bases, and nature of any disciplinary action taken by the CFP Board against any graduate of the program and will report the results of this monitoring effort.

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

**Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall**

CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.

**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.

---

**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
  Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
  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-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
**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Philosophy has developed this policy to set out its student learning outcomes and assessment procedures. Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as 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 history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. 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, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

**Goals**

**G 1: Phil 1010**

Phil 1010, Critical Thinking (in Area B), contributes significantly to GSU's General Education program by helping students hone critical thinking skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Students learn to effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**G 2: Phil 2010**

Phil 2010, Introduction to Philosophy (Area C) offers students the opportunity to confront big questions and to learn what history's most original thinkers have said about issues fundamental to existence as a human being. This contributes significantly to GSU's General Education program by helping students hone critical thinking skills that are applicable to any endeavor. Students learn to effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. Students also learn to effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: 1010 Objective 1: Recognizing Arguments (G: 1) (M: 1)**

All students who take Phil 1010 should be able to accurately distinguish arguments from non-arguments.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 3.0 | Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. |
| 9.0 | Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

| 2 | Student promotion and progression |

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

| 1.5 | Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education). |

**SLO 2: 1010 Objective 2: Premises & Conclusions (G: 1) (M: 2)**

All students who take Phil 1010 should be able to identify the premises and conclusions of arguments.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

| 3.0 | Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. |
| 9.0 | Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. |

**Institutional Priority Associations**

| 2 | Student promotion and progression |

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

| 1.5 | Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education). |

**SLO 3: 1010 Objective 3: Subordinate Arguments (G: 1) (M: 3)**

All students who take Phil 1010 should understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<p>| 3.0 | Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. |
| 9.0 | Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: 1010 Objective 4: Argument Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students who take Phil 1010 should be able to critically evaluate the arguments of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who take Phil 2010 should be able to think critically and effectively as evidenced by a basic ability to present clear and sound arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: 2010 Objective 2: Content (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who take Phil 2010 should have mastery of some standard content knowledge, including the following: (i) a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?) (ii) a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology (What do we know?) (iii) a basic understanding of central problems in ethics (What should we do?) (iv) a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. (v) a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors. (We do not separate these out in the Measures and Findings.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
### M1: 1010 Measure 1: Recognizing Arguments (O: 1)

Every fall, five sections of Phil 1010 taught by different instructors will be selected at random. Four final argument analyses will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the analyses of the first four students on the roll [assuming that each of these four turns in an analysis, if they do not, continue down the roll], but only one per student.) A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each analysis letter grades (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on the student's ability to analyze information and arguments by (i) distinguishing arguments from non-arguments.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: 1010 Objective 1: Recognizing Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is that the average 1010 student's ability to distinguish arguments from non-arguments is assessed a 2.25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 1010 student's ability to distinguish arguments from non-arguments was assessed a 2.94.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M2: 1010 Measure 2: Premises & Conclusions (O: 2)

Every fall, five sections of Phil 1010 taught by different instructors will be selected at random. Four final argument analyses will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the analyses of the first four students on the roll [assuming that each of these four turns in an analysis, if they do not, continue down the roll], but only one per student.) A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each analysis letter grades (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on the student's ability to analyze information and arguments by (ii) identifying premises and conclusions.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: 1010 Objective 2: Premises &amp; Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is that the average 1010 student's ability to identify premises and conclusions is assessed a 2.25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this 2010-2011 cycle, average 1010 student's ability to identify premises and conclusions was assessed a 2.66.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M3: 1010 Measure 3: Subordinate Arguments (O: 3)

Every fall, five sections of Phil 1010 taught by different instructors will be selected at random. Four final argument analyses will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the analyses of the first four students on the roll [assuming that each of these four turns in an analysis, if they do not, continue down the roll], but only one per student.) A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each analysis letter grades (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on the student's ability to analyze information and arguments by (iii) understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: 1010 Objective 3: Subordinate Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is that the average 1010 student's ability to understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments is assessed a 2.25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 1010 student's ability to understand the relation between main and subordinate arguments was assessed a 2.68.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M4: 1010 Measure 4: Argument Evaluation (O: 4)

Every fall, five sections of Phil 1010 taught by different instructors will be selected at random. Four final argument analyses will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the analyses of the first four students on the roll [assuming that each of these four turns in an analysis, if they do not, continue down the roll], but only one per student.) A committee of three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) will assign each analysis letter grades (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on the student's ability to analyze information and arguments by (iv) critically evaluating the arguments of others.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: 1010 Objective 4: Argument Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is that the average 1010 student's ability to critically evaluating the arguments of others is assessed a 2.25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 1010 student's ability to critically evaluating the arguments of others was assessed a 2.57.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M5: 2010 Measure 1: Critical Thinking (O: 5)

Every Fall, five sections of Phil 2010 will be selected at random. Four final exams will be selected at random from each of these five sections. (It will be the exams of the first four students on the roll [assuming that each of these students turns in an exam, if they do not, continue down the roll], but only one per student.) The instructor of the course will assign each exam letter grades (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on the following criterion: 2. Think critically and effectively as evidenced by (i) a basic ability to present clear and sound arguments.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our target is that the average 2010 student's ability to think critically and effectively is assessed a 2.25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 2010 student's ability to think critically and effectively was assessed a 2.39.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 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. 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.

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.

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: In-Progress
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 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 correct 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 little or no explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to develop a properly 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). 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 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 inadequate 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 read like a first draft. 2: Papers assessed at a 2.0 for writing have a thesis statement and some organization of paragraphs, but overall do not flow. They contain a significant number of grammar or spelling errors and read like a first draft. 1: Papers assessed at a 1.0 for writing are poorly organized, with paragraphs that do not have a coherent structure. They contain numerous grammar and/or spelling errors and read like first drafts that have not been proofread. 0: Papers assessed at a 0 for writing are similar to papers assessed at a 1.0, but contains 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 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

**Add element to student tests**

Beginning in the Spring of 2011, the tests for 1010 were improved to include an assessment of the ability of the students to distinguish arguments from non-arguments. This should help improve the findings for 1010 measure #1

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: 1010 Measure 1: Recognizing Arguments | Outcome/Objective: 1010 Objective 1: Recognizing Arguments

**Remove 1010 Objective 3**

Upon going through this revised process, we discovered that this measure served little purpose and will be removing it.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: 1010 Measure 2: Premises & Conclusions | Outcome/Objective: 1010 Objective 2: Premises & Conclusions  
Measure: 1010 Measure 3: Subordinate Arguments | Outcome/Objective: 1010 Objective 3: Subordinate Arguments

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the tests process will you make in the coming academic year?

We completely revamped our assessment policies in the Fall of 2010 and were able to use the new policies right away (excepting for the M.A. program). Importantly, we previously used 3 measures for both 1010 and 2010: philosophical skills, writing ability, and application. Phil 1010 is no longer a class with substantial writing, so that measure was no longer sensible for that class. "Application of skills" was never clear to many of our faculty and has been removed from the assessment policy for both classes. Phil 1010 concentrates on teaching students how to argue well. We thus set about to make fine distinctions of the skill set we think of as "critical thinking" and came up with the four used here: (i) distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, (ii) identifying premises and
The Department of Philosophy has developed this policy to set out its student learning outcomes and assessment procedures. Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as 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 history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. 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, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

**Goals**

**G 1: Philosophy BA**

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 both. As such, students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate a knowledge of representative philosophers and movements in historical and contemporary philosophy as well as knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in the various fields of philosophy. They will also demonstrate the ability to read critically with comprehension, think critically, and write clearly and critically.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: B.A. Objective 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate the ability to (a) read critically with comprehension and (b) think critically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate a knowledge of representative philosophers and movements in historical and contemporary philosophy as well as the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in the following concentrations: ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology. (These concentrations are to be defined broadly so as to exhaust all fields of philosophy.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and critically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

2 Student promotion and progression
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: BA Measure 1: Critical Thinking (O: 1)

Every Fall, instructors of all Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 classes include on their syllabi the requirement that final papers be submitted electronically to the professor. The instructors of these classes will send these to the Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Coordinator will use a random number generator (such as that found at www.random.org) to select 15 papers total from all Phil 3000 classes and 10 (current policy says 15; we will adjust) papers total from all Phil 4990 classes. (These should come equally from each of the classes. For example, if there are 3 Phil 3000 classes, 5 papers should be chosen from each class; if there are 2 Phil 4990 classes, 7 papers should be chosen from each class and a 15th paper should be chosen at random from the combined set of papers from both.) Every Spring, the Assessment Coordinator distributes the selected papers to the other three members of the Assessment Committee. Those three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) assign each paper a letter score (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on critical thinking. When the scoring is complete, the Assessment Coordinator calculates the average score of the Phil 3000 papers and the average score of the Phil 4990 papers.

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

**Target for O1: B.A. Objective 1: Critical Thinking**

Our target is that the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability is assessed a 2.25 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability is assessed a 2.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.49 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.68. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.39. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.39, progressing students at 2.49, and finishing students at 2.68. This seems like a reasonable progression.

#### M 2: BA Measure 2: Content Knowledge (O: 2)

Every Fall, instructors of all Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 classes include on their syllabi the requirement that final papers be submitted electronically to the professor. The instructors of these classes will send these to the Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Coordinator will use a random number generator (such as that found at www.random.org) to select 15 papers total from all Phil 3000 classes and 10 (current policy says 15; we will adjust) papers total from all Phil 4990 classes. (These should come equally from each of the classes. For example, if there are 3 Phil 3000 classes, 5 papers should be chosen from each class; if there are 2 Phil 4990 classes, 7 papers should be chosen from each class and a 15th paper should be chosen at random from the combined set of papers from both.) Every Spring, the Assessment Coordinator distributes the selected papers to the other three members of the Assessment Committee. Those three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) assign each paper a letter score (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on content knowledge. When the scoring is complete, the Assessment Coordinator calculates the average score of the Phil 3000 papers and the average score of the Phil 4990 papers.

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

**Target for O2: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge**

Our target is that the average 3000 student's content knowledge is assessed a 2.25 and the average 4990 student's content knowledge is assessed a 2.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 3000 student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.68 and the average 4990 student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.79. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.26. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.26, progressing students at 2.68, and finishing students at 2.79. This seems like a reasonable progression.

#### M 3: BA Measure 3: Written Communication (O: 3)

Every Fall, instructors of all Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 classes include on their syllabi the requirement that final papers be submitted electronically to the professor. The instructors of these classes will send these to the Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Coordinator will use a random number generator (such as that found at www.random.org) to select 15 papers total from all Phil 3000 classes and 10 (current policy says 15; we will adjust) papers total from all Phil 4990 classes. (These should come equally from each of the classes. For example, if there are 3 Phil 3000 classes, 5 papers should be chosen from each class; if there are 2 Phil 4990 classes, 7 papers should be chosen from each class and a 15th paper should be chosen at random from the combined set of papers from both.) Every Spring, the Assessment Coordinator distributes the selected papers to the other three members of the Assessment Committee. Those three continuing faculty (tenured, tenure-track or lecturers) assign each paper a letter score (A+, A, A-, B+, B, etc.) on written communication. When the scoring is complete, the Assessment Coordinator calculates the average score of the Phil 3000 papers and the average score of the Phil 4990 papers.

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

**Target for O3: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication**

Our target is that the average 3000 student's written communication ability is assessed a 2.25 and the average 4990 student's written communication ability is assessed a 2.5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In this 2010-2011 cycle, the average 3000 student's written communication ability is assessed a 2.62 and the average 4990 student's written communication ability is assessed a 2.88. This seems like a reasonable progression.
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:** In-Progress
- **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

**Change to Instructor evaluation of content knowledge**
Beginning in the 2011-2012 cycle, we will have the instructors of the Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 classes do the assessment of the content knowledge demonstrated in their student’s papers. This should significantly improve the value of this measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: BA Measure 2: Content | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge

**Reduce # of 4990 papers used**
Beginning in the 2011-2012 cycle, we will use 10 papers from Phil 4990 students instead of 15. Given the number of students, this should leave us with the valuable evidence needed while making the process simpler. Given the larger number of students in Phil 3000, we will continue to use 15 papers from those classes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: BA Measure 1: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 1: Critical Thinking
- Measure: BA Measure 2: Content | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge
- Measure: BA Measure 3: Written Communication | Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We previously had a fourth assessed “skill”: collaboration. This was in response to wider requirements that have since been eliminated and we have thus eliminated it from our assessment process. Our BA is now assessed by considering 3 standard skills our students should have: critical thinking, content knowledge, and writing ability. Importantly, the desire of the Department is to do the Assessment by considering the students in the different classes by comparison to what we believe a graduate of our Department should be at, skill-wise. We thus expect higher numbers in Phil 3000 then in Phil 2010 and higher numbers still in Phil 4990. Now that we have completed a cycle with the new policies, we anticipate (1) formally reducing the number of papers used in the assessment of Phil 4990 to 10 and (2) altering our policy such that the professors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 will provide the assessment scores for content knowledge.

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

Given the new system we have put in place, it would be to soon to use its results to suggest changes to our program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you
Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
We completely revamped our assessment policies in the Fall of 2010 and were able to use the new policies right away (excepting for the M.A. program).

Challenges for Next Year
Given the major changes put in place in our new assessment policy, we expected to have to make adjustments.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes

Modifications in Measurement Methods
1. Now that we have completed a cycle with the new policies, we anticipate formally reducing the number of papers used in the assessment of Phil 4990 to 10. 2. We also anticipate altering our policy such that the professors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 will provide the assessment scores for content knowledge.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Philosophy MA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Philosophy has developed this policy to set out its student learning outcomes and assessment procedures. Philosophy has a central role in any university. The writings of philosophers such as 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 history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? These issues have moved minds for centuries. 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, bioethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, only philosophy systematically studies what distinguishes good arguments from bad. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering reasoning skills as with imparting information.

Goals

G 1: Goal of the M.A. Program
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. As such, students who earn the M.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate a knowledge of representative philosophers and movements in historical and contemporary philosophy as well as knowledge of the fundamental concepts, principles, and issues found in the various fields of philosophy. They will also demonstrate the ability to read critically with comprehension, think critically, and write clearly and critically. This is the same goal that we have B.A. students, but we expect graduates of the M.A. program to have a greater mastery of the content knowledge and a higher level of philosophical and communication skills than graduates of the B.A. program.

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.

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.

### 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**

Our target is that the average an M.A. student is assessed on their knowledge of content applicable to their thesis at a 3.3.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the 2010 calendar year, M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 3.67 on the knowledge of content applicable to their theses.

#### 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**

Our target is that the average an M.A. student is assessed on their content skills at a 3.3.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the 2010 calendar year, M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 3.53 on their philosophical skills.

#### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the 2010 calendar year, we had 10 MA graduates apply to PhD programs. All but one were accepted to at least one school (that one was accepted to several law schools). One of these students was accepted into 3 psychology PhD programs. Of the others, one student was accepted to 8 Philosophy PhD programs, another to 6, another to 3, and another to 2. The acceptance rate is thus 90% for those who applied. We take this as clear indication that our grad students are learning philosophical skills and content. (Six graduates did not apply to PhD programs; one was accepted into 4 J.D. programs and is pursuing that career path; another is enrolled in a Master of Public Affairs program.)

### 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 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. 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 seem not to have any understanding of the basic points 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 PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We completely revamped our assessment policies in the Fall of 2010 and were able to use the new policies right away, except for assessing the M.A. program. The only change for the M.A. program assessment was the addition of an additional objective (and corresponding measurement and findings): the ability of our graduates to engage in written communication. In the future, data for this assessment will be collected in the same way that the other assessment data is collected: the thesis committee of each student will provide their scores of the student for written communication ability.

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

Our M.A. program is one of the strongest in the country and widely recognized as such. We will continue providing an excellent M.A. education.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

See the answer to academic question 1 above.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

We need to refine our new policy.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
We completely revamped our assessment policies in the Fall of 2010 and were able to use the new policies right away (excepting for the M.A. program).

**Challenges for Next Year**
Given the major changes put in place in our new assessment policy, we expected to have to make adjustments.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**
Our new policy includes an assessment of the M.A. students' writing ability. This will be an additional outcome.

**Modification in Measurement Methods**
The thesis committees of M.A. students will add an assessment score of the student’s writing ability.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Physical Therapy DPT**

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

In accordance with, and in support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Brydine F. Lewis School of Nursing and Health Professions, the mission of the Division of Physical Therapy is to prepare, teach and graduate doctors of physical therapy who are knowledgeable in the practice of physical therapy, committed to clinical excellence, demonstrate professional distinction, and are passionate in their pursuit of scholarly activities that contribute to the body of scientific and clinical knowledge. Note: 103 graduate students were enrolled in the Doctor of Physical Therapy program in Fall of 2011. Thirty-three doctors of physical therapy graduated in August of 2011.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Prepare a competent physical therapist that is ready to work autonomously.**
1. Prepare a competent physical therapist that is ready to work autonomously in a variety of settings throughout the continuum of healthcare. o Provide culturally competent physical therapy services for prevention, health promotion, fitness, and wellness, to individuals, groups and communities. o Provide a variety of clinical educational opportunities to allow students to perform competently across the healthcare continuum.

**G 2: Prepare a competent physical therapist who has obtained a sufficient level of knowledge.**
2. Prepare a competent physical therapist who has obtained a sufficient level of knowledge in the foundational (basic, applied and social) and clinical sciences to understand the facts, concepts, and principles essential to competent evidence based practice. o Deliver and manage a plan of care that is safe, effective and patient/client centered and incorporates all elements of the physical therapy management model as described in the Guide to Physical Therapist Practice. o Monitor and adjust the plan of care in response to patient/client outcomes. o Provide physical therapy interventions to achieve patient/client goals and outcomes. o Consistently and critically evaluate sources of information related to physical therapy practice, research, and education and apply knowledge from these sources in a scientific manner and to appropriate populations. o Consistently integrate the best evidence for practice from sources of information with clinical judgment and patient/client values to determine the best care for a patient/client. o Use clinical judgment and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning in order to minimize errors and enhance patient/client outcomes. o Consistently apply current knowledge, theory, and professional judgment while considering the patient/client perspective in patient/client management.

**G 3: Prepare a competent physical therapist that recognizes the limits of current knowledge, clinical skill, and experience.**
3. Prepare a competent physical therapist that recognizes the limits of current knowledge, clinical skill, and experience and demonstrate the commitment to acquire new knowledge and skill through lifelong learning. o Acquire new knowledge and skill: writing and presenting evidence based practice paper/research project, attend conferences and consult with colleagues o Facilitate reflective thinking using reflective journals, small group discussions o Utilize technology to access information o Formulate clinical patterns based on best available evidence for various patient populations. o Read literature, attend conferences, and consult with colleagues to examine and evaluate current and future trends to challenge the status quo of the practice of physical therapy.

**G 4: Prepare a competent physical therapist who embraces a multi-cultural learning environment.**
4. Prepare a competent physical therapist who embraces a multi-cultural learning environment that assists in the development of culturally competent physical therapy practitioners o Identify respect and act with consideration for patients'/clients' differences, values preferences and expressed needs in all professional activities. o Effectively educate others using culturally appropriate teaching methods that are commensurate with the needs of the learner. o Provide culturally competent physical therapy services for prevention, health promotion, fitness and wellness to individuals, groups and communities.

**G 5: Prepare a competent physical therapist who promotes interdisciplinary collaboration.**
5. Prepare a competent physical therapist who promotes interdisciplinary collaboration in the pursuit of clinical and scholarly activities. o Collaborate with patients/clients, family members, payers, other professionals, and other individuals to determine a plan of care that is acceptable, realistic, culturally competent, and patient/client-centered. o Develop and participate in inter-departmental research collaboration and education opportunities.

**G 6: Prepare a competent physical therapist that supports professional, community, and clinical service.**
6. Prepare a competent physical therapist that supports professional, community, and clinical service opportunities and activities. o Incorporate pro bono services into practice. o Participate and show leadership in community organizations and volunteer service. o Advocate for the health and wellness needs of society. o Provide consultation within boundaries of expertise to businesses, schools, government agencies, other organizations, or individuals. o Participate in professional organizations.

**G 7: Prepare a competent physical therapist who models professionalism consistent with the American Physical Therapy Association.**
7. Prepare a competent physical therapist who models professionalism consistent with the American Physical Therapy Association’s core values. o Adhere to legal practice standards, including all federal, state and institutional regulations related to patient/client care and fiscal management. o Practice in a manner consistent with the professional code of ethics. o Participate in organizations and efforts that support the role of the physical therapist in furthering the health and wellness of the public. o Place patient/client’s needs above the physical therapist’s needs. o Exhibit caring, compassion, and empathy in providing services to patients/clients. o Demonstrate integrity in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, other health care providers, students, other...
Demonstrate professional behavior in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, other health care providers, students, other consumers, and payers. Expressively and receptively communicate in a culturally competent manner with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, practitioners, interdisciplinary team members, consumers, payers, and policy makers. Influence legislative and political processes.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability (G: 1, 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate the ability to actively accept responsibility for diverse roles, obligations, and actions, including self-regulation and other behaviors that positively influence patient/client outcomes, the profession, and health care needs of society.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student promotion and progression
2. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
2. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring (G: 4, 6) (M: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate compassion, caring and empathy in providing service to patients/clients.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
2. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity (G: 1, 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate integrity in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, and other health care providers, students, other consumers and payers.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
2. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate professional behaviors in all interactions with patients/clients.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
2. Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication (G: 1, 5, 6) (M: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will expressively and receptively communicate in a culturally competent manner.
with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, practitioners, interdisciplinary team members, consumers, payers, and policy makers.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will exemplify primary regard for the interest of their patients/clients, thus assuming fiduciary responsibility of placing the needs of the patient/client ahead of their self-interests.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Professional Practice: Cultural Competence (G: 1, 2, 4, 7) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will identify, respect, and act with consideration for patients/clients differences, values, preferences, and expressed needs in all professional activities.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning (G: 2, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate a systematic process for clinical judgment and reflection to identify, monitor, and enhance clinical reasoning.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice (G: 2, 3, 5) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will integrate the best possible research evidence with clinical expertise and
patient values, to optimize patient/client outcomes and quality of life to achieve the highest level of excellence in clinical practice.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**SLO 10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education (G: 4, 5) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will effectively educate others using culturally appropriate teaching methods that are commensurate with the needs of the learner.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 11: Patient/Client Management Expectation (G: 1, 2, 3, 5) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate competency in the five elements of care including examination, evaluation, diagnosis, prognosis, and intervention for patients across the lifespan.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 12: Practice Management Expectations (G: 1, 5) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Upon completion of the program, student/graduates will demonstrate competence in determining a plan of care that is acceptable, realistic, culturally competent, and patient/client-centered.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Professional Behaviors (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9)

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Based on performance criteria #3, #6 (Accountability, Professional Development): #3 Accountability Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.88- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 15.78- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 11.21- In between Intermediate and Advance Beginner #6 Professional Development Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.6- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 15.42- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 9.7- Intermediate.

Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Based on performance criteria #2, #12 (Professional Behavior, Plan of Care): #2 Professional Behavior Class 2011 (9th semester): 19.09- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 16.3- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 11.48- In between Intermediate and Advance Beginner. One student performed below this level with remediation in progress. #12 Plan of Care Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.21- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 14.17- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 8.41- In between Advance Beginner and Intermediate. One student performed below this level with remediation in progress.

Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Based on performance criteria #2 (Professional Behavior): #2 Professional Behavior Class 2011 (9th semester): 19.09- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 16.3- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 11.48- In between Intermediate and Advance Beginner. One student performed below this level with remediation in progress.

Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Based on performance criteria #2, #6 (Professional Behavior, Professional Development): #2 Professional Behavior Class 2011 (9th semester): 19.09- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 16.3- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 11.48- In between Intermediate and Advance Beginner. One student performed below this level with remediation in progress. #6 Professional Development Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.6- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 15.42- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 9.7- Intermediate.

Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Based on performance criteria #4 (Communication): #4 Communication Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.73- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 15.36- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 10.41- In between Intermediate and Advance Beginner.

Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruisim

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #3 (Accountability): #3 Accountability Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.88- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 15.78- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 11.21- In between Intermediate and Advance Beginner.

**Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**


**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

**M 2: Licensure Exam Pass Rate (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**

The National Physical Therapy Examination pass rate for the program (first time and ultimate)

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

**Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.
time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O10: Professional Pracion Expectation: Education**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations**
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
34 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.56 compared to the national mean of 648.62. At the time of this report 22 graduates of the 2011 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. The mean scores were not available at the time of this report. The remaining graduates of 2011 are scheduled to take the test at a later date.

**M 3: Clinical Skills (O: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #7 (clinical reasoning): Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.15- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 14.72- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 8.48- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate. One student performed below this level with remediation in progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #6, #7 (professional development, clinical reasoning): #6 Professional Development Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.6- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 15.42- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 9.7- Intermediate. #7 Clinical Reasoning Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.15- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 14.72- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 8.48- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate. One student performed below this level with remediation in progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #14 (Educational Intervention): #14 Educational Intervention Class 2011 (9th semester): 18.48- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level Class 2012 (6th semester): 14.69- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level Class 2013 (3rd semester): 9.4- Intermediate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #1, #8, #12, #16, #17, #18 (Safety, Screening, Outcomes Assessment, Financial resources,
**M 4: Research Project (O: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**

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/or 2) a poster/platform presentation at a regional or national meeting.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the period 2010-2011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on 6/17/2011.

**Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the period 2010-2011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on 6/17/2011.

**Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the period 2010-2011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on 6/17/2011.

**Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

For the period 2010-2011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on
### Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the period 2010-1011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on 6/17/2011.

### Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the period 2010-1011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on 6/17/2011.

### Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

Completed program requirement of student-driven research project progressing over three semesters resulting in a manuscript and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the period 2010-1011 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Posters from 5 research projects were presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia 2010 fall meeting at Mercer University in Atlanta, Georgia. 1 poster was presented at the 2011 CSM meeting in New Orleans. A record number of abstracts were submitted for presentation at this year's Fall PTAG meeting. Two of which requested to make platform presentations with the rest being poster presentations. Posters of 7 research projects will be presented at the Physical Therapy Association of Georgia fall meeting in Dahlonega, Georgia on October 29, 2011. These posters were/are externally peer-reviewed by the State organization’s Research Committee prior to being accepted to present. 1 research paper was accepted for publication in the Physical and Occupational therapy in Geriatrics journal on 6/17/2011.

### M 5: Comprehensive Exams (O: 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

A comprehensive examination will be administered at the completion of each year.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

### Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty

First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice
A survey instrument to assess 2011 graduate satisfaction with overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge and length of program. Scoring based on scale from 5-0 (Strongly agree- N/A)

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O10: Professional Practive Expectation: Education
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations
First year DPT students will score 70% or higher on a 50-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Second year DPT students will score 75% or higher on a 100-question cumulative and comprehensive multiple choice examination. Third year DPT students will score 80% on a 200-question cumulative and comprehensive examination.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For the school year 2010-2011 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2011: 86% pass first time testing, mean score of 85.7 Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 80.6 Class of 2013: 93% pass first time testing, mean score of 77.3 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Professional Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate score of greater &gt;4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate survey scores on a scale of 0-5:
1. Satisfaction with overall academic experience: 4.3
2. Adequate preparation: 4.7
3. Academic challenge: 4.7
4. Clinical preparation: 4.4

**Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education**
Graduate score of greater >4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Graduate survey scores on a scale of 0-5:
1. Satisfaction with overall academic experience: 4.3
2. Adequate preparation: 4.7
3. Academic challenge: 4.7
4. Clinical preparation: 4.4

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**
Graduate score of greater >4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Graduate survey scores on a scale of 0-5:
1. Satisfaction with overall academic experience: 4.3
2. Adequate preparation: 4.7
3. Academic challenge: 4.7
4. Clinical preparation: 4.4

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations**
Graduate score of greater >4 on survey of four program components including overall academic experience, preparedness, challenge, length of clinical experience.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Graduate survey scores on a scale of 0-5:
1. Satisfaction with overall academic experience: 4.3
2. Adequate preparation: 4.7
3. Academic challenge: 4.7
4. Clinical preparation: 4.4

**M 7: Employer Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)**
Employers of GSU DPT graduates were surveyed and asked to grade the competence of the graduates on a scale from 5 to 1 (Strongly Agree- Slightly Disagree) on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability**
Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**
Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**
Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

**Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**
Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

**Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**
Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence

Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

Target for O10: Professional Praction Expectation: Education

Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation

Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

Employer survey score of >4 on the following characteristics: Autonomy, Knowledge, Accountability, Professionalism Behavior, Safety, Clinical Reasoning, Professional Development, Plan of Care, Interventions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Employer survey only revealed one response with an average score of 4 on all criteria except professional behavior which scored a 5.

M 8: Alumni Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10)


Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability

Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met


Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring

Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education
Alumni survey score of >4 in the following areas: Autonomy, Knowledge, Professional Development, Education, Professional Behavior, Cultural Competence, Accountability.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

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: Finished
- Priority: High
Assistant to ACCE
Discussion to determine need and feasibility of hiring administrative assistant for ACCE.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Division Head
Additional Resources: Budget considerations

Core Faculty Positions
By the end of Spring 2012 fill two open core faculty positions with qualifications to include: PhD, DSc, DPT with knowledge and teaching experience in acute care, neuro-rehab, pediatrics, and/or geriatrics.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Both positions approved by university and applications are being accepted.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Division Head

Opening Faculty Clinic
By the end of Spring 2011 open the University approved faculty clinic to serve as a rehabilitation center for the University population and surrounding community, education site for current student population and to advance research opportunities within the division and as promoted by the University Strategic Plan.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: GSU Faculty clinic approved by the University July 2011. Currently pending Board of Regents approval.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Division Head
Additional Resources: Site Determination

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

All measurable outcomes goals were met this past calendar year. No specified plans were established the previous academic year.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Critical thinking among students has been demonstrated as indicated by measurement of comprehensive evaluation, national testing and CPI scoring. Improvement is present comprehensive evaluation and is reflective in the national testing pass rates and mean scoring.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

The CTW has been used within the program since 2006 and has been consistent up to 2009-2010. The 2009-2010 assessment was not performed due to faculty and division head turn over with re-implementation occurring for this past academic year which has been helping in the assistance of program re-accreditation.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

Given the previous academic year was not assessed, some changes from the previous assessment have occurred with goals, objectives and measurement criteria. All changes occurred in reflection with the upcoming re-accreditation and and requirements therein.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No assessment report was performed for last year due to faculty and division head exit. Future assessment will take into consideration student course and faculty evaluation to further reflect on the effectiveness of each course and instructor.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data impact is a reflection of a strong program teaching and graduating competent physical therapists. Given the turn over in faculty and leadership the recent success should be viewed favorably toward the current faculty and program in general. Comment from students/graduates though positive do reflect the need to address issues such as course redundancy and addition of core faculty to teach courses currently being addressed with adjunct faculty.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you
take? What changes did you make as a result?
2009-2010 assessment not completed due to faculty and division head turn-over.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
We have learned that our program is strong overall yet improvements can be made in relation to filling open faculty positions which will allow for consistent student learning opportunities and allow faculty to complete all required scholarship and service requirements.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Many of the recent new faculty hires are new to the education/teaching environment. As part of each faculty plan, mentorship and continuing education will be in place to improve upon their teaching skills. It is expected with this plan and the increasing experience of teaching that the goals and objectives of the program will continue to be met and enhanced.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
1. Successful program completion and graduation of the 2011 DPT class in consideration of Division Head and faculty attrition during the course of their program. 2. Faculty practice approval by school dean and university provost and president.

Challenges for Next Year
1. Maintain program, student and faculty objective and goals despite current core faculty status minus two. 2. Hire two full time core faculty to establish goal of 50% advanced degree personnel (PhD, DSc, EdD) and fill current teaching needs. 3. Successful completion of CAPTE re-accreditation. 4. Passage of Faculty Practice by Board of Regents. 5. Curriculum change from 9 semesters to 8.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes
None

Modifications in Measurement Methods
1. Improve delivery of alumni and employer survey to increase response of participants. 2. Add instructor and course evaluation measurements.

University-wide Committee Participation
Committees List 9/1/2011 (by YChen) Name Division of Physical Therapy School of Health Professions School of Nursing and Health Professions University Yu-ping Chen -Curriculum -Faculty Search (Chair) -Rho Tau advisor -Student Retention None -Faculty Appeal None Jennifer Cline -Clinical Advisory (Chair) -Curriculum -CAPTE None -Faculty Advisory None Jodan Garcia -Admission (Chair) -Faculty Clinic -Student Retention None None Steven Janos -Clinical Advisory -Curriculum None None None None Jim Lewis -Clinical Advisory -Faculty Clinic (Chair) -Faculty Search (Chair) -Student Retention (Chair) None None None Anne Lorio -Clinical Advisory -Curriculum -CAPTE None None Noreen Kimberly Morelli -Admission -Clinical Advisory -Curriculum (Chair) -Faculty Clinic -Faculty Search -CAPTE (Chair) -Curriculum -Academic Affair None Deon Thompson -Curriculum None None Tai Wang -Admission Assistant Dean -Non-Tenure Promotion Committee -Professor Promotion Committee (Chair) -Intellectual Property Committee -Senator Commencement Committee -Senator Cultural Diversity Committee Gordon Warren -Student Retention -Faculty Search -Research -Promotion and/or Tenure Committee (Chair) -Research (Chair) -Triennial Faculty Evaluation (Chair) -Internal Research Grant Review Committee -Capital Budget and Space Allocation Committee -Laboratory Safety Committee

Publications and Presentations
Scholarship forms available through division head.

Academic Teaching Activities
Academic teaching responsibilities and accomplishments available through Division Head.

International Activities
1. Clinical education sites established in Europe.

Contributions to Student Retention
1. Department student retention committee in place. For the academic year 2010-2011 two students left the program. One due to family reasons and another secondary to failed clinical education requirements.

Service to the External Community
Students and faculty are actively involved with charity and non-profit organizations promoting the university, program and profession. The following are organizations that our program, students and faculty participated with: Good Samaritan Clinic, The ALS Association; MS association; Getting 2 Tri Foundation; The Down Syndrome Buddy Walk; Migrant Worker Health Initiative in collaboration with Emory University.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Physics & Astronomy Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Physics and Astronomy teaches a number of courses in the University Core. Introductory physics and astronomy courses may be either terminal sequences or preparation for additional courses or professional degree programs. The mission of the
department in introductory science courses is to provide the students with the ability to understand and analyze their world by making use of the theoretical and practical tools of science, in particular physics and astronomy. The mission of these courses is to a) provide foundational knowledge of the workings of the physical world, b) allow students to develop the ability to perform reasoning and analysis from a scientific perspective, c) teach both conceptual and practical knowledge of physical processes, and d) enhance the students abilities in applying mathematical or technological tools in their analysis. Where these courses serve as prerequisites to upper division courses or professional degree programs the department also seeks to give the students the content knowledge and skills required to succeed in those courses or programs.

Goals

G 1: University Learning Outcome - Critical Thinking
Among the skills developed in introductory science sequences such as those taught in the department of physics & astronomy are those identified by the university as important in all areas of study and fields of preparation. The department supports those learning outcomes by integrating them into the goals of its Area D science courses. Once of these learning outcomes is critical thinking. As applied to the introductory science courses, critical thinking is closely related to the ability to understand and apply the scientific process.

G 2: Area D GenEd Learning Goal
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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 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.

SLO 2: Understanding of Mechanics Concepts (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students in Phys1111 and Phys2211 will demonstrate a competent understanding of mechanics, in particular, forces and Newton's Laws.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5.0 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.

SLO 3: Understanding of Electricity & Magnetism Concepts (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students in Phys1112 and Phys2212 will demonstrate a competent understanding of electricity & magnetism, in particular, charges, electric fields and forces, electric potential and potential energy, currents, magnetic fields and forces and electromagnetic induction.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5.0 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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Data was collected for students in selected sections of the assessed astronomy courses. Based on data from Astr1010, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 58%. Based on data from Astr1020, the average score on the 10 final exam questions was 53%.

M 3: Mechanics Diagnostic Test (O: 2)
Within the lab portion of the courses, students in Phys1111K and Phys2211K take a widely-used multiple choice mechanics diagnostic test at the beginning of the course and again near the end of the course. This test has been developed using the most widely held misconceptions.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target for O2: Understanding of Mechanics Concepts
For the diagnostic test used, published literature in the field gives a score of 60% as a competent understanding of mechanics concepts and 80% as mastery. We have therefore set a goal of 60% for the post test for both Phys1111K and Phys2211K. In addition, physics education researchers often use normalized gain to gauge the success of introductory mechanics courses. Normalized gain for each student is the increase in score from pre-test to post-test divided by the largest gain that student could
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Department Assessment Committee Review

The Departmental Assessment Committee will meet and review the results from the previous three years. They will discuss ways to address the few areas in which targets were not met for Critical Thinking in General Education courses. Among the possible actions discussed will be 1) changes in measurement tools, 2) changes in implementation of measurement tools, and 3) curriculum changes to improve instruction in critical thinking. In addition, the department assessment committee with interact with the new IMPACT (Improving Physics & Astronomy Curriculum & Teaching) group 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Low
- **Measure:** Multiple Choice Questions on Astronomy Final Exams
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking
- **Implementation Description:** September 30, 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms/Department Assessment Committee

#### Evaluation of Phys1111/1112 Interventions

A number of changes have been made to the delivery of Phys1111/1112 classes including new faculty, new textbook, and an innovative "studio" physics learning environment. In addition to the critical thinking assessment, a number of other evaluation methods are being used to determine the success of these innovations. Included in these is the use of standard assessment instruments developed in the field of physics education research. An IRB approved research effort is underway.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** These evaluations will be completed by the end of the Spring 2010 term with analysis to occur over Summer 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms and John Evans

#### 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 Astr1010 and Astr1020 where multiple choice final exams will be used. However for the introductory physics courses (Phys1111/1112/2211/2212) we will no longer use 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The force diagnostic test will be given at the beginning of all 4 physics courses

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Only findings for Spring 2011 will be reported here. Results for Fall 2010 were very similar, but since that was the initial semester using the new outcome and collecting the data using an electronic collection rather than bubble forms, Spring 2011 data is believed to be more reliable. Phys1111K students scored an average of 26% on the pre-test and 43% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.24. Phys2211K students scored an average of 36% on the pre-test and 50% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.23.

### M 4: Electricity & Magnetism Diagnostic Test (O: 3)

Within the lab portion of the courses, students in Phys1112K and Phys2212K take a multiple choice diagnostic test of electricity & magnetism conceptual understanding. Since the language is often unfamiliar to the students at the beginning of the course and published research indicates there is no value in giving it as a pre-instruction test, it is given only once near the end of the course.

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

#### Target for O3: Understanding of Electricity & Magnetism Concepts

Only limited data has been published for performance on this diagnostic. In that work at an institution comparable to GSU, post-instruction scores were reported of 44% for a Phys1112 equivalent course and 47% for a Phys2212 equivalent course. We have adopted these values as our initial targets for this measure.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

  In the Spring of 2011, students in Phys1112 scored 30% while students in Phys2212 scored 41%. However, there were some issues with the timing of the exam compared to the coverage of material in the lecture portion of the course that may have resulted in lower scores than would represent the actual student learning in the courses.
**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 knowledge and skills to new situations.

**Physics111/Phys1112 Redesign**

The first year of data using the new Area D learning outcome and using the diagnostic tests has shown that both the initial scores and the learning outcomes are lower than many scores reported in the literature. We have therefore embarked on some curricular and pedagogical review of one of our course sequences, Phys111 and Phys112, the algebra-based introductory physics. Over the course of this process we will standardize the course content over all sections. In addition, we are moving some content to be taught in the laboratory only so that the lecture will be able to concentrate on a smaller core of material. The laboratory portion will then be redesigned to accommodate this material in a stand-alone fashion. This course redesign is expected to take all of the 2011-2012 academic year and be implemented in the 2012-2013 academic year. The department is considering a similar re-examination of the Phys2211/Phys2212 sequence beginning in Fall of 2012.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The department has changed its learning outcome for the core physics classes to the new Area-based outcome. The core astronomy courses have continued to assess critical thinking but will be changing to the new outcome this year. For the physics courses, besides changing the outcome the department has changed the method of assessment. Instead of common final exam questions covering critical thinking we are now using nationally recognized diagnostic tests to assess conceptual understanding in physics. We are using pre- and post-tests where appropriate to assess learning gains. One reason for the change is that using widely used assessment instruments allows us to compare our students initial knowledge and learning gains with those found in other programs. Since this is the first year using these instruments across all physics courses, we made some logistical changes in how the testing was done over the course of the year. We intend to keep the process the same for the coming year.

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

The first year of data using the new Area D learning outcome and using the diagnostic tests has shown that both the initial scores and the learning outcomes are lower than many scores reported in the literature. We have therefore embarked on some curricular and pedagogical review of one of our course sequences, Phys111 and Phys112, the algebra-based introductory physics. Over the course of this process we will standardize the course content over all sections. In addition, we are moving some content to be taught in the laboratory only so that the lecture will be able to concentrate on a smaller core of material. The laboratory portion will then be redesigned to accommodate this material in a stand-alone fashion. This course redesign is expected to take all of the 2011-2012 academic year and be implemented in the Fall of 2012. The department is considering a similar re-examination of the Phys2211/Phys2212 sequence beginning in Fall of 2012.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Physics BS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Physics and Astronomy offers a bachelor of science in physics. In addition to the standard program in physics, concentrations in Applied Physics, Astronomy, Pre-Medicine, Biophysics, Geology, and Computer Science are available. All bachelor degrees are constructed around a core of upper division physics and math courses which cover the core subject matter for a degree in physics. All physics majors also complete upper division lab and research requirements. In addition to the physics content, instruction in scientific reasoning, scientific writing, and technology are emphasized. The mission of the program is quite broad since students go on to many different career paths. Half of physics majors nationally go to graduate school in some field including physics, math, chemistry, engineering, medicine and law. The other half pursue careers which include research & development, business, technical sales or support, K-12 education, and many others. Due to the rigor of a physics degree program, the overwhelming feature of a student with a physics degree should be the ability to think clearly and apply scientific reasoning. The mission of the B.S. in physics program is to prepare students for a wide variety of fields and activities which require analysis, critical thinking, and the application of physical principles and scientific critical thinking to new situations.

**Goals**

**G 1: Physics Content Knowledge and Application Skills**

Students receiving a B.S. in physics should understand the core principles of physics, usually divided into the areas of classical mechanics, electricity & magnetism, statistical & thermal physics, and quantum physics. In addition students should be able to apply...
appropriate mathematical tools to set-up and solve quantitative problems using those core principles.

**G 2: Skills of a scientist**

Students receiving a B.S. in physics should demonstrate the skills and abilities needed to use their scientific knowledge and problem-solving skills in a collaborative, technological environment.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Classical Mechanics (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in classical mechanics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

**SLO 2: Electricity & Magnetism (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in electricity & magnetism and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

**SLO 3: Statistical & Thermal Physics (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in statistical & thermal physics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

**SLO 4: Quantum Physics (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of core principles in quantum physics and effectively apply their knowledge in the above areas to solve problems using advanced mathematical tools where appropriate.

**SLO 5: Scientific Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 2, 3)**  
Students collaborate effectively with other students in a laboratory setting as they perform physics experiments.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

---

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Nine physics majors completed Phys4600, Classical Mechanics, in the Spring 2011 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.7 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.7 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Ten physics majors completed Phys4700, Electricity Magnetism, in the Fall 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.2 out of 5.0. The
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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Phys3850, Statistical Thermal Physics, was offered in the Spring of 2011. However, no assessments were performed for this course.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Sixteen physics majors completed Phys3401, Modern Physics I, in Fall 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.2 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.1 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Fourteen physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in th Fall 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.6 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Fourteen physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in th Fall 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.4 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Fourteen physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in th Fall 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.3 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Fourteen physics majors completed Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory - CTW, in th Fall 2010 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.6 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 students senior research project by rating the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty. Criteria for assessment 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.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Four physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, and two physics majors were assessed for Research Project course, Phys4900, in 2010-2011. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.2 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Four physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, and two physics majors were assessed for Research Project course, Phys4900, in 2010-2011. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.7 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Four physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, and two physics majors were assessed for Research Project course, Phys4900, in 2010-2011. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.7 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Four physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, and two physics majors were assessed for Research Project course, Phys4900, in 2010-2011. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.7 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Four physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, and two physics majors were assessed for Research Project course, Phys4900, in 2010-2011. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 4.0 out of 5.0 for scientific & research technology.

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

**Implementation of Assessment in CTW courses**

The program's two CTW courses are being taught for the first time this year. These two courses replace courses previously used as major parts of our assessment of student learning outcomes. The assessments are being migrated over to the new courses. The interplay between CTW assessments and learning outcomes assessment is being worked out. Phys3300, the new lab course, is being taught for the first time in the Fall of 2009. Phys4900, the new research class, is being taught for the first time in Spring 2010. Since most of our upperclassmen are under the older catalogs, many will still complete the older research class (fewer credit hours and less externally supervised written work). Since the program is relatively small, the performance of the assessments while students are split between two different research requirements creates some unknowns in our assessment which will only be revealed in the spring term.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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.

Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process for the B.S. in Physics has not been changed this cycle. We continue to use instructor evaluations of student work in core content classes and in required lab and research classes to evaluate student learning outcomes. We are not planning any changes in the assessment process in the coming year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The B.S. in Physics program has been growing significantly over the last five years. Five years ago the program was graduating 3 to 4 students per year. The program is now graduating 8 to 10 students per year and still growing. In the fall of 2011 there are 25 students in Modern Physics I and 20 students in the Advanced Physics Laboratory, two required physics major courses typically taken by juniors. These are large classes by the standards of upper division physics courses. The department is working to maintain the effectiveness of our instruction in the face of these increasing numbers. Although we have not completely met all of our targets, we are using the assessment data to monitor our effectiveness as the size of the classes increases. Some courses may in the future be split into two sections based on the assessment data.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Physics MS
As of 12/12/2016 04:11 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

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 (M: 2, 3)
Students collaborate effectively with colleagues including other students, postdoctoral researchers, committee members, faculty advisor, and outside research collaborators.

SLO 2: Motivations and Implications of Research (M: 4, 5, 6)
Students effectively evaluate the implications and applications of research and technology.

SLO 3: Scientific Critical Thinking (M: 4, 5, 6)
Students apply the basic scientific process as they perform and report their research. That is, they develop research questions appropriate for research, appropriately collect experimental or theoretical data to address identified research questions, analyze and interpret data to evaluate research questions, and use results of data analysis to formulate new research questions.

SLO 4: Scientific Communication (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

SLO 5: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills (M: 1, 4, 6)
Students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in advanced classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, and quantum mechanics. Astronomy concentration students will instead demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge, in at least two of the above areas, as well as in the fundamentals of astrophysics.

SLO 6: Scientific & Research Technology (M: 2, 3, 5)
Students effectively use specialized scientific equipment for data collection and effectively use computers for data analysis, literature
research and scientific writing in laboratory and research settings.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Astronomy Qualifying Exam I (O: 5)**

As part of the astronomy concentration, each astronomy graduate student takes a first qualifying exam, consisting of an extensive written exam on the broad scope of astronomy and astrophysics and the essential skills required to apply the relevant physical and mathematical reasoning. Students are counseled at this point on their preparedness for further study. The learning outcomes related to core principles and math skills are assessed by the exam committee by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Astronomy Qualifying Exam I Assessment Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six students were rated by the exam committee after completing the Astronomy Qualifying Exam I. The average rating for Physics and Astronomy Knowledge was 5.0 out of 5.0 and the average rating for Math Skills was 4.0 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.</td>
<td></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>2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.</td>
<td></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>2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Physics Advisor (O: 1, 4, 6)**

Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research advisor and committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student's progress in collaboration, knowledge content, and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the advisor at the completion of M.S. degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which can be found at Physics MS Advisor Evaluation Form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students were rated by their research advisors at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.</td>
<td></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>2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No students were rated by their research advisors at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.</td>
<td></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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No students were rated by their research advisors at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.

**M 4: Physics Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Physics M.S. (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Physics MS Committee Evaluation Form.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Thirteen committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.5 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Thirteen committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.5 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Thirteen committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.5 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Thirteen committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.4 out of 5.0.

**M 5: Astronomy Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)**
Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Astronomy MS Committee Evaluation Form.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**
Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.

Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Just one student was rated by their research advisor or committee member at the completion of their M.S. requirements in 2010-2011. Therefore no data is being reported this cycle.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.5 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.4 out of 5.0.

Target for O4: Scientific Communication

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

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.4 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.4 out of 5.0.

M 7: Astronomy Thesis Defense

Physics M.S. with Astronomy concentration (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 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 with Astronomy Concentration Committee 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 M.S. students in both the physics and the astronomy track. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in both tracks of the MS in Physics program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure:Astronomy Advisor | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
  Measure:Scientific & Research Technology | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Communication
  Measure:Astronomy Committee Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 changed its assessment process since last year's assessment.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment findings indicate a very high level of achievement for the students in the program. No significant changes are planned for the coming year based on this assessment.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Physics PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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)
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 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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Physics Qualifying Exam (O: 5)

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**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No results were reported for the assessment of the Physics Qualifying exam for 2010-2011 cycle.

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

The students work in close collaboration with their research advisor throughout the course of their Ph.D. program. The advisor has the opportunity to observe and evaluate the student’s progress in collaboration and technology. The learning outcomes are assessed by the research advisor following the student’s successful dissertation defense. The advisor rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are the first section of the advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 4.3 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Three students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific & Research Technology was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the written dissertation, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, written communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.
**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertations. The average rating for Physics Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents the motivation, methods, results, and implications of their research. When the student has finished the dissertation, and successfully defended it, the members of the dissertation committee produce a final assessment. Based on the oral presentation and defense, the committee assesses the learning outcomes related to motivation and implications, the scientific process, communication skills, and physics, astronomy, and math knowledge and application. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and are sections of the documents available in the committee member evaluation form and advisor evaluation form.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.3 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.7 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Communication was 4.5 out of 5.0.

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

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Twenty-one committee member evaluations were performed of student’s dissertation defenses. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.

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

**Assessment Committee Review and Report**
The departmental assessment committee will present the results for this past year (along with the previous 3 years) to the faculty to keep them informed on the performance of the Ph.D. students in physics. The assessment shows very high achievement of learning goals for students in the Ph.D in Astronomy program. In past years there have been occasional low scores in some areas but all results were very good this year. 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:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Committee Evaluation of Dissertation
- **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
Physics Knowledge and Math Skills | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking

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: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 changed its assessment process since last year’s assessment. Although data was collected last year, no report was submitted for the Astronomy PhD. Also, the number of students completing the Physics PhD each year is small. Therefore the report for this cycle contains data collected from July 2009 to June 2011.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The assessment findings indicate a very high level of achievement for the students in the program. No significant changes are planned for the coming year based on this assessment.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Political Science Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(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 governmental institutions and processes in the state of Georgia, the United States and the World.

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 in American and Global Politics (G: 1) (M: 1)
First learning outcome: Students should demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of American 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 and understanding of major global issues, an appreciation of political issues from a global perspective, and an appreciation of global issues from a political perspective.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.
8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.
**SLO 2: Analytic Skills in Introductory Political Science (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Students should demonstrate an understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.
8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

---

**SLO 3: Communication Skills in Political Science (G: 3) (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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

**Standard Associations**

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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Measures of Substantive Knowledge (O: 1)**

Concerning the first learning outcome (American government), students should be able to pass exams involving these concepts. The department uses ten (10) common questions that all sections of POLS 1101 administer to students as part of various quizzes and examinations. These questions assess students on, among other objectives, the acquisition of substantive knowledge. student scores on these questions are compiled to show passing rate on these questions as a measure of learning outcomes for the course. In addition the department collects data involving the overall pass rate for these classes. Concerning the second learning outcome (Global Issues), students should be able to pass exams demonstrating the political nature of global issues. The department uses fifteen (15) common questions that all sections of POLS 2401 administer to students as part of various quizzes and examinations. These questions assess students on, among other objectives, the acquisition of substantive knowledge. student scores on these questions are compiled to show passing rate on these questions as a measure of learning outcomes for the course. In addition the department collects data involving the overall pass rate for these classes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Substantive Knowledge in American and Global Politics**

The department assesses student learning outcome in this area by two measures for each of the two courses (POLS 1101 & POLS 2401). For POLS 1101 The department seeks a pass rate of 75% for each individual common question. In addition the department also seeks to achieve a target of 75% of students earning a grade of C or higher in the course. For POLS 2401 The department seeks a pass rate of 60% for each individual common question. In addition the department also seeks to achieve a target of 75% of students earning a grade of C or higher in the course. The goal is to eliminate use of grades for learning assessment in the next reporting cycle.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report of learning outcomes in both POLS 1101 and POLS 2401. (Report POLS 1101 & 2401 Substantive Knowledge 2010-2011)

**M 2: Measures of 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 in Introductory Political Science**

For POLS 1101 student responses to the 10 common questions many of which involve use of analysis are used to measure analytic skills. The department aims at achieving a passing rate of 75% on the 10 common questions for assessment. For POLS 2401 student performance on various exercises designed to elicit use of analytic skills are used for assessment. Faculty are asked to assign a score ranging from 0 to 4 for each students performance on this exercise. 4= Excellent, 3= Very Good, 2=Satisfactory, 1= Passing and 0= Failing. A sample exercise used for this is attached below. The achievement target for the objective is an average score of 2.25 on the above scale.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Please see Report POLS 1101 & 2401 Analytic Skill 2010-2011 for assessment scores on POLS 1101 Please see Report POLS 1101 & 2401 Analytic Skill 2010-2011 for assessment scores on POLS 2401

M 3: Measures of Communication Skills (O: 3)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Instructors 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 in Political Science

The department seeks an average score of 2.5 or higher on the four point assessment of the written assignment

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Please see assessment scores for communications skills in attached Report POLS 2401 Communication Skills 2010-2011

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: Finished
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.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010

Enhancement of assessment tools

The department is in the process of enhancing existing assessment tools for POLS 1101 and 2401 in order to provide better assessment of learning outcomes for the POLS courses in the core. This includes developing more sophisticated assessment tools for analytical skills and substantive knowledge as well as communications skills. The goal is to move away completely from the use of grades in assessments for these courses.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: director undergraduate studies, Coordinators for POLS 2401 and POLS 1101
Additional Resources: Summer funding for faculty

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Political Science BA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 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 seeks to fulfill the above mission by offering undergraduate students education in the five major sub-fields 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 political institutions and behavior
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate basic understanding of political institutions and behavior both in the United States and globally.

G 3: Developing critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate critical thinking skills appropriate to the discipline
G 4: Effective written and oral communications
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate effective writing and oral presentation skills

G 2: Methodological and analytical skills
All students in the BA program in Political Science will demonstrate a competence in methodological and analytical skills

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Appropriate methodological and analytical skills (G: 2) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate methodological skills appropriate to the Major. Specifically students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the use of social statistics. Students will demonstrate an ability to understand data reported in various forms. Students will demonstrate an ability to conduct research using traditional and new technological resources. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the scientific method, including the formulation of hypotheses and the role of independent, control and dependent variables.

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

SLO 2: Critical thinking (G: 3) (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate competence in six 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, and integration and synthesis of other perspectives.

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

SLO 3: Effective Communication (G: 4) (M: 3)
Students will demonstrate the 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.

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

SLO 4: Substantive Knowledge- US structures and processes (G: 1) (M: 4)
Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of the institutions of government and the behavior of governmental and non governmental actors in the United States. 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

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

SLO 5: Substantive knowledge -Global structures and processes (G: 1) (M: 5)
Students will demonstrate understanding of the structures and processes of international institutions and the government and the behavior of governmental and non governmental actors in the international system. Students will demonstrate and understanding 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

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Methodological Skills (O: 1)
The department uses assessments from a number of courses to assess learning outcomes for this objective. 1. Instructors for POLS 3800 - Introduction to political research (a required course for all majors) are asked to assess student learning in several methodological skills using a rubric (see attached rubric). Assessment scores from the first three items on the rubric are used to assess learning outcome for this objective. 2. Instructors in POLS 3200, POLS 3400 (required courses for International Affairs Concentration) and POLS 3140 (Required course for pre-law concentration) are asked to evaluate student learning outcomes in use of methodological skills in written assignments and papers submitted as part of the course. This measure uses a five (5) point scale to assess students. A score of five (5) representing the highest level of learning outcomes and one (1) the lowest. 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 O1: Appropriate methodological and analytical skills
On the POLS 3800 rubric the department expects 80% of students to score 1 or better out of two on the three items of the rubric used to measure achievement of this objective. On the assessments from POLS 3200, POLS 3400 and POLS 3140 The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in methodological skills appropriate to the major.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

246 students took POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2010-2011. 10 sections of the course were taught during the period. The three assessment scores (on the first 3 items of the rubric) used to assess outcomes for this objective yielded the following. On the Identification of Research Question assignment 65.9% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 28.5% scored a 1 (Developing) 5.7% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 57.7% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 33.7% scored a 1 (Developing) 8.5% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off. On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 45.9% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 42.3% scored a 1 (Developing) 12.2% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off. Instructor scores on assessments of student methodological skills in the other courses were as follows - POLS 3200 - 4.25, POLS 3400 - 3.70 and POLS 3140 - 3.75

M 2: Critical Thinking measures (O: 2)

This measure evaluates student achievement in terms of critical thinking skills identified by the department as critical thinking skills appropriate to the major. The department uses learning assessments from POLS 4900 (CTW course) to measure achievement in this objective. The course uses a rubric for this assessment (Please see attached rubric). The first six items of the POLS 4900 Assessment rubric are used to assess learning outcomes for critical thinking.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Critical thinking

We expect 80% of our students to score a 3 or better on each of the six items on the rubric (the first six) being used to measure critical thinking learning outcomes.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

On the effective formulation of the research question portion of the rubric (items 1-3) the scores were as follows. Identification of question or issue - 39.7% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated). 48.5% scored 3-4 (Competent) 5.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 36.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 58.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 4.1% scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 44.1% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 47.1% scored 3-4 (Competent) 5.8% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric (items 4-5) the scores were as follows. Collection and presentation of facts/data - 47.1% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 39.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 5.8% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 51.5% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 35.3% scored 3-4 (Competent) 5.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the Integration and synthesis of other perspectives - 33.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 54.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 11.8% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off. Percentage figures are rounded off.

M 3: Effective Communication (O: 3)

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE The assessment of effective communications skill was carried out using two courses (Both of them CTW courses and required of all majors) POLS 3800 and POLS 4900. Both these courses use rubrics to assess learning (Please see attached rubrics). The last items on each of these rubrics deal with communication skills and are used to assess learning for this objective.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Effective Communication

On the POLS 3800 assessment Rubric we expect 80% of our students to score 1 or higher out of a possible score of 2 on Item four (4) of the rubric. On the POLS 4900 assessment rubric we expect 80% of our students to score 3 or higher out of a possible score of 5 on Item seven (7) of the rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill On the POLS 3800 assessment rubric 54.5% of our students scored 2 (Competent). 34.6% scored 1 (Developing) and 10.7% scored 0 (Absent). On the Presentation of conclusions skill on the POLS 4900 Assessment Rubric 36.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 54.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 7.4% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.

M 4: Measure of substantive knowledge US structures and processes (O: 4)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Substantive Knowledge- US structures and processes

The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in substantive knowledge of American political structures and processes.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In the period Summer 2010 to Spring 2011 220 students took POLS 3140. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 4.00.

M 5: Measure substantive knowledge global structures and processes (O: 5)

The Department offers three concentrations in the major, General Political Science, Pre Law and International Relations with different course requirements for each concentration. Students must earn 27 credit hours in the major to graduate and must take at least one course in each of the five subject areas in political science, to wit, American Government, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration and Political Theory. Currently the only courses that all majors must take are POLS 3800, Introduction to Political Research and POLS 4900 (starting incoming class Fall 2009). Capstone Seminar. Students in International Affairs take POLS 3200, Comparative Politics and POLS 3400, International Relations, while student in Pre Law take the introductory course of POLS 3140, Judicial Politics and Process. POLS 3200 and 3400 instructors were asked to evaluate learning outcomes in substantive knowledge in the area of American government and processes for each student using results of exams and quizzes as well as written work turned in for the course. They used the following five (5) point scale, with five (5) representing the highest level of learning outcomes and one (1) the lowest. The instructors rated each student in the following subject area: overall knowledge/mastery of the subject matter. The scale is as follows: 1. Demonstrates an absence of knowledge 2. Demonstrates basic knowledge 3. Demonstrates competency 4. Demonstrates mastery 5. Demonstrates sophistication See examples of attached projects and quizzes used in POLS 3200 and POLS 3400.
## 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.

**SLO 2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students should demonstrate knowledge of the research literature in their area of specialization.

**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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects (O: 1, 2, 3)**
The members of each MA thesis committee or of a non-thesis paper will individually assess the student’s achievement in terms of the program's stated learning objectives.

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

**Target for O1: Use of Appropriate Research Skills**
All completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects should demonstrate mastery of the program’s stated learning objectives.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Eight thesis projects and four non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2010 through summer 2011), up from seven thesis projects last year. Thesis projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects evaluated, 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 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 2.9 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Eight thesis projects and four non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2010 through summer 2011), up from seven thesis projects last year. Thesis projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects evaluated, 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 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 2.9 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Eight thesis projects and four non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2010 through summer 2011), up from seven thesis projects last year. Thesis projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which learning objectives were met. Of the thesis projects evaluated, 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 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 2.9 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: This is continued from last year.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director, non-thesis committee members
Additional Resources: none

Pre- and post-tests for methods sequence
For next year, we plan to strengthen our assessment capacity for the graduate programs by implementing a pre-test and post-test for students in our required methods sequence, POLS 8800 (fall) and POLS 8810 (spring). 8800 teaches research design, while 8810 is intermediate applied statistics. Because we must do this in order, the first pre-test will be given in Fall 2010, and the first results will not be reported until June 2011. The Graduate Director will work with the instructors of these two courses to come up with appropriate pre- and post-tests and ensure inter-coder reliability. Normally the same person teaches 8800 on a regular basis, and the same is true for 8810.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will give the first pre-test in August 2010, the last post-test in April 2011, and report results in June 2011.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Grad director, graduate committee, instructors of 8800 and 8810.

"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; 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 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: Finished
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 PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The primary changes undertaken in the program last year are the following: (1) we added a new regular course in advanced quantitative methods to our methods sequence to better prepare our graduate students in the increasingly sophisticated techniques that they will be expected to know; (2) we expanded graduate recruitment to include purchasing GRE scores and contacting potential candidates this way; and (3) we eliminated spring intake for our MA program to better create clear cohorts in the required methods sequence.

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

We will consider adding a new qualitative methods component to the methods sequence, and we will expand again our recruitment efforts to include visits to metro Atlanta colleges and universities.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Political Science PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

**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 Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student's major field of expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (G: 4) (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive exam assessments (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Comprehensive exams are normally offered twice a year, in December and May. This academic year, a total of 11 students took comprehensive exams, and 7 passed all three of their exams (64%). All but one of the six students who took exams were taking them for the first time. This represents an increase from the last academic year’s pass rate of 50% and a reduction from the pass rate of two years ago, which was 87.5%. As is worth noting, 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, and the improved pass rate over last year indicates that students are adjusting to these higher standards. Also, on the positive side of the ledger, two of the students who passed their exams received a "high pass" on at least one of them, something that is rare in our department, and two of the students who failed only failed one of their three exams. Therefore, only two of the six exams demonstrated serious problems in quality. Sample of readers' comments on passing exams in the student's primary fields: "The student displays an unusually strong command of the literature on international politics and provides clear and compelling arguments and answers to the questions. The student offers thoughtful critiques of the IR literature, suggesting a strong ability to think independently, and skillfully draws upon the literature in other fields of political science to generate useful syntheses. The answers are very well written and demonstrate strong competence in the literature. The student is able to make very insightful connections across subfields of IR, but also across fields of political science, especially comparative politics. The answer also demonstrated the ability to skillfully use empirical examples to make a larger theoretical point." "Candidate did well explaining the benefits of experiments, but ignored discussion of observational data almost completely."

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

Comprehensive exams are normally offered twice a year, in December and May. This academic year, a total of 11 students took comprehensive exams, and 7 passed all three of their exams (64%). All but one of the six students who took exams were taking them for the first time. This represents an increase from the last academic year’s pass rate of 50% and a reduction from the pass rate of two years ago, which was 87.5%. As is worth noting, 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, and the improved pass rate over last year indicates that students are adjusting to these higher standards. Also, on the positive side of the ledger, two of the students who passed their exams received a "high pass" on at least one of them, something that is rare in our department, and two of the students who failed only failed one of their three exams. Therefore, only two of the six exams demonstrated serious problems in quality. Sample of readers' comments on passing exams in the student's sub-fields: "This is an easy pass. The answers were well constructed and did a great job of synthesizing the relevant literature without neglecting the need to fully address the question."
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: Presentation, either individual or group

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Three doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2010 through summer 2011). 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 4.0, 4.7, and 3.9). 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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Three doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2010 through summer 2011). The dissertations were ranked 4, 4.7, and 4 on the research methods dimension, indicating that there has been improvement in strengthening students' methodological skills (see action plan for details on recent 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Three doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2010 through summer 2011). 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 evaluating the students' familiarity with the research enterprise (the averages were 4, 4.5, and 4.7).

M 3: Conference presentations, publications and grants (O: 1, 3, 4)

This measure gauges research competency and professional socialization by assessing the success of graduate students in placing their work at conferences and in publishing outlets and in attracting funding to support their research.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

At least 20 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on department funding records). These conferences range from small gatherings to the most prestigious (and competitive) in the discipline. For example, fully six of our PhD students presented a paper or poster at the 2010 American Political Science Association Convention, a conference with an acceptance rate well under 50% (including for faculty). In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized their third annual conference at Georgia State on building political institutions, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. In this past year we also placed three former PhD students in tenure-track / permanent positions (Georgia Gwinnett, Thammasat University [in Bangkok], and Southern Utah University), and at least five of our graduate students published in 2010-2011. In addition, two of our PhD students received Revise and Resubmit offers at journals ranked within the top 10 in the discipline (out of about 200 journals ranked). We also had a number of our students applying for grants, and one of them was awarded a highly competitive travel grant to spend fall semester doing field work in Asia. Finally, several students have made marks in related professional fields over the past year, with one doing development consulting in Africa and another working with the UN to improve refugee camp conditions.

Target for O3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

At least 20 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on department funding records). These conferences range from small gatherings to the most prestigious (and competitive) in the discipline. For example, fully six of our PhD students presented a paper or poster at the 2010 American Political Science Association Convention, a conference with an acceptance rate well under 50% (including for faculty). In addition, both doctoral and masters student members of the Political Science Graduate Student Association organized their third annual conference at Georgia State on building political institutions, attracting scholars from around the country and even from abroad to Georgia State. In this past year we also placed three former PhD students in tenure-track / permanent positions (Georgia Gwinnett, Thammasat University [in Bangkok], and Southern Utah University), and at least five of our graduate students published in 2010-2011. In addition, two of our PhD students received Revise and Resubmit offers at journals ranked within the top 10 in the discipline (out of about 200 journals ranked). We also had a number of our students applying for grants, and one of them was awarded a highly competitive travel grant to spend fall semester doing field work in Asia. Finally, several students have made marks in related professional fields over the past year, with one doing development consulting in Africa and another working with the UN to improve refugee camp conditions.

Target for O5: Teaching Effectiveness

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Thirteen instructors taught a total of 21 sections in fall, spring, and summer of 2010-11 (up from 19 sections last year). Seven instructors taught 10 sections in fall 2010, ten instructors taught 10 sections in spring 2011, and one instructor taught 1 section in summer 2011. Seven instructors taught 10 sections of POLS 1101 (Introduction to American Politics) and six instructors taught 11 sections of POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Six of these 22 sections were large (an unfortunate increase in over-100 sections over last year) and nine were small (a positive increase in under-25 sections from last year). Syllabi were examined by the 2401 and 1101 coordinators and found to be substantially in common learning outcomes for 2401 and will complete doing so this year for 1101. The average score for overall teaching effectiveness (question 17) was 4.4 for 1101 and 4.3 for 2401 (the relevant numbers were 4.5 and 4.0 last year); it ranged from 3.7 to 4.8 for 1101 and from 3.4 to 4.9 for 2401. These numbers are quite impressive for graduate instruction in this discipline (out of about 200 journals ranked). We also had a number of our students applying for grants, and one of them was awarded a highly competitive travel grant to spend fall semester doing field work in Asia. Finally, several students have made marks in related professional fields over the past year, with one doing development consulting in Africa and another working with the UN to improve refugee camp conditions.
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: On-Hold
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 into line with the current scholarly emphasis of the department.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
### 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 year 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. 

### Teaching Course for Graduate Students

The department introduced a new teaching 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.

### Expanded Recruitment

The department will begin reaching out to metro Atlanta schools more fully to recruit new graduate students. We will also continue with our expanded recruitment efforts, which last year included purchasing GRE scores, emailing minority APSA scholars, and contacting faculty at a number of Georgia and southern undergraduate institutions.

| 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 |

| Teaching Course for Graduate Students |

The department introduced a new teaching 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: 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 graduate director and chair will cooperate in implementing the new policies. |
| Projected Completion Date: 08/2011 |
| Responsible Person/Group: Graduate director and chair. |
| Additional Resources: New faculty member |

| Expanded Recruitment |

The department will begin reaching out to metro Atlanta schools more fully to recruit new graduate students. We will also continue with our expanded recruitment efforts, which last year included purchasing GRE scores, emailing minority APSA scholars, and contacting faculty at a number of Georgia and southern undergraduate institutions.

| Established in Cycle: 2010-2011 |
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The primary changes undertaken in the program last year are the following: (1) we added a new regular course in advanced quantitative methods to our methods sequence to better prepare our graduate students in the increasingly sophisticated techniques that they will be expected to know; (2) we expanded graduate recruitment to include purchasing GRE scores and contacting potential candidates this way; and (3) we eliminated spring intake for our MA program to better create clear cohorts in the required methods sequence.

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

We will consider adding a new qualitative methods component to the methods sequence, and we will expand again our recruitment efforts to include visits to metro Atlanta colleges and universities. We may also discuss changes to our comprehensive exams, but this will need to be a consensus decision.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Professional Accountancy-Financial Reporting & Assurance MPA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**
For students to develop skills in: (1) developing financial reporting systems, (2) interpreting and predicting choices in financial reporting systems, (4) applying taxation law to business entities.

**Goals**

**G 1: Develop financial reporting systems**
Develop financial reporting systems.

**G 2: Interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems**
Interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems.

**G 3: Apply tax law to business entities**
Apply taxation law to business entities.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Develop reporting systems: Prepare consolidated financial statements (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Prepare consolidated financial statements.

**SLO 2: Develop reporting systems: Analyze financial accounting standards (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Critically analyze current and proposed financial accounting standards to identify their strengths and weaknesses.

**SLO 3: Develop reporting systems: Analyze accounting's effect on stock prices (G: 1) (M: 3)**
Analyze the effect of accounting results on stock prices.

**SLO 4: Interpret and predict: Analyze earnings management (G: 2) (M: 4)**
Analyze why and how managers manage earnings.

**SLO 5: Interpret and predict: Perform financial analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)**
Perform financial analysis for making lending and investment decisions.

**SLO 6: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law (G: 3) (M: 6)**
Identify relevant tax law for the creation and liquidation of entities, state and local taxation, international taxation, and estates.
SLO 7: Apply tax law: Develop tax research skills (G: 3) (M: 7)
Develop research skills to find and evaluate tax authority.

SLO 8: Apply tax law: Apply tax law (G: 3) (M: 8)
Apply appropriate taxation law in situations involving individuals and entities.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

| M 1: Develop reporting systems: Prepare consolidated financial statements Acct 8130 (O: 1) |
| Prepare consolidated financial statements. Performance on assignments in Acct 8130. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O1: Develop reporting systems: Prepare consolidated financial statements**
Exam mean of 75%

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Except for noncontrolling interests (NCI), students scored 75% or above. FastTrack MPA classes are 4 hours in duration. The first exam, covering chapters 1-3, usually takes 2 hours, leaving 2 hours for class lecture on the next topic, NCI. Student participation was minimal because the exam was exhausting. The class needs an incentive to engage in class discussion.

| M 2: Develop reporting systems: Analyze financial accounting standards Acct 8410 (O: 2) |
| Analyze financial accounting standards. Performance on exam questions in 8410. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O2: Develop reporting systems: Analyze financial accounting standards**
Mean score of 80% or above

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
In the FastTrack MPA, the mean score was 75%. The course was taught over a period of three semesters for one hour credit each, beginning fall 2010. The volume of course materials needs to be recalibrated for a one credit class. Due to the format of class meetings (4.25 hours), the final exam was given in the final two hours of the last class meeting, with regular class held in the first two hours with students being tested on the material just discussed and material from previous classes. In the FlexMPA, the mean score on exam questions was 82%. Although overall the target was met, students had difficulty identifying the strengths and weaknesses of an accounting standard from the point of view of parties other than preparers, e.g., analysts, shareholders, creditors, auditors. The mean score on this question was 76%

| M 3: Develop reporting systems: Analyze accounting effect on stock prices Acct 8410 (O: 3) |
| Analyze accounting’s effect on stock prices. Performance on assignments in Acct 8410. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O3: Develop reporting systems: Analyze accounting’s effect on stock prices**
Exam mean of 80% or better

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
In the FastTrack MPA, the mean score on exam questions was 74%. The course was taught over a period of three semesters for one hour credit each, beginning fall 2010. The volume of course materials needs to be recalibrated for a one credit class. Due to the format of class meetings (4.25 hours), the final exam was given in the final two hours of the last class meeting, with regular class held in the first two hours with students being tested on the material just discussed and material from previous classes. In the FlexMPA, the mean score on exam questions was 81%. Although the target was met overall, students had difficulty applying the Efficient Markets concept to an exam case in which managers were pressured by dissident shareholders to change the depreciation method to boost the stock price. The average score on this question was 75%

| M 4: Interpret and predict: Analyze earnings management Acct 8410 (O: 4) |
| Analyze earnings management. Performance on assignments in Acct 8410. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O4: Interpret and predict: Analyze earnings management**
Exam question mean of 80% or better

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
In the FastTrack MPA, the mean exam score was 76%. The course was taught over a period of three semesters for one hour credit each, beginning fall 2010. The volume of course materials needs to be recalibrated for a one credit class. Due to the format of class meetings (4.25 hours), the final exam was given in the final two hours of the last class meeting, with regular class held in the first two hours with students being tested on the material just discussed and material from previous classes. In the FlexMPA, the exam score mean was 83%. Although students met the target, they had difficulty with a question involving the relation between earnings management and market efficiency. The mean score on this question was 79%

| M 5: Interpret and predict: Perform financial analysis Acct 8700 (O: 5) |
| Perform financial analysis for making lending and investment decisions. Performance target of mean of 75% on test questions in Acct 8700. |

| Target for O5: Interpret and predict: Perform financial analysis |
| Exam question mean of 80% or better |

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
In the FastTrack MPA, the mean exam score was 76%. The course was taught over a period of three semesters for one hour credit each, beginning fall 2010. The volume of course materials needs to be recalibrated for a one credit class. Due to the format of class meetings (4.25 hours), the final exam was given in the final two hours of the last class meeting, with regular class held in the first two hours with students being tested on the material just discussed and material from previous classes. In the FlexMPA, the exam score mean was 83%. Although students met the target, they had difficulty with a question involving the relation between earnings management and market efficiency. The mean score on this question was 79%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Interpret and predict: Perform financial analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean of 75% on test questions in Acct 8700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Target was met except for (1) assessing post-retirement disclosures for firm valuation and risk and (2) analyzing impact of nonrecurring items on financial statements. Grading allowed the lowest quiz score to be dropped, which permitted students to ignore some material. The number of assessment reduced the amount of class time to cover material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law Tx 8120 (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify relevant tax law at the Federal level. Target is a mean of 85% for exam questions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law**
Mean score on relevant exam questions of 85% in Tx 8120.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
Mean score on exam questions was 82.5%. The long class periods (4.25 hours) for FT-MPA students need to be redesigned for better integration of instructional and testing class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Apply tax law: Develop tax research skills Tx 8020 (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop research skills to find and evaluate tax authority.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Apply tax law: Develop tax research skills**
Target is mean of 85% on exam questions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
Mean score on exam questions was 80%. Although the traditional and Fast-Track MPA (FT-MPA) cohorts met the target, the long class periods (4.25 hours) for FT-MPA students need to be redesigned for better integration of instructional and testing class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Apply tax law: Apply tax law Acct 8040 (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apply tax law to individuals and entities. Target of mean of 85% on exam questions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O8: Apply tax law: Apply tax law**
Mean of 85% on relevant exam questions in Acct 8040.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Mean score on exam questions was 86.8% (met target) for the traditional cohort and 84.3% (target not met) for the Fast-Track MPA (FT-MPA) cohort.

---

**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):**

- **Measure:** Develop reporting systems: Analyze financial accounting standards Acct 8410  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Develop reporting systems: Prepare consolidated financial statements

**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.

**Include tax research written assignment.**
Include a tax research written assignment as one-fourth of the students' grades to permit the students to convey their knowledge through another means besides exam testing.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Apply tax law: Apply tax law Acct 8040  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Apply tax law: Apply tax law

**Implementation Description:** Include a tax research written assignment as one-fourth of the students' grades to permit the students to convey their knowledge through another means besides exam testing.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2011
Outside research project.
Incorporate outside research project that includes two tax returns, one for corporations and one for partnerships as well as a research component consisting of a client letter and a tax file memorandum, using the unique Master of Tax writing website.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law Tx 8120 | Outcome/Objective: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law

Implementation Description: ncorporate outside research project that includes two tax returns, one for corporations and one for partnerships as well as a research component consisting of a client letter and a tax file memorandum, using the unique Master of Tax writing website.

Responsible Person/Group: Lucia Smeal
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing how an accounting standard affects parties other than preparers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing how an accounting standard affects parties other than preparers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing how an accounting standard affects parties other than preparers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing how an accounting standard affects parties other than preparers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Develop reporting systems: Analyze accounting effect on stock prices Acct 8410 | Outcome/Objective: Develop reporting systems: Analyze accounting's effect on stock prices

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Interpret and predict: Analyze earnings management Acct 8410 | Outcome/Objective: Interpret and predict: Analyze earnings management

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Develop reporting systems: Analyze financial accounting standards Acct 8410 | Outcome/Objective: Develop reporting systems: Analyze financial accounting standards
Reallocate testing and class time
For the FastTrackMPA, reallocate course material across the three one-hour courses. Administer the exam in the first two hours on the last class day and cover additional material in the next two hours, which will be tested with a take-home exam. For the FlexMPA, spend additional class time discussing the application of the efficient markets theory.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reallocate testing and coverage time
Reduce the number of quizzes to allow more time for coverage of materials and eliminate the dropped quiz.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Interpret and predict: Perform financial analysis Acct 8700 | Outcome/Objective: Interpret and predict: Perform financial analysis

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Usha Ramachandran
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Reconfigure graded work
While the traditional cohort exceeded the target, the new Fast-Track MPA (FT-MPA) cohort did not. For the FT-MPA, an out-of-class written assignment will be developed to afford students another way to demonstrate their mastery of tax rules.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Apply tax law: Apply tax law Acct 8040 | Outcome/Objective: Apply tax law: Apply tax law

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Lucia Smeal

Reconfigure last class meeting.
Give students a reason for being attentive to the second two hours of the 4-hour course. Announce and give a quiz over NCI concepts for extra points on the exam just taken.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Develop reporting systems: Prepare consolidated financial statements Acct 8130 | Outcome/Objective: Develop reporting systems: Prepare consolidated financial statements

Responsible Person/Group: Bert Richards
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Redesign integration of class and testing time
Redesign class meetings to integrate class and test time, e.g., test content of last class meeting in a take-home exam.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law Tx 8120 | Outcome/Objective: Apply tax law: Identify relevant tax law

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher

Redesign integration of class and testing time
Redesign class meetings to integrate class and test time, e.g., test content of last class meeting in a take-home exam.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Apply tax law: Develop tax research skills Tx 8020 | Outcome/Objective: Apply tax law: Develop tax research skills

Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher
## 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 professionals to contribute to the body of knowledge that undergirds the profession and to provide service to the profession and the community.

## Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 1: Goal #1</th>
<th>To prepare counselors to work with diverse populations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 2: Goal #2</td>
<td>To integrate advanced theoretical perspectives into clinical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3: Goal #3</td>
<td>To improve student's learning of qualitative and/or quantitative research methodologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 4: Goal #4</td>
<td>Enhance individual and group counseling skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Implementation of specific theories in practice. (M: 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 1: Process ethical dilemmas and lead others (M: 2, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process ethical dilemmas and lead others in supervision for successful resolution and toward the implementation of an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 2: Ethical group guidelines for ACA, ASGW, and APA (M: 2, 3, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and application of ethical guidelines pertinent to the establishment, conducting, and group outcome for various types of groups are acquired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 3: Apply group theory through research. (M: 2, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 4: Co-leader functions (M: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-leadership functions pertains to the standard level in didactic learning and in the application component. The advantages and disadvantages in co-leadership training is central to effective group functioning and outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 5: Acquire knowledge and use of adjunct structures (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 6: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity (M: 3, 4, 9, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 7: Work with individuals experiencing a trauma/crisis (M: 4, 5, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 8: Advocate for the profession. (M: 1, 8, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate by demonstrating actions that will further the identity and respect for the counseling profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 9: Share knowledge with professional community. (M: 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share knowledge through speaking, volunteerism, employment, supervision, and involvement in professional organizations. These involvements are to be with the body of master level students, community requests, and professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O 10: Implement advanced counseling skills. (M: 2, 6, 7, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement advanced counseling skills during the internship field experience. Implementation of these skills and knowledge will be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 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 2010-2011 - 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 O11: 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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
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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 O11: Lead groups in the counseling relationship.
All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling will, successfully co-facilitate a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.
students in Professional Counseling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling successfully co-facilitated a 9-week personal growth group, comprised of masters students in Professional Counseling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Sensitivity and group learning in diversity (O: 1, 2, 5, 7)**

Sensitivity in group learning in diversity is to acquire and respect differences in communication (verbal and non-verbal), values, mores, and the world view of all clients.

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

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of all Ed.S. students enrolled in practicum/internship earned a minimum of 3.0 on Form 1010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of all Ed.S. students enrolled in practicum/internship earned a minimum of 3.0 on Form 1010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Ed.S. students in Professional Counselor earned a minimum score of 70 on their final taping interview rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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. 

**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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students who were enrolled in CPS 8450 (Advanced Group Counseling) in the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students who were enrolled in CPS 8450 (Advanced Group Counseling) in the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students who were enrolled in CPS 8450 (Advanced Group Counseling) in the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the Ed.S. students in Professional Counseling who enrolled in the Crisis Management course during the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
94% of all Ed.S. Professional Counseling students received 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
94% of all Ed.S. Professional Counseling students received 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)
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
Students in the Ed.S. program in Professional Counseling continued to demonstrate excellent both within the classroom and various clinical settings throughout metropolitan Atlanta. Please note that this program is being phased out due to transition to the 60 credit hour Mental Health Program and thus, is no longer accepting new students. As of fall, 2011, approximately 20 students are enrolled.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Students in this Ed.S. program ascertain and demonstrate advanced skills in group and individual counseling as well as obtain a more detailed knowledge of qualitative and/or quantitative skills.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Due to the development of the 60 credit hour Mental Health Counseling program, the CPS department is no longer accepting students in this program. Approximately 20 students are still enrolled, of whom 80% expect to complete the degree by Spring 2012.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
Please see the response in #3.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Due to the high level of student performance on predetermined objectives and measurements, no changes in the assessment process were made to this program.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
No changes to curriculum or courses have been made as a result of the phasing out of this program as well as high student achievement.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
We used data from the 2009-2010 assessment to establish student outcome measures for the masters degree program in Mental Health Counseling.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
Data from this year’s assessment efforts supports effective classroom and practica training of our advanced students in Professional Counseling.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We anticipate that students will continue to meet all predetermined goals and objectives in the 2011-12 academic year.

Goals

G 1: Professional Counseling (MS) Program Goals
The academic goals for the masters degree program in Professional Counseling are the following: 1) Prepare counselors to offer effective clinical services to diverse clientele; 2) Integrate evidence-based theoretical interventions into counseling orientation; and 3) Enhance understanding of research methods in order to increase interpretation and contribution to the profession’s literature base.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Internship Membership in ACA (O: 7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>94% of all professional counseling Masters students who completed their internships within the 2010-11 academic year joined 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>
<td>94% of all professional counseling Masters students who completed their internships within the 2010-11 academic year joined ACA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: National Counselor's Examination (O: 2, 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>92% of all students enrolled in the Masters in Professional Counseling Program who took the NCE in April 2011 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>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 for a national group, CACREP programs, and non-CACREP programs.</td>
<td>94% of all students enrolled in the Masters in Professional Counseling Program who took the NCE in April 2011 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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research</strong></td>
<td>Over 90% of all students enrolled in the Masters Program for Professional Counseling will score a 72% or better on the Program Evaluation and Research section of the National Counselor Examination (NCE). The average score on the Program Evaluation and Research section of the NCE among GSU students will be higher than the national, CACREP, and non-CACREP accredited averages.</td>
<td>92% of all students enrolled in the Masters in Professional Counseling Program who took the NCE in April 2011 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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>A minimum of 80% of all Masters in Professional Counseling at GSU who take the program-specific Comprehensive Exam during</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the 2009-2010 academic year will score higher than 75% on the ethics section.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
83% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 scored at least a 75% on the Ethics section.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
83% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 scored at least a 75% on the Ethics section.

**Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics**
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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
83% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 scored at least a 75% on the Ethics section.

**Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research**
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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
86% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 scored at least a 75% on the Program Evaluation and Research section.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
86% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 scored at least a 75% on the Program Evaluation and Research section.

**Target for O4: Practices educational, social, & career assessment**
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
84% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
91% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
85% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
94% of M.S. students in Professional Counseling who took their comprehensive exams during 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - 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 4.4).

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 2010-2011 - 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 4.4).

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 2010-2011 - 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 4.1).

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 2010-2011 - 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 4.5).

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students earned a minimum of 3 on the Form 1010 Counseling Effectiveness subscale (average score was 4.4 out of 6).

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
All practicum students will earn a average minimum score of 4 on the Counseling Ethics Form 1010 subscale.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students averaged higher than 4.0 on the Form 1010 subscale that assessed for Counseling Ethics (average score: 4.9 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 2010-2011 - 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 4.5.

**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 2010-2011 - 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: 4.6).

**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 2010-2011 - 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: 5.0).

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

86% of students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2010-11 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

86% of students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2010-11 academic year answered 75% of the questions included in the Assessment and Ethics section 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

84% of students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Professional Counseling during the 2010-11 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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.
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 will score a minimum of 3.0 on the "Clinical Reasoning" section found in Form 1015.

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - 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.

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

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of all students received a score of 75 or higher on the Comprehensive Exam section related to counseling theories and interventions.

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% 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

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% 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.

**Targets 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O6: Effectively works with groups of clients.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

94% 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.

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 Developmental Knowledge section of the NCE.

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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.

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 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% of all students taking their Comprehensive Exams during the 2009-2010 academic year earned a grade of 70 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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.

M 17: CPS Departmental Examination (O: 2, 3)

The CPS Departmental Examination has 1 subtest measuring research knowledge. The research stubtest has 10 questions on the 150 comprehensive examination.

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

Target for O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics

80% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination will score a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

83% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination scored a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.

Target for O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research

80% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination will score a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

83% of all students taking the Professional Counseling Masters-level Comprehensive Examination scored a minimum of 75% on the research and evaluation section.

M 18: Form 1015 (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

Form 1015 with 10 subscales (1-5 likert scale) assessing overall knowledge is administered at year end. The 10 subscales are knowledge, clinical reasoning, relationship skills, assessment, intervention, written communication, oral communication, ethics, sensitivity to diversity, and attitudes toward supervision.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Applies appropriate technology for counseling.
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 2010-2011 - 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 O2: Understands and practices the ACA Code of Ethics
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 O3: Conducts effective program evaluation and research
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 O5: Can counsel and consult with diverse populations.
All students enrolled in CPS 7680 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 earned a minimum of 3.0 on the Cumulative Evaluation (average of all subscales) on Form 1015.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
For ALL measures, students in the masters degree program in Professional Counseling met the minimum scores as established by program faculty. Students continue to demonstrate mastery on all CACREP-core areas and exceed both non-CACREP and CACREP program scores on the National Counselor Examination.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
Students in the Professional Counseling masters program demonstrate both the learning of clinical theory within the first year of the academic program and demonstration of counseling skills in the program's second year via the practicum/internship sequence.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
Please note that the 48 credit hour masters program in Professional Counseling is being phased out and replaced by the 60 credit hour masters program in Mental Health Counseling. Starting in fall of 2011, only 17 students remained in the Professional Counseling Program and nearly all students will have completed by spring 2012.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
The masters program in Professional Counseling is in the process of being phased out and replaced by the masters program in Mental Health Counseling. Starting in fall 2011, 17 students remained in the program of which nearly 90% will have graduated by Spring 2012. The Mental Health Counseling Program will have a separate WEAVE report affiliated with its performance.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM 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 were made due to the fact that 100% of objectives were met in the previous year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The accreditation of our Professional Counseling program is requiring that student outcome data be used to justify program effectiveness. This data will be used in the 2011-2011 WEAVE report.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
We used the outcome data from the 2009-2010 assessment to develop and implement the student outcome measurements for the Mental Health Counseling Program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
Faculty members in the Professional Counseling Program continue to provide excellent training and supervision to the students in this program. No areas of deficiency were noted.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Since 90% of students now enrolled in this program are in the practicum/internship sequence, the objectives and goals that will be measured will have to change. Please note that the majority of students will be in the Mental Health Counseling Program and their outcomes and measurements will be provided in a separate WEAVE report.
**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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 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)

**Other 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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5.0 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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: PSYC1100 (Intro to Biopsychology) - Learning Survey 2010-11 (O: 1)**
Students are asked to rate on a scale of 1-5 their own knowledge in 8 different areas of the course once at the beginning of the semester, and once at the end. The course areas are listed below. A copy of the learning survey can be found in the document repository. General Knowledge of Psychology 1) What biological psychology is about 2) The theory of evolution through natural selection Knowledge in Specific Areas of Psychology 3) Neurons and how they work 4) The brain and the nervous system 5) Vision 6) Audition 7) Learning and memory 8) Schizophrenia 9) Language
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Knowledge Base of Physiological Mechanisms of Behavior**
Our target for this measure is significant improvement in the average, total score on the survey, with a moderate or better effect size.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Average total scores on the survey at the end of the course (M=33.07, SD=4.70) were significantly higher than at the beginning of the course (M=24.28, SD=5.53), (t(392)=10.93, p<.001). The effect size was large, Cohen's d=.68.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Sixty-seven percent of the sampled students (n=188 of 280) passed the mastery test with a score of 70% or better. The mean score on the test was 75 with a standard deviation of 14.3.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process have your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since last year's assessment report we have added a measure of progress toward the core objective of natural and computational sciences. Our recently revised course offering, PSYC1100 - Introduction to Biopsychology, already contained a measure that can be used to track progress in this core curriculum objective. This course was previously entitled Natural Science Aspects of Psychology, and has since been revised thoroughly, prompting our revision of the measurement. We hope to improve this assessment process by analyzing data from all sections of this course.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Because the data from the 1100 course are relatively new, we have not yet had time to act upon them - currently, the target is being met. For the 1101 mastery test measurement, we did not meet the target. This is the first semester this has occurred and we will continue to monitor this measurement. If we continue to fail to meet the target, we may consider revising the curriculum or discussing the appropriateness of the target level, e.g. comparing our targets to those of other core objective measures.
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Mission / Purpose
The department offers a general undergraduate degree program aligned with the American Psychological Association's guidelines for a baccalaureate in psychology and that is integrated with the broader liberal arts education goals of the College of Arts and Sciences. The department's undergraduate mission is to teach scientific thinking about behavior, the skills related to the conduct of research and the values that reflect psychology as both a science and an applied discipline, and to convey knowledge, skills, and values consistent with liberal arts education that are further developed in psychology.

Goals

G 1: Knowledge Skills and Values Specific to Psychology

[Comment for reviewers: As a member of the Undergraduate Assessment Committee I have reviewed Weave reports from several departments and have noticed that many reporters use the level of Assessment Goals as established in the Weave system differently. I thought it would be useful to say a bit about how we in the Psychology Department are using Weave and how this aligns with American Psychological Association standards for undergraduate degree program learning outcomes. The APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major (see document repository) outline ten learning objectives, each of which falls under one of two broad categories: Knowledge, skills and values consistent with the science and application of psychology; and knowledge, skills and values consistent with a more general liberal arts education that are further developed in psychology.) The first category represents objectives that provide hallmarks of psychology education. The general goal is to foster knowledge, skills and values consistent with the science and application of psychology, specifically. Five specific objectives are associated with this broad goal.

G 2: Knowledge, Skills, and Values Consistent with Liberal Arts Education that are Further Enhanced by Psychology

This broad goal describes 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.

G 3: Knowledge, scientist, and applied
1. To train graduate students to be well-versed both broadly in psychology (e.g., history of the field, research methodology) as well as experts in specific areas of concentration (e.g., clinical, child clinical, specific research program). 2. To train graduate students to be scientists (e.g., empiricists, critical thinkers) across domains (e.g., applied, theoretical). 3. To train graduate students to be able to apply their skills across settings (e.g., research, instruction, applied) and within specific areas of individualized interest and concentration (e.g., community center for disadvantaged populations).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge Base of Psychology (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)

Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
Standard Associations

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

**SLO 2: Research Methods in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 7, 8, 11)**
Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation.

**SLO 3: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 6)**
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.

**SLO 4: Application of Psychological Principles (G: 1) (M: 9, 10)**
Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues.

**SLO 5: Values in Psychology (G: 1) (M: 8, 10)**
Students will be able to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values that are the underpinnings of psychology as a discipline.

**SLO 6: Information and Technological Literacy (G: 2) (M: 5)**
Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes.

**SLO 7: Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4, 6)**
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.

**SLO 8: Sociocultural and International Awareness (G: 2) (M: 8, 9, 10)**
Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.

**SLO 9: Personal Development (G: 2) (M: 3, 7, 9)**
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: 7, 9, 12)**
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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: PSYC1100 Learning Survey (O: 1)**
Students are asked to rate on a scale of 1-5 their own knowledge in 8 different areas of the course once at the beginning of the semester, and once at the end. The course areas are listed below. A copy of the learning survey can be found in the document repository. General Knowledge of Psychology 1) What biological psychology is about 2) The theory of evolution through natural selection Knowledge in Specific Areas of Psychology 3) Neurons and how they work 4) The brain and the nervous system 5) Vision 6) Audition 7) Learning and memory 8) Schizophrenia 9) Language
Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

**Target for O1: Knowledge Base of Psychology**
Our target for this measure is significant improvement in the average, total score on the survey, with a moderate or better effect size.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Average total scores on the survey at the end of the course (M=33.07, SD=4.70) were significantly higher than at the beginning of the course (M=24.28, SD=5.53), t(392)=10.93, p<.001. The effect size was large (Cohen's d=.68).

**M 2: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
Sixty-seven percent of the sampled students (n=188 of 280) passed the mastery test with a score of 70% or better. The mean score on the test was 75 with a standard deviation of 14.3.

**M 3: PSYC3110 - Behavioral Observation (O: 9)**
Students in PSYC3110 - Interpersonal Behavior are asked to learn 3 interpersonal skills (listener, evaluator and talker) and perform
M 4: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Students showed significant improvement between the pre-test (M=27.87, SD=12.98) and post-test (M=21.94, SD=12.35). This effect was significant, F(1, 128)=31.29, p<0.001, and of moderate effect size (partial Eta^2 = 0.196).

M 5: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Seventy-seven percent of sampled students (n=54 of 70) passed with a grade of 75% or better.

M 6: PSYC3530 and 4800 (CTW) Final Papers (O: 3, 7)
PSYC 3530 provides psychology majors with experience in research design, data analysis, and scientific communication needed for higher-level understanding in 4000-level courses, the development and writing of senior-year theses, and graduate study. Topics include the structure and style of scientific writing in psychology, experimental design, statistical techniques, and the preparation of a formal research paper in APA style. The form of the final paper varied across terms: Students who took the course in Fall 2010 completed an APA-style research project proposal, including Introduction, Method, and Projected Results sections, with 10 recent peer-reviewed articles as primary sources; students who took the course in Spring 2011 completed an APA-style literature review based on 4-10 recent peer-reviewed articles as primary sources. 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. PSYC 4800 is a senior seminar; each section focuses on a different topic. As such, the types and topics of the CTW posttest writing assignments vary across sections. Below is a brief description of the different assignments for which student examples have been provided, organized by section. PSYC 4800, Section 1 (4800-1) Each student will complete a weekly short reaction essay (approximately two well-formed paragraphs) on the article or chapter assigned for discussion. These essays should evaluate the theoretical arguments and evidence presented and/or compare and contrast the assigned article(s) with other points made in class. At the end of the essay, each student should list a question to discuss during class. Though brief, these submissions should use appropriate organization, style, and grammar. PSYC 4800, Section 2 (4800-2) The Case: In 1996 Oprah Winfrey had a guest on her show from the Human Society who discussed the practice of feeding cows ground-up meat from dead livestock. This practice, now banned by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States, is believed to have contributed to the spread of bovine spongiform encephalopathy, commonly known as "mad cow disease". Oprah, after hearing of the risks associated with this practice, pronounced on her show that she would not eat another burger. The resultant "Oprah Crash" of 1996 sent beef prices and cattle futures tumbling downward by nearly 10%. Cattle ranchers were convinced that Oprah's comments led to the decline in prices, the public's concerns regarding the safety of beef, and the heightened fear of mad cow disease. Oprah Winfrey was sued in 1998 by the cattle industry for $12 million in damages and losses. The ranchers sued under a Texas law, the False Disparagement of Perishable Food Products Act regarding the safety of beef, and the heightened fear of mad cow disease. Oprah, after hearing of the risks associated with this practice, pronounced on her show that she would not eat another burger. The resultant "Oprah Crash" of 1996 sent beef prices and cattle futures tumbling downward by nearly 10%. Cattle ranchers were convinced that Oprah's comments led to the decline in prices, the public's concerns regarding the safety of beef, and the heightened fear of mad cow disease. Oprah Winfrey was sued in 1998 by the cattle industry for $12 million in damages and losses. The ranchers sued under a Texas law, the False Disparagement of Perishable Food Products Act of 1995. The Assignment: Act as a trial consultant for jury selection and (based on research) suggest two characteristics that should be used to determine who you would select for the jury or two characteristics that should be used to remove people from the jury. Remember to write scientifically and do not use the word "I". You can take the side of the prosecuting attorney or the defense attorney. PSYC 4800, Section 3 (4800-3) As a final project, each student must prepare a synthesis paper in which he/she describes and evaluates the various theories of the psychology of war discussed in the course, reflecting on their similarities and differences and the connections the student sees between the various theories and the data about the psychology of war discussed over the semester.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology**

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
For PSYC3530 students, the median score for Organization and Logic was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 93% of sampled students (n=154 of 166) received scores of 2 or higher. The median score for Position and Balance was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 95% of sampled students (n=158 of 166) received scores of 2 or higher. The median score for
Use of Evidence was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 98% of sampled students (n=163 of 166) received scores of 2 or higher. For PSYC4800 students, the median score for Organization and logic was 5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 96% of sampled students (n=75 of 78) received scores of 4 or higher. The median score for Position and Balance was 5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 100% of sampled students (n=78) received scores of 4 or higher. The median score for Use of Evidence was 5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 78% of sampled students (n=61 of 78) received scores of 4 or higher.

Target for O7: Communication Skills

In 2010-2011, instructors rate each student's submission on 6 criteria: Grammar and Mechanics; Content and Development; Organization and Logic; Use of Evidence, Position and balance, and Citation and Use of Sources. We use Grammar and Mechanics, Content and Development and Citation and Use of Sources as measures of Communication Skills in Psychology. In both PSYC3530 and PSYC4800, instructors rate each student’s submission on a 5 point scale (see document repository for full rubric). A score of 0-1 is considered Emerging and is below expectations. A score of 2-3 is considered Developing and meets basic expectations. A score of 4-5 is considered Mastering and meets advanced expectations. For PSYC3530, our junior CTW course, the target is the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for these measures.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 83% (n=138 of 166) students received a rating of 2 or higher. The median score for Content and Development was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 98% (n=163 of 166) students received a rating of 2 or higher. The median score for Citation and Use of Sources was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 95% (n=158 of 166) students received a rating of 2 or higher.

M 7: PSYC4760 - Research Practicum Survey (of students) (O: 2, 9, 10)

Students in PSYC4760, Research Practicum, are asked to rate their research practicum experience on a scale of 1-5 for seven dimensions: 1) Research methods/Research skill development 2) Application of psychological theory to a practical setting 3) Personal development 4) Information & technology 5) Values in psychology 6) Career planning/Personal Development 7) Career planning/Mentoring We use students' responses to numbers 1, 3, 6 and 7 to measure progress toward objectives 2, 9, 10 (and 10 again). 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

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate their application of research methodology 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statement "this experience helped me acquire or improve skills related to psychology (i.e. evaluating research, understanding how studies are set up and conducted, understanding statistical analyses, learning about disorders, learned how to work with participants/animals, becoming more independent)," was rated as "very true."

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

87% (n=66 of 76 respondents) rated this item with a score of 4.

Target for O9: Personal Development

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate their application of personal development as 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statement "this practicum experience has had a positive impact on my personal development (i.e., it had an impact on my insight into my own thoughts, feelings and behaviors)" was rated as "very true."

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

84% of students (n=65 of 77 respondents) rated this item as 4, very true.

Target for O10: Career Planning and Development

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate their progress toward career planning and development, as well as the impact of their relationship with their mentor on their career development as 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statements "My practicum experience has had a positive impact on my professional development (i.e. I have a better understanding of what I would like to do or not do professionally, including graduate school, pursuing a masters versus a doctoral degree, pursuing a particular career or field in graduate school, etc.)," and "I feel that my relationship with my practicum supervisor or supervising graduate student had a positive impact on my development," were rated as "very true."

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

70% of students (n=64 of 77 respondents) rated their progress at 4; and 86% (n=64 of 74 respondents) rated the impact of their relationship with their supervisor most highly (4).

M 8: 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) 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 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

Our target for this measure is that 80% of students receive a rating of 4 or higher on items related to research 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

97% of students received a rating of 4 or higher for designing research studies in laboratory or field settings (n=70 of 72 respondents), and 98% received a rating of 4 or higher for appropriate use of statistics (n=44 of 45 respondents).

### Target for O5: Values in Psychology

Our target for this measure is that 80% of students receive a 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of students received a rating of 4 or higher on ethical behavior (n=92 of 92 respondents).

### Target for O8: Sociocultural and International Awareness

Our target for this measure is that 80% of students receive a rating 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/who were subjects," as "good" or "excellent."

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of students received a rating of 4 or better for this item (n=80 of 80 respondents).

#### M 9: PSYC4770 - Applied Practicum Survey (of students) (O: 4, 8, 9, 10)

Students in PSYC4760, Applied Practicum, are asked to rate their applied practicum experience on a scale of 1-5 for ten dimensions: 1) Application of psychological theory to a practical setting; 2) Application/skill acquisition; 3) Application/knowledge of community mental health services; 4) Communication and collaboration; 5) Critical thinking; 6) Personal Development; 7) Values/Sociocultural awareness; 8) Values/Ethics; 9) Career Planning/Professional Development; and 10) Career planning/Mentoring. We use students' responses to numbers 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 to measure progress toward objectives 4, 9, 8, 10 (and 10 again), respectively.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

#### Target for O4: Application of Psychological Principles

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate their application of psychological theory to a practical setting as 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statement "I was able to see and/or apply psychological principles and theories learned in the classroom to the real world" was rated as "very true."

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

50% of surveyed students (n=6 of 12 respondents) rated this item at 4.

#### Target for O8: Sociocultural and International Awareness

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate their experience regarding values/social awareness as 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statement "I was able to get a better understanding of what different types of people experience through my practicum experience (e.g. women who are bettered, children who have experienced sexual abuse; the role of discrimination, prejudice and economic factors in people's lives)" was rated as "very true."

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

75% of students surveyed (n=6 of 12 respondents) rated this item most highly (4).

#### Target for O9: Personal Development

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate the degree to which their practicum experience enhanced their personal development as 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statement "My practicum experience has had a positive impact on my personal development (e.g. it has had an impact on my insight into my own thoughts, feelings and behaviors)" was rated as "very true."

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

75% of surveyed students (n=9 of 12 respondents) rated this item most highly (4).

#### Target for O10: Career Planning and Development

Our target for this item is that 70% of students rate the degree to which their practicum experience enhanced their professional development and their relationship with their mentor as 4, the highest rating. This indicates that the statements "My practicum experience has had a positive impact on my professional development (e.g. I have a better understanding of what I would like to do or not do professionally, including graduate school);" and "I feel that my relationship with my practicum supervisor had a positive impact on my development (e.g. 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 both rated as "very true."

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

67% of surveyed students (n=8 of 12 respondents) rated the first item at 4, and 75% (n=9 of 12 respondents) rated this item at 4.

#### M 10: 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
Target for O4: Application of Psychological Principles

Our target for this measure is that 80% of students receive a 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

87% of students received a rating of 4 or higher for the item probing application of basic principles (n=20 of 23 respondents) and 91% of students received a rating of 4 or higher for the item proving the utilization of psychological concepts.

Target for O5: Values in Psychology

Our target for this measure is that 80% of students receive a 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

96% of students received a rating of 4 or higher for this item (n=25 of 26 respondents).

Target for O8: Sociocultural and International Awareness

Our target for this measure is that 80% of students receive a 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."

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

96% of students received a rating of 4 or higher on this item (n=26 of 27 respondents).

M 11: PSYC4760 - Research Practicum Science Self-efficacy survey (O: 2)

A modified version of Chemers' (2010) Scientific Self-Efficacy Scale was administered to students in PSYC4760 at the beginning and end of the semester. This scale measures students' belief in their own ability to use scientific skills to solve real problems, e.g. "use technical science skills," and "generate a research question to answer." A complete version of the survey can be found in the documents repository.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Research Methods in Psychology

Significant increase in Science Self-Efficacy, between pre- and post- measurements, with moderate or greater effect size.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Science self-efficacy scores increased significantly from pre (M=37.31, SD=5.20) to post-practicum (M=41.02, SD=5.36). This increase was significant, t(50)=4.255, p<0.001, and the effect size was moderate to large (Cohen's d=.60).

M 12: PSYC4760 - Careers Survey (O: 10)

As part of the research practicum pre/post survey we included some questions about science careers. These questions measure attitudes toward science careers in general, as they apply to the student. A complete copy of the research practicum pre/post survey can be found in the documents repository.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target for O10: Career Planning and Development

Significant increase in science careers attitudes with moderate or larger effect size.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Attitudes toward science careers were significantly higher at the end of the program (M=53.73, SD=8.70) than at the end of the program (M=50.76, SD=10.76), t(50)=2.53, p<.015. This was a small to moderate effect, Cohen's d=.32.

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

Introduce CTW Courses

Two new Critical Thinking through Writing courses come online this year: PSYC3530, Advanced Research Design and Analysis, part of our redesigned quantitative core, and PSYC4800, Seminar in Psychology. The former is a survey of advanced research designs and their appropriate statistical analyses. Students learn about advanced statistics and their application with an emphasis on expressing critical thinking about psychological research through writing. The latter is designed to be a senior year capstone course. We plan on offering several special topics seminars. This semester, we began offering a PSYC4800 seminar called Neurobiology of Music. As a CTW course, students are encouraged to demonstrate critical thinking about this topic in a variety of written assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: PSYC4800 is currently being offered (Fall, 2009). PSYC3530 will be offered in Spring 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
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 already identified from which courses we will be collecting measurement data. For some of these courses we have already identified a specific measure, that is already being taken as part of the course, that we can use to track progress toward specific goals.

Our planned map of courses to goals is as follows: 1. Knowledge Base of Psychology - Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and historical trends in psychology. Course: PSYC1100. Measure: We already have a mastery test in place that we can use to measure progress toward this goal. 2. Research Methods in Psychology - Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation. Course: PSYC3510 (2˚ measure PSYC3530) - we will need to find an existing measure in the course - this is the first semester it is being taught. 3. Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology - Students will respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes. Course: PSYC4800 - We have a two sample writing analysis in the course already - we will use an existing CTW rubric to compare pre/post writing samples. 4. Application of Psychology - Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues. Course: PSYC2040, PSYC2101 - We need to identify an existing measure in these courses to serve as a “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 measure that already exists in this new course.

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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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.

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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have been revising measures for learning outcomes over the past three years. We followed established American Psychological Association guidelines for learning outcomes in an undergraduate degree program in psychology. Since adopting this model we have tried to identify measures that already exist as part of coursework that probe these items. Our goal was to have at least one unique measurement per learning outcome, and then to target objectives wherein it would be useful to have multiple measurements. We made these changes to conform to APA best practices for our discipline, and to address, in part, comments on previous learning
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Some of the data we analyzed this past year confirm that we are on the right track with improvements we have made as a result of previous action plans, e.g., establishing the CTW course sequence and offering peer tutoring in psychological statistics and writing. We also created a Careers in Psychology course, and hope to see improvements in the related objective (career planning & development) as measures are developed and refined in that course, and in our other existing measure (survey in the applied practicum) as more students in the major take the course. Based on the data we report here, we met all targets except for 4 measurements: the 1101 mastery test, which measures progress toward the knowledge base objective; the listening and talking measurement, which measures progress toward the personal development objective, the utility of the applied practicum survey which measures progress toward the career planning and development objective, and the applied practicum survey which measures progress toward the application of psychological principles objective. It is unlikely we will make major changes to our program based on these data, as this was the first year we did not meet our targets for these measures. We established some action plans in the previous year (described above) and it may be they have not been in place long enough to maintain our targets for the related measures (e.g. the careers course and career planning). If the knowledge base-related measurement remains only partially met for another year running, we may consider revising our target (for example measuring progress for majors only?) or addressing the problem with a change to our introductory course. We may make some changes to our curriculum for other reasons, e.g. to accommodate the record number of majors passing through our department. It is unlikely that these changes will affect the objectives we track here, but we may consider revising measures of progress toward those objectives.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Psychology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

Goals
G 1: Psychological Science
To train graduate students to be scientists (e.g., empiricists, critical thinkers) across domains (e.g., applied, theoretical).

G 2: Knowledge in Psychology
To train graduate students to be well-versed broadly in psychology (e.g., history of the field, research methodology) as well as experts in specific areas of concentration (e.g., clinical, child clinical, specific research program).

G 3: Applied Skills in Psychology
To train graduate students to be able to apply their skills across settings (e.g., research, instruction, applied) and within specific areas of individualized interest and concentration (e.g., community center for disadvantaged populations).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Theory and Content (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16)
Students will 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

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

SLO 2: Research Methods (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16)
Students will understand and appropriately apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
5.0 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.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**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**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration Skills (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)**
Students will communicate and collaborate effectively in a variety of formats and settings.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 4: Application (G: 3) (M: 4, 13, 14, 15, 16)**
Students will apply psychological principles in professional activities.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 5: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16)**
Students will respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 6: Personal Development (G: 3) (M: 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will show insight into their own and others’ behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 7: Information and Technology Literacy (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16)**

Students will demonstrate information technology competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for relevant purposes.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 8: Values in Psychology (G: 1, 3) (M: 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values underpinning psychology.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

**SLO 9: Sociocultural and International Awareness (G: 2, 3) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16)**

Students will incorporate knowledge of sociocultural and international diversity in their work.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

2.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 10: Career Planning and Development (G: 2, 3) (M: 13, 14, 15, 16)**

Students will emerge from graduate school with ideas about how to implement their psychological knowledge, skills, and values in occupational pursuits in a variety of settings.

Relevant Associations: American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation of the Clinical Program

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2 Student promotion and progression

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: MA Thesis Proposal GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the oral presentation of the Master’s proposal, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations), or 3 (Exceeded expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Theory and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Research Methods</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 |
| **Target for O1: Theory and Content** |
| At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations"). |
| **Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

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

Target for O1: Theory and Content
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.

Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.

Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.

Target for O8: Values in Psychology
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of students passed on first attempt.

M 4: General Exam (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8)
Target for **O1: Theory and Content**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
76% of students failed the General Exam on the first attempt.

Target for **O2: Research Methods**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
76% of students failed the General Exam on the first attempt.

Target for **O4: Application**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
76% of students failed the General Exam on the first attempt.

Target for **O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
76% of students failed the General Exam on the first attempt.

Target for **O8: Values in Psychology**
A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
76% of students failed the General Exam on the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
87.5% of student 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
82.5% of student 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
80% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**
77.5% of student 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of student received a score of 2 or 3.

### 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").

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### 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").

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students passed on first attempt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students passed on first attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: 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><strong>Target for 08: 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 2010-2011 - 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>M 10: 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><strong>Target for 09: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students earned an A or B on a major assignment that assessed expertise with issues of human diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: 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><strong>Target for 02: 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students earned a grade of A or B on an assignment that assessed expertise in data analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 12: 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><strong>Target for O1: Theory and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students earned an A or A+ on a major assignment that assessed expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology.

### 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students earned an A or A+ on a major assignment that assessed 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students earned an A or A+ on a major assignment that assessed 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students earned an A or A+ on a major assignment that assessed 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students earned an A or A+ on a major assignment that assessed 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met or exceeded 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met or exceeded 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met or exceeded 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met or exceeded 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met or exceeded 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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the students met or exceeded 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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall, 75% (9 of 12) of the GTAs, received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17. In the spring, 94% (16 of 17) of the GTAs received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall, 75% (9 of 12) of the GTAs, received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17. In the spring, 94% (16 of 17) of the GTAs received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall, 75% (9 of 12) of the GTAs, received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17. In the spring, 94% (16 of 17) of the GTAs received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall, 75% (9 of 12) of the GTAs, received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17. In the spring, 94% (16 of 17) of the GTAs received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall, 75% (9 of 12) of the GTAs, received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17. In the spring, 94% (16 of 17) of the GTAs received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17.

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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
In the fall, 75% (9 of 12) of the GTAs, received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17. In the spring, 94% (16 of 17) of the GTAs received an average rating of 3.9 or higher on question 17.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O2</strong>: Research Methods</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3</strong>: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4</strong>: Application</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O5</strong>: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6</strong>: Personal Development</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7</strong>: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8</strong>: Values in Psychology</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O9</strong>: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O10</strong>: Career Planning and Development</th>
<th>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 of 26 faculty tenure-track (58%) published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 21 of 26 tenure-track faculty (81%) presented at least 1 paper with a student co-author.

**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.

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**
At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
At least 95% of student evaluations indicated that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

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

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Personal Development

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC

Discuss with Graduate Program Committee
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Application

Responsible Person/Group: DGS and GPC
The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Sociocultural and International Awareness

**Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC

### Discuss with Graduate Program Committee

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development

**Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC

### Evaluate Communication and Collaboration Skills training as evaluated with the General Exam

The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in communication and collaboration skills, especially training related to the skills assessed on the General Exam.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Committee

### Evaluate Communication and Critical Thinking Skills training as evaluated with the General Exam

The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in critical thinking, especially these skills as they are demonstrated on the General Exam.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Committee

### Evaluate Research Methods training as evaluated with the General Exam

The Graduate Program Committee will evaluate training in research methods, especially the skills that are assessed with the General Exam.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Program Committee

### Evaluate teaching performance

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Information and Technology Literacy

**Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC

### Evaluate teaching performance

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) will bring these results to the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 program) to determine whether the achievement target is reasonable or the training is adequate in this domain.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Values in Psychology

**Responsible Person/Group:** DGS and GPC
Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Application

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Career Planning and Development

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Values in Psychology

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate teaching performance
The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course will be informed of these findings so that he/she can evaluate the training of graduate student instructors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching performance | Outcome/Objective: Personal Development

Responsible Person/Group: The Director of Undergraduate Studies/Instructor of Teaching Course

Evaluate Theory and Content training as evaluated with the General Exam
Findings will be discussed by the Graduate Program Committee (Chairs of the 5 Psychology program) to identify whether training in theory and content should be improved, especially around the skills assessed by the General Exam.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: General Exam GLOE | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program Committee
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In a review of the 2009-2010 assessment report (feedback was never received from the college assessment committee), the Graduate Program Committee (GPC; Chairs of the 5 Psychology graduate programs/concentrations) and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) largely retained the structure of the assessment process. It was determined that an additional review of the objectives, measures, and targets will be made in conjunction with feedback from the College assessment committee. The DGS plans to evaluate the objectives to determine where they are in line with the objectives of the University’s Strategic Plan and other agencies (e.g., SACS). The DGS will work with graduate instructors and faculty to determine if better measures might be created, such as pre- and post-assessments of learning within domains (e.g., research methods).

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

The data largely reinforce the perception of the department that graduate training is adequate. However, there is some appreciation that greater numbers of students should publish and present papers. In addition, the higher number of failures and poor performance on the General Exam deserves greater scrutiny to determine if the problem is with the training, the exam, or some other variable.

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) program of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies prepares students to become leaders as executives, managers, analysts, and policy specialists in public and nonprofit sectors.

### Goals

**G 1: Understanding disciplinary and conceptual foundations of public or nonprofit administration**

Students learn major disciplinary and conceptual foundations of public or nonprofit 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 intermediate methods and statistics**

Students understand intermediate 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 or nonprofit sectors**

Students will understand basic principles of microeconomics as applied to public and nonprofit sectors.

**G 5: Understanding practice and problems of budgeting and finance in public or nonprofit organizations**

Students understand the practice and problems of budgeting and finance in the public or nonprofit organizations. This includes fiscal management in government and nonprofits 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 relevant to public and nonprofit organizations. This includes communication, motivation, group dynamics, organizational change, leadership and decision making in public organizations.

**G 9: Analyze problems, develop solutions, and communicate about policy and management issues**

Students understand how to critically assess public or nonprofit policy and management issues and to develop solutions through research and analysis. Students understand how to effectively communicate verbally and through writing about public or nonprofit policy and management issues, problems, and solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1</strong>: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform (G: 1) (M: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate their understanding of key difference among the models of government and administrative reform or important contemporary organizational and environmental challenges faced by leaders and managers of nonprofit organizations and the policy and management issues that confront the public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2</strong>: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public or nonprofit sector (G: 1) (M: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in the public or nonprofit sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3</strong>: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector (G: 1) (M: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students analyze the nature and function of the public service in the US, including the importance of public sector in modern societies or demonstrate an understanding of the scope and significance of the nonprofit sector in the U.S and abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4</strong>: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5</strong>: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6</strong>: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7</strong>: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers (G: 2) (M: 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing public and nonprofit managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8</strong>: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public and nonprofit administration and policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9</strong>: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10</strong>: Ability to demonstrate graduate-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (G: 3) (M: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate graduate-level writing skills in policy-relevant research using real-world context. Students must be able to emphasize interpretation and application of statistics in reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11</strong>: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles (G: 4) (M: 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 12</strong>: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public and nonprofit policy issues (G: 4) (M: 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to policy issues affecting the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 13</strong>: Demonstrate understanding of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors (G: 4) (M: 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 14</strong>: Describe the technical nature and process of public and nonprofit budgeting (G: 5) (M: 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students describe and explain the technical nature of public or nonprofit budgeting in the U.S., including the timetable and rules of the process that are typical of the three levels of government or typical of the nonprofit sector. Students should be able to conduct a budget analysis and demonstrate an understanding of key indicators of financial health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 15</strong>: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or nonprofit organizations (G: 5) (M: 15)</td>
</tr>
<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 or explain how organizational characteristics and external sources of regulation and funding affect nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 16</strong>: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (G: 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students demonstrate the ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks as they apply in the public and nonprofit sectors.

**SLO 17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design (G: 6) (M: 17)**

Students demonstrate the ability to understand the advantages and disadvantages of various models of organizational structure and design.

**SLO 18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law (G: 7) (M: 18)**

Students able to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking, adjudication of administrative action, and judicial review of administrative action or demonstrate knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising, and employee compensation.

**SLO 19: Evaluate the legal rights and responsibilities of public or nonprofit managers and employees (G: 7) (M: 19)**

Students able to evaluate the legal rights and responsibilities of public or nonprofit managers and employees.

**SLO 20: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (G: 7) (M: 20)**

Students demonstrate ability to understand administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution avenues to resolve conflict and grievances.

**SLO 21: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (G: 8) (M: 21)**

Students able to identify and evaluate the major theories of leadership and organizational behavior.

**SLO 22: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (G: 8) (M: 22)**

Students able to demonstrate how specific organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations.

**SLO 23: Demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies (G: 8) (M: 23)**

Students demonstrate how to use organizational theories and related tools to solve practical management problems in a public and nonprofit agency.

**SLO 24: Demonstrate ability to effectively analyze problems and develop solutions (G: 9) (M: 24)**

Students will demonstrate an ability to use critical thinking skills to analyze problems and develop solutions to these problems.

**SLO 25: Effective verbal and written communication skills related to public or nonprofit issues (G: 9) (M: 25)**

Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate clearly and concisely through written or oral communication. Different classes will emphasize different aspects of communication skills depending on the nature of the material to be covered.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Describe and analyze the key models of government and administrative reform (O: 1)**

In policy memos and on the final exam students will be able to describe and analyze the key models of government and administrative reform or demonstrate knowledge of important contemporary organizational and environmental challenges faced by leaders and managers of nonprofit organizations and the policy and management issues that now confront the sector (PMA 8111 or PMA 8210)

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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

93.06% of students in PMA 8111 at least partially meet this objective.

**M 2: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public or nonprofit sector (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 or nonprofit organizations.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public or nonprofit 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 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 or nonprofit organizations.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students in PMAP 8111 at least partially met this objectives as demonstrated in a policy memo and on the final examination.

**M 3: Describe the nature and function of the public or nonprofit sector (O: 3)**

On papers, policy memos, and the final exam students will describe the nature and function of the public sector or demonstrate an understanding of the scope and significance of the nonprofit sector in the U.S. and abroad (PMAP 8111 or PMAP 8210)

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 and PMAP 8210 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 or nonprofit sector.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students enrolled in the courses at least partially met the objectives. This was measured on papers, policy memos, and the final examinations.

**M 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and using 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 8121 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

85.5% of the students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

85.5% of students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill.

**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,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students’ final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers</strong></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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.03% of the students met the objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit administration and policy</strong></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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.26% of the students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables</strong></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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.82% of students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M10: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O10: Ability to demonstrate graduate-level writing skill in policy-relevant research</strong></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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.3% of students met this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 11: Demonstrated understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 11)</td>
<td>93.94% of students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12: Ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 12)</td>
<td>93.94% of students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13: Demonstrated understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 13)</td>
<td>92.43% fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14: Demonstrated ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (O: 14)</td>
<td>90.38% of the students fully demonstrated the skill or knowledge and met the objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15: Demonstrated ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (O: 15)</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O15: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or nonprofit organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.38% of the students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Demonstrated ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (O: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93.65% of the students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skills and met the objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Demonstrated understanding of models of organizational structure and design (O: 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93.65% of the students fully demonstrated the skill or knowledge and, therefore, met the objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Demonstrated knowledge of contract and administrative law or nonprofit law (O: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research proposal and research paper will allow students to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking, adjudication of administrative action, and judicial review of administrative action, or demonstrate knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising and employee compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8411 or PMAP 8203 will at least partially meet this objective. The research proposal and paper will allow students to demonstrate knowledge of contract law and administrative law, including rulemaking, adjudication of administrative action, and judicial review of administrative action, or demonstrate knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising and employee compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.97% of the students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |
Target for O19: Evaluate the legal rights and responsibilities of public or nonprofit managers and employees

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students in PMAP 8411 will at least partially meet the objective. On the homework assignments and the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All of the students met this objective.

M 20: Demonstrated understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution (O: 20)

On the homework assignments and the final examination students demonstrate their understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O20: Demonstrate understanding of administrative, adjudicatory, and alternative dispute resolution

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
96.97% of the students fully demonstrated the knowledge and skill, thus, meeting the objective.

M 21: Demonstrated ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior (O: 21)

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O21: Ability to evaluate major theories of leadership and organizational behavior

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
91.6% of students fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.

M 22: Demonstrated how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations (O: 22)

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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O22: Demonstrate how organizational and leadership theories are applied in public and nonprofit organizations

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet this 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.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
95.65% of the students fully demonstrated the skills or knowledge and met the objective.

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 MPA 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.

M 24: Demonstrate ability to analyze problems effectively and develop solutions (O: 24)
Students will demonstrate an ability to use critical thinking skills to analyze problems and develop solutions to these problems. Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze problems and develop solutions using written, analytical or quantitative skills depending on the nature of the class. (All Courses)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O24: Demonstrate ability to effectively analyze problems and develop solutions
Faculty teaching all core courses 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 core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students demonstrated the skills or knowledge and met the objective.

M 25: Effective verbal and written communication on public or nonprofit issues (O: 25)
Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate clearly and concisely through written or oral communication. Different classes will emphasize different aspects of communication skills depending on the nature of the material to be covered.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O25: Effective verbal and written communication skills related to public or nonprofit issues
Faculty teaching all core courses are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objectives 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 core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All of the students met the 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 course law (MPA 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 PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

During the past year, a faculty committee was established for each degree program. (In the past, one committee worked on the entire WEAVE report.) These committees examined last year’s report, reviewed the mission statement, program goals, learning objectives, and measure for each objective for each degree program. In the MPA Committee, there were learning objectives added and appropriate measures put in place. In the BS in Public Policy degree program, the syllabus for each course were reviewed by the committee to determine if the learning objectives for each course overlapped with other courses, and if measures were appropriate
for each learning objective. Recommendations were made to faculty members teaching courses where measures did not match objectives. These are now more closely aligned. For the MPP program, the committee produced the first report on this new degree program, which replaced the old MS in Urban Policy. The PhD Committee looked closely at examination practices in the core and fields of specialization. Some new procedures were put in place to improve outcomes on the examinations.

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

The members of the PMAP faculty were pleased with the data from the assessment process this past year. Faculty members were more aware of the WEAVE process and took seriously the responsibility of collecting and reviewing the data from each degree program in the department. The changes that were made in the learning objectives of the MPA degree program were made in anticipation of the accreditation renewal process in three year, which for the first time will be based on mission driven learning outcomes.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

As a result of the last year’s assessment process and data, degree committees were established this year to address the WEAVE process for each program separately. This helped the MPA program faculty begin to align the WEAVE data collection process with the needs of the accreditation process of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. New learning objectives were added for the program and appropriate measures established. For the doctoral program, the committee revised the examination process to help students do better on the tests.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

It is an old lesson, but the more broadly a responsibility is shared the greater the potential that people will understand and appreciate the entire process. This past year, faculty began to take responsibility for understand the WEAVE data collection process and, as a result, the report was a better reflection of this more wide-spread involvement. Overall, the faculty of the PMAP Department are pleased with the process we use and the results we are achieving.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The faculty will continue to monitor the data collection process and how this information reflects the quality of the instruction in every class that is part of a degree program. It is difficult to anticipate how much improvement will be made.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Public Health MPH**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Institute of Public Health has the mission of advancing health through leadership, scholarship, research, and service to better the human condition and promote the common good. The most significant application of that mission is to prepare students through the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree program to apply multi-disciplinary skills in public health practice and research and to assume leadership roles to address contemporary public health problems. The mission of the Institute of Public Health complements the stated mission of its administrative college home, the College of Health and Human Sciences, which is “to engage in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service activities that improve health and well-being, and address social justice issues within a multi-cultural society.” With a focus on scholarship and research in urban health and health disparities, the Institute supports the mission of Georgia State University “to achieve a front-rank position among the nation's premier state-supported universities located in an urban setting.” The Institute’s mission is strengthened by the objective of the University System of Georgia, through its Strategic Plan for Public Health Education, Research and Service, “to ensure that the System becomes one of the national leaders in public health education, research and service.”

Note: The Master of Public Health program began in the Fall of 2004 and currently has 120 graduate students enrolled. The first students graduated in Spring 2006.

**Goals**

**G 1: IPH Program Goal**

The goal of the GSU IPH is to uphold the overarching goal of the Council on Education for Public Health [CEPH], which is to ‘enhance health in human populations through organized community effort’. The IPH focus is to prepare students to enter the public health workforce so that health problems of local communities, and the world, can be identified, addressed, and/or prevented.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts (M: 1)**

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]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate skills in public health research and communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to plan, implement and evaluate programs and services designed to address these conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Assess Public Health Conditions (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and assess the public health conditions, both assets and deficiencies, of populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health [CEPH]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Analyze Health Disparities (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and analyze health disparities and design appropriate, culturally-competent prevention and intervention strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply critical thinking skills within the context of public health practice and research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Apply Theory in Field Settings (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to apply theory and knowledge in applied, field-based settings, as evidenced by a competency level of knowledgeable to proficient across the eight (8) competency domains for public health professionals (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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O4: Assess Public Health Conditions**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O5: Analyze Health Disparities**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O6: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O7: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**Target for O8: Apply Theory in Field Settings**

100% of students will successfully complete a thesis or special capstone project.

**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
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.

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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2:</td>
<td>Participate in public and community affairs (G: 1) (M: 2)</td>
<td>Through service learning students participate in public and community affairs. The students become active citizens of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3:</td>
<td>Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy (G: 1) (M: 3)</td>
<td>As a CTW course, students develop writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4:</td>
<td>Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations (G: 2) (M: 4)</td>
<td>Students learn from leaders from all three sectors of society and how these leaders make changes within their organizational settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5:</td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership (G: 2) (M: 5)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate their understanding of important issue in leadership theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6:</td>
<td>Compare leadership theory and practice (G: 2) (M: 6)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate their ability to compare theoretical aspects of leadership with practical applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7:</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate (G: 3) (M: 7)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8:</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (G: 3) (M: 8)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation and examinations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 9:</td>
<td>Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (G: 3) (M: 9)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 10:</td>
<td>Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy (G: 4) (M: 10)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze important questions in public policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 11:</td>
<td>Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 11)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 12:</td>
<td>Apply scientific method to policy issues (G: 5) (M: 12)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate their ability to apply the scientific method to policy issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 13:</td>
<td>Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research (G: 5) (M: 13)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 14:</td>
<td>Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW) (G: 5) (M: 14)</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 15:</td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (G: 6) (M: 15)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 16:</td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention (G: 6) (M: 16)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
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 using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
91.0% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
86.8% 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 partially 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
89.3% at least partially met the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
80.7% at least partially met the 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 each week showing their ability to apply theoretical perspectives on leadership to their roles as emerging leaders. This is also measured in the final application paper assignment.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
89.3% at least partially met the objective.

M 7: Demonstrate knowledge of main current policy issues (O: 7)

Measure knowledge of main policy issues currently under debate using exams and classroom policy debates.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
87.3% at least partially met the 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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 enrolled in the Policy Leadership course 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
90.9% at least partially met the 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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
87.3% at least partially met the 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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 the course will at least partially meet this objective. Students apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze public policy issues. This is measured by performance on examinations.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
82.7% at least partially met the 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.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
87.0% at least partially met the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
88.0% at least partially met the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
88.0% at least partially met the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
88.0% at least partially met the 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.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Action Plan**

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

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

**Basic Policy Analysis**

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good
Basic Tools of Government Intervention

The drop in the percentage of students who did not at least partially meet this objective from the 2008-09 academic year was steep. Much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities.

In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

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

Market Economy & Policy Analysis

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities.

In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores -- secrets of success, etc. The Department of Public Administration and Policy should create a committee to outline the content expectations for the 4061 course. There has been some tension about the role of economics in this course, and it would be a good time to resolve this matter. Economics and public administration faculty defined policy analysis differently, and instructors of this course definitely need additional guidance. If we determine that students need detailed economic knowledge to complete this course, then we might think of creating a support system of some sort. We have many graduate students able to provide assistance, for example. There should be no reason why our excellent students should be getting unsatisfactory assessment scores. In fact, an electronic filing system could provide easy access to short course guideline documents. (Faculty committees could ultimately develop guidelines for every course.) See above, the spreadsheet rating form could remind faculty about these guidelines and even ask them to indicate that they have reviewed them. It has become routine to review past course syllabi, but we need to go further. The course guidelines can provide tips about teaching strategies and outline departmental expectations for each individual course. This would be much better than relying on hearsay or developing expectations in some random way that faculty members are likely to forget about.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention

Improve MATH skills of students in lower division courses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of statistical techniques to analyze public issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Public Policy MPP**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Public Policy (MPP) is an interdisciplinary degree program designed to provide students with an understanding of policy analysis as well as methods of generating new knowledge about specific policy areas.

**Goals**

**G 2: Understanding 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 1: Understanding the policy process**

Students understand the development of policy through the policy process framework as well as through other policy models. Students are introduced to different actors and factors likely to influence public policy.

**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 policy**

Students will understand basic principles of microeconomics applied to public administration and policy.
### G 6: Understanding the principles of policy analysis
Understand how to identify public policy problems, some of the characteristics of different policy alternatives, and how to choose among different policy options.

### G 5: Understanding the principles of policy evaluation
This course is designed to introduce students to the conceptual methods used to analyze the need for change in the public sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 1:</strong> Understand different ways of categorizing policies (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 2:</strong> Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies.</td>
<td>Students consider the influence of formal and informal actors on public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 3:</strong> Understand different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 4:</strong> Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students understand different models of policy making such as the policy process model, as well as other models drawn from the public policy literature.</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 5:</strong> Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 6:</strong> Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
<td>Students are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 7:</strong> Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts (G: 3) (M: 7)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 8:</strong> Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing policy analysts.</td>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 9:</strong> Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 10:</strong> Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.</td>
<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><strong>SLO 11:</strong> Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 11)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 12:</strong> Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (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>
<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><strong>SLO 13:</strong> Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (G: 5) (M: 13)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 14:</strong> Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (G: 5) (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 15:</strong> Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain (G: 5) (M: 15)</th>
<th><strong>SLO 16:</strong> To understand how to identify policy problems (G: 6) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students understand how to identify attributes of problems that may be addressed through public policy.

**SLO 17: To understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives (G: 6) (M: 17)**

Students learn to understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives and in which circumstances it may be appropriate to use them.

**SLO 18: To understand how to construct a policy memo (G: 6) (M: 18)**

Students understand how to construct a policy memo for a potential client.

** Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies (O: 1)**

Students demonstrate understanding of different ways of categorizing public policies. This is measured on the students' examinations in PMAP 8011, Politics and Policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Understand different ways of categorizing policies**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students will at least partially meet this objective.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 83.4% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8011 fully demonstrated their ability to meet this objective. This was measured by their performance on examinations.

**M 2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (O: 2)**

Students demonstrate understanding of how different actors are likely to influence policy decisions. This is measured by in-class policy debates and on written assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students will at least partially meet this objective.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 86.1% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8011 at least partially demonstrated this skill or knowledge as demonstrated by their performance in classroom debates and on written assignments.

**M 3: Students understand different models of policy making (O: 3)**

Students understand different models of policy making such as the policy process model, as well as other models drawn from the public policy literature. This is measured by examinations and written assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Understand different models of policy-making**

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 8011 will at least partially meet this objective.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 86.2% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8011 demonstrated the ability to understand the different models of policy making.

**M 4: Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (O: 4)**

Students in PMAP 8121 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 8121 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.
M 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (O: 5)

Students in PMAP 8121 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

85.5% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill.

M 6: Demonstrate the 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

84.3% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 during the past year 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 in PMAP 8121 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 policy analysts

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

83.03% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8121 during the past year met the objective.

M 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 8)

Students in PMAP 8131 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.
M 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)

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 in PMAP 8131 of interpreting regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
87.82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.

M 10: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 10)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O10: 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. 93.94% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met this objective.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
93.94% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met this objective.

M 11: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 11)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O11: 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. 87.26% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8131 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
93.94% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.

M 12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 12)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O12: 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. 87.82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
87.82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.

87.26% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8131, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective.

82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective.

87.82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective.

82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective.

87.82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.
M 13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (O: 13)
Students enrolled in PMAP 8521, Evaluation Research, will demonstrate the ability to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression 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 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies are measured by examinations and the final project.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
93.9% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8521 during the past year fully demonstrated the knowledge or skill and met the objective.

M 14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (O: 14)
Students enrolled in PMAP 8521 will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies
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 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies are measured by examinations and the final project.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8521 during the past year demonstrated the skills or knowledge and met the objective.

M 15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain (O: 15)
Students enrolled in PMAP 8521 can select the appropriate evaluation design for a particular evaluation domain. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain
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 8521 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the students enrolled in PMAP 8521 during the past year demonstrated the skills and knowledge and met this objective.

M 16: Understand how to identify policy problems (O: 16)
The students enrolled in PMAP 8531 will demonstrate that they can identify policy problems. This is measured by the students' papers. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O16: To understand how to identify policy problems
Faculty teaching all core courses 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 core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students enrolled in PMAP 8531 during the past year demonstrated the skills or knowledge and met this objective.

M 17: Understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives (O: 17)
Students enrolled in PMAP 8531 will demonstrate their understanding of the characteristics of different policy alternatives. This is measured by their performance of papers and two examinations. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O17: To understand the characteristics of different policy alternatives
Faculty teaching all core courses 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 core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All students enrolled in PMAP 8531 during the past year demonstrated the skills or knowledge and met the objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Understand how to construct a policy memo (O: 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in PMAP 8531 demonstrate how to construct a policy memo. This is done on several policy memo assignments and a final paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O18: To understand how to construct a policy memo**

Faculty teaching all core courses 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 core courses will at least partially meet this objective.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All students enrolled in PMAP 8531 during the past year demonstrated the skills or knowledge and met the objective.

---

Georgia State University  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2010-2011 Public Policy PhD**  
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*(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

### Mission / Purpose

To combine the resources of two excellent schools of public policy to create a top doctoral program. To produce high-quality researchers capable of making contributions to the academic study of public policy and to the public policy process. To produce high-quality teachers, knowledgeable in the field and capable of conveying their knowledge to others.

### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 1: Knowledge of Theoretical Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will have an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 2: Analytical methods of public policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 3: Field of Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G 4: Original Research in Public Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply their understanding of the theories and analytical methods of public policy to a particular sub-field specialization to produce original research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Students apply analytical methods to public policy (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to apply analytical methods to the study of public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate their understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Produce Original Public Policy Research (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will produce original public policy research to demonstrate understanding of theories and analytical methods of the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive Examination (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical framework section of the public policy section of the core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the 2010-2011 academic year, 7 students attempted the core portion of the comprehensive examination. Six of these students (85.7%) passed the core portion of the comprehensive examination.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the 2010-2011 academic year, 7 students attempted the core portion of the comprehensive examination. Six of these students (85.7%) passed the core portion of the comprehensive examination.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the 2010-2011 academic year, one student attempted the major field portion of the comprehensive examination. The student passed. The program met 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During the past year, 4 students produced and successfully defended their dissertation proposals. During the past year, 20 doctoral students produced 30 conference papers, and 12 students submitted 20 manuscripts for review as journal articles, book chapters, and conference proceedings. Of the 35 active students in the doctoral program who are in their second year or later, all but 4 have presented papers and submitted manuscripts. These 4 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Major Field Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Understanding of Major Field

Implementation Description: Faculty will complete these action plan steps prior to the beginning of the new academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Doctoral Program Committee

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission of the Master of Education RLL Reading Specialist is to prepare educators to become reading specialists who are informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **G 1: G1: Content Knowledge**  
Candidates are informed educators who have a strong knowledge of the content needed to teach literacy. |

| **G 2: G2: Planning and Teaching Performance**  
Candidates are professional educators with pedagogical knowledge and dispositions needed to design culturally responsive learning spaces. |

| **G 3: G3: Impact on Students**  
Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the reading development of their students. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SLO 1: History of Literacy (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Candidates are knowledgeable of literacy research and histories of literacy development. |

| **SLO 2: Foundations of Reading and Writing (G: 1) (M: 2)**  
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. |

| **SLO 3: SBRR (G: 2) (M: 3)**  
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development. |

| **SLO 4: Planning and Teaching Performance (G: 2) (M: 4)**  
Candidates create a literate environment that fosters literacy by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. |

| **SLO 5: Range of Curricular Materials (G: 2) (M: 5)**  
Candidates use a wide range of curricular materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of literacy development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. |

| **SLO 6: Professional Development (G: 2) (M: 6)**  
Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility. |

| **SLO 7: Impact on Students (G: 3) (M: 7)**  
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction. |

| **SLO 8: Evaluate Practice (G: 2) (M: 8)**  
Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the history of literacy research in the Content Knowledge portion of their video portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: History of Literacy</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students received a 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of literacy processes and instruction in the Content Knowledge portion of their video portfolio.</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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.</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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the students received a 4, 50% of the students received a 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate their understanding of how to integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters literacy in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Planning and Teaching Performance</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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the range of curricular materials for providing effective literacy instruction for learners at different stages of literacy development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.</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 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev (O: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

### M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment (O: 7)

Candidates demonstrate their understanding how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction in the Impact on Students portion of their video portfolio.

**Target for O7: Impact on Students**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

### M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice (O: 8)

Candidates demonstrate their understanding how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

### 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:** nono
- **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. Candidates continue to refine their process and create video portfolios that demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the reading process, instructional practices, and assessments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012

**video refinement**

MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we are...
going to require candidates to demonstrate more synthesis across the standards so that it is clear to the viewer that the candidate has a deep knowledge of the reading/writing process, how to design and implement strategies based on this knowledge, and how to effectively assess children's literacy progress. Additionally, with future changes to the program to better reflect the trends in the field, the candidate will also add information related to home/community literacy practices and response to intervention information to their video presentation.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History | Outcome/Objective: History of Literacy
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations | Outcome/Objective: Foundations of Reading and Writing
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBR | Outcome/Objective: SBR
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Planning and Teaching Performance
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials | Outcome/Objective: Range of Curricular Materials
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev | Outcome/Objective: Professional Development
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Students
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice | Outcome/Objective: Evaluate Practice

**Implementation Description:** Candidates will be instructed to synthesize across their coursework to complete the video portfolio

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1:** Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2:** Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3:** Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4:** Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The MEd Reading faculty meet on a regular basis to discuss the direction of the MEd reading specialist program. There have been no changes in how we assess the students. The students, however, continue to refine their process of creating the portfolio. We have a large number of sample videos that students may view as they begin to create their own. In the upcoming year, the MEd Reading faculty will begin to consider how to update the program to better reflect trends in the field. This will necessitate a change in learning outcomes and objectives, which will also change the rubric for the video portfolio.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

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

The MEd Reading faculty meet on a regular basis to discuss the direction of the MEd reading specialist program. Through the assessment of the students' video portfolios we are considering redesigning the coursework to better reflect the current trends in the field. There will be greater attention to issues related to community and home literacies, as well as digital literacies, thereby impacting the standards and rubric that will be used to assess students' understandings.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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
Mission / Purpose
The Ed.S. in Reading is designed to provide students the in-depth theoretical and applied knowledge needed to excel in school, district, and state level positions in literacy curriculum.

Goals
G 1: Content knowledge
EdS candidates are informed educators who have a strong knowledge of the content needed to teach literacy.

G 2: Teaching Performance
EdS candidates have pedagogical knowledge and dispositions to effectively teach literacy practices as well as provide coaching/leadership in the area of literacy development.

G 3: Impact on Students
EdS candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the reading development of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Knowledge of the field (G: 1) (M: 1)
Knowledge of the Field of Literacy: Reading-Language Arts. Accomplished Early and Middle Childhood/ Literacy: Reading–Language Arts teachers know and understand current literature and theories about reading–language arts. They evaluate this knowledge and use it in their instructional practice.

SLO 2: Continued development (G: 2) (M: 2)
Candidates constantly seek to improve their knowledge and practice through a continuing process of professional reading, writing, dialogue, inquiry, and reflection.

SLO 3: Reciprocal nature of literacy development (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates understand the reciprocal nature of the literacy processes of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing, and they provide developmentally appropriate learning activities that integrate among the language arts and across the curriculum.

SLO 4: Lifelong learning and effective instruction (G: 3) (M: 4)
Candidates use their knowledge of reading processes, language development, texts, and ongoing assessment to advance literacy, develop strategic readers, promote an appreciation of reading as vital to lifelong learning, and create effective instruction so that readers can negotiate, inquire about, and construct meaning across the curriculum.

SLO 5: Knowledge of writing (G: 3) (M: 5)
Candidates use their knowledge of writing processes, language development, writing development, and ongoing assessment to provide instruction in the components of writing, assist students in constructing meaning in their written work, and provide genuine opportunities for students to write for a variety of purposes and audiences.

SLO 6: Knowledge of oral language (G: 3) (M: 6)
Candidates know, value, and teach oral language development and listening and speaking skills as essential components of literacy, and they provide opportunities for students to listen and speak for a variety of purposes and audiences.

SLO 7: Knowledge of viewing (G: 3) (M: 7)
Candidates know, value, and teach viewing as an essential component of literacy. They use a wide variety of print and nonprint resources to develop students' viewing and visual-representation skills.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Knowledge of field (O: 1)
EdS candidates will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the field of literacy development and instruction in the content area of their portfolio.

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

Target for O1: Knowledge of the field
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4; with 50% of them scoring a 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 2: Continued development (O: 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdS candidates demonstrate their ability to improve their practice through a continuing process of professional reading, writing, dialogue, inquiry, and reflection in the teaching performance section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Continued development</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% of them scoring a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 3: Reciprocal nature of literacy development (O: 3)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdS candidates demonstrate their understanding of the reciprocal nature of the literacy processes of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing, and they provide developmentally appropriate learning activities that integrate among the language arts and across the curriculum as evidenced in the teaching performance section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Reciprocal nature of literacy development</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% of them scoring a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 4: Lifelong learning and effective instruction (O: 4)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdS candidates use their knowledge of reading processes, language development, texts, and ongoing assessment to advance literacy, develop strategic readers, promote an appreciation of reading as vital to lifelong learning, and create effective instruction so that readers can negotiate, inquire about, and construct meaning across the curriculum as evidenced in the impact on student learning section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Lifelong learning and effective instruction</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% of them scoring a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 5: Knowledge of writing (O: 5)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdS candidates use their knowledge of writing processes, language development, writing development, and ongoing assessment to provide instruction in the components of writing, assist students in constructing meaning in their written work, and provide genuine opportunities for students to write for a variety of purposes and audiences as evidenced in the impact on student section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Knowledge of 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% scoring a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 6: Knowledge of oral language (O: 6)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdS candidates know, value, and teach oral language development and listening and speaking skills as essential components of literacy, and they provide opportunities for students to listen and speak for a variety of purposes and audiences as evidenced in the impact on student learning section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Knowledge of oral language</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% scoring a 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M 7: Knowledge of viewing (O: 7)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdS candidates know, value, and teach viewing as an essential component of literacy. They use a wide variety of print and nonprint resources to develop students’ viewing and visual-representation skills as evidenced by the impact on student learning section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for O7: Knowledge of viewing
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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
100% of the students scored a 4.

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

Portfolio
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is being phased out so there are no substantive changes in the way the portfolio is designed or how students go about completing the requirements for the portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of field | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the field
- Measure: Knowledge of oral language | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of oral language
- Measure: Knowledge of viewing | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of viewing
- Measure: Knowledge of writing | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of writing
- Measure: Lifelong learning and effective instruction | Outcome/Objective: Lifelong learning and effective instruction
- Measure: Reciprocal nature of literacy development | Outcome/Objective: Reciprocal nature of literacy development

Implementation Description: To continue supporting students in the program, there are planned advising sessions that review the requirements.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2012

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The EdS Reading Specialist program has not undergone any substantive changes in the assessment process. The current students are aware of and knowledgeable about the standards and rubric for the portfolio. The program is being phased out.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The number of students pursuing the EdS degree has declined in recent years, thereby prompting a decision to phase the degree and program out. No changes are planned in courses or sequence of courses at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Mission / Purpose

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The M.A.T. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education provides initial teacher preparation in ESOL for individuals holding bachelor's degree and who have an interest in English to speakers of other languages in K-12 settings. The Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) enables ESOL paraprofessional or provisional teachers to earn initial certification. The course of study meets the requirements for professional certification at the initial level in ESOL and the requirements for a Reading Endorsement. The M.A.T. teacher education program for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) is one of the five distance learning programs and two non-degree endorsements offered by the College of Education at Georgia State University through Georgia OnmyLine (GOML). Georgia ONmyLINE provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. This M.A.T. in Reading, Language and Literacy Education (ESOL) at Georgia State University ("GSU") is a collaborative program between GSU, Valdosta State University ("VSU"), and North Georgia College and State University ("NGCSU"), institutions of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

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. In this online program, 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
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

G 3: Impact on student learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 7)
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum).

SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (G: 1, 3) (M: 2, 3)
Candidates create learning environments which support ESOL students' cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families (Goal 2). (Key Assessment- Planning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction); Key Assessment- Clinical Practice: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions (G: 1, 2) (M: 5)
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision (Goal 2). (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

SLO 4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students (G: 3) (M: 4, 6)
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates in 2010-11 scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. M.A.T. Content Knowledge (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates can discuss the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language; discuss how this knowledge has aided you in the creation of learning environments that support the language and literacy development and content area achievement of ELLs, and demonstrate the impact of pedagogy informed by our current and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition on the linguistic, literacy, and content area achievement of ELLs (both individuals and groups) through the inclusion of student work. 2.1 Candidates are knowledgeable about the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups and the ways in which you use those theories to construct learning environments that support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development and content area achievement. 2.1

**M 2: Planning Performance (O: 2)**

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) M.A.T. Planning performance (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have demonstrated the ability to plan for lessons for learners of English as a second language. 2.1

**M 3: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 2)**

Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher), M.A.T. clinical practice at midpoint (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses at the midpoint of their coursework. 2.1

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)**

Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Target for O4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level, (4 or higher) M.A.T. clinical practice at endpoint (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses at the end of the program. 2.1

**M 5: Dispositions (O: 3)**

Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level or higher (score 4). M.A.T. Dispositions (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts)
Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of others; trust learner’s capacity for change; believe others can and will rather than can’t or won’t. Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of self; possess a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; have positive expectations of self 2 1

M 6: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 4)

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning (EDCI 7680).
Source of Evidence: External report

Target for O4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning). This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level (4 or higher). M.A.T. Effects on P-12 Student Learning (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have made impact on the P-12 ESOL students’ learning. 2 1

M 7: Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores (O: 1)

Candidate performance on GACE tests for English to Speakers of Other Languages (forms 119 and 120). * * Data for students who pursued a certification only is included.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

100% of candidates will pass the GACE 1 and 2 tests by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100 percent of the candidates passed the GACE tests. See table below: M.A.T. Content Knowledge.GACE (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Pass Fail English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Test I 3 English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Test II 3

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)

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
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: Plan will be assessed in October 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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 implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

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

improving clinical practice
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Clinical Practice at Midpoint
  Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
Implementation Description: Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving clinical practice at endpoint
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Clinical Practice at Endpoint
  Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students
Implementation Description: Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.
**Improving content knowledge**

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in this content knowledge. This means that we set our expectations from the outset clearly and we maintain closer monitoring of candidates’ obtaining content knowledge.

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Content Knowledge via Coursework  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** As we were successful in attaining this target, we will continue with our implementation plan of effective monitoring of our students and effective teaching.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & MSIT Faculty

---

**Improving content knowledge: GACE**

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their GACE scores. This means that candidates’ content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Candidates’ content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Additional Resources:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

---

**Improving dispositions**

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and their work is consistently monitored throughout the program.

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Dispositions  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

**Implementation Description:** Expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and candidates’ work is consistently monitored throughout the program by the program coordinator.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

---

**Improving effects on P-12 student learning**

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners’ learning. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Effects on P-12 Student Learning  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

**Implementation Description:** Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

---

**Improving planning**

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving planning. This means that candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teachers.

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Planning Performance  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

**Implementation Description:** Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teachers.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty
## Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Content knowledge has been strengthened as a result of close monitoring of students' work in the courses and in the program.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

N/A

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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

2010-2011 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) MEd

As of 12/13/2010 04:11 PM EST

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

### Mission / Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. 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

G1: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (SBRR principles).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to culture, language teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners (G: 3) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Demonstrate Student Language and Literacy Development (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities (G: 4) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our candidates will achieve a &quot;proficient&quot; or &quot;advanced&quot; rating on this standard. While the majority of our students met this standard, three failed to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of our candidates achieved this target. Three of the four graduates attained "advanced" with one student gaining "proficiency." The average of the scores attained is 4.75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of our candidates will achieve a &quot;proficient&quot; or &quot;advanced&quot; rating on this standard. The majority of our students met this standard while 2 achieved passing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of our candidates attained this target. 50% of the teachers achieved "advanced" and 50% "proficient." With an average score of 4.6 more students are leaning toward "advanced."
### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of our students attained this target. 50% of our students attained "advanced" and 50% attained "proficiency." With the average score of 4.6 most of our students are leaning toward "advanced."

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of our students met this target. However, for this year's reporting, this target attained the weakest average score of 4.25 with three students achieving "proficient" and only one student attaining "advanced."

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of our students attained this target. This portfolio continues to be the strongest standard for our students. This year shows that of all the standards, this one attained the highest overall average of 4.75. Three of our students attained "advanced" and one attained "proficiency."

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of our students attained this target. 50% of our students attained "advanced" and 50% attained "proficient."

### 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
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 Reflective Action | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of 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
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
**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

### 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

### 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

### Continue effective monitoring and implementation of this target.

We will continue with the current design of our program, continue updating and strengthening so that our students continue to shine in advocating for their learners and parents.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Achievement of Instructional Practices
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

### Continue monitoring student progress and effective implementation strategies.

As we have been successful with our past implementation plan of effective teaching and monitoring of students’ progress, we will continue with this.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: Continue monitoring student progress and effective implementation strategies
Responsible Person/Group: Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.
Additional Resources: Nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching.
As we were successful in attaining this target, we will continue with our implementation plan of effective monitoring of our students and effective teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture
  
  Implementation Description: Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching.
  Responsible Person/Group: Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.
  Additional Resources: Nil
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue to provide additional opportunities for students to develop in this area.
As all our students met this target, we will continue to monitor and provide additional opportunities for our students to demonstrate leadership in their professionalism through presenting at conferences and at in-school events and seeking publications for their writing.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities
  
  Implementation Description: Continue to provide additional opportunities for students to develop in this area
  Responsible Person/Group: Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.
  Additional Resources: Nil
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Continue with the implementation of effective teaching and monitoring of all students.
Our implementation of higher standards, good monitoring, focussed and effective teaching with pertinent assignments have helped us to realize this objective. We will continue to apply these strategies.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
  
  Implementation Description: Greater clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard throughout students' term of studies.
  Responsible Person/Group: Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.
  Additional Resources: Nil
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Greater clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard.
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in teaching. This means, clearly working on this standard with great clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
  
  Implementation Description: Greater clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard throughout students' term of studies.
  Responsible Person/Group: Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.
  Additional Resources: Nil
  Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A
CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?  
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?  
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
Since our last assessment report, we have continued to monitor our students more closely by collecting data on our students from the outset in our classes. This closer monitoring of students was deemed necessary so that academically weak students could be identified early and given the necessary support and encouragement to successfully attain our standards. In the coming academic year we will continue to implement our close monitoring of all students especially the academically weak ones so that appropriate support may be offered.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.  
The data obtained from the assessment findings inform us of the strengths and weaknesses of our program. We are generally strong and increased vigilance and close monitoring of our students with the necessary support will help us to maintain our strength. Based on this year’s data, we know that we need to continue to be vigilant. This means, keeping an eye on our curriculum so that it is always upgraded to meet the needs of all stakeholders, monitoring our teaching so that we continue to be responsive to our students’ challenges and maintaining awareness of the societal context (at the local, national and international levels) so that we continue to prepare quality teachers to meet the needs of 21st century urban teaching contexts.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**  
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?  
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**  
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?  
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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**

| 2010-2011 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) Online MEd | As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST | (Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request) |

**Mission / Purpose**

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. with ESOL Concentration - Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The 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 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. 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. In this online program, 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: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Students are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching reading and English to Speakers of Other Languages in their base certifications (Grades PreK-12).

G 3: Impact on student learning
Students are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on reading and the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition.

SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)
Students create learning environments which support ESOL students' cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families. Students also demonstrate the effectiveness of the P-12 students' learning of reading.

SLO 4: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.

SLO 5: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students (G: 3) (M: 6)
Students use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content Knowledge in ESOL (O: 1)
Content Knowledge in ESOL through coursework is assessed.

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

Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their TSLE course work.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 69% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of ESOL content knowledge as shown in their course work and the pertinent portfolio standard narrative. Med.Content Knowledge in ESOL(Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates can discuss the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language; discuss how this knowledge has aided you in the creation of learning environments that support the language and literacy development and content area achievement of ELLs, and demonstrate the impact of pedagogy informed by our current and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition on the linguistic, literacy, and content area achievement of ELLs (both individuals and groups) through the inclusion of student work. 11 3 9 Candidates are knowledgeable about the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups and the ways in which you use those theories to construct learning environments that support ESOL students' cultural identities, language and literacy development and content area achievement. 12 6 5

M 2: Content knowledge in Reading (O: 2)
Content knowledge in Reading in coursework is assessed.

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

Target for O2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their EDRD course work.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 95% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their coursework.
M 3: Planning Performance (O: 3)

Students’ ability to plan effectively is assessed in the course work and clinical practice.

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

Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 48% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric Med. Planning performance (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have demonstrated the ability to effectively plan for reading lessons. 11 12

M 4: Clinical Practice (O: 3)

Students’ effectiveness of lessons drawing on the learning theories and approaches is assessed in course work and clinical practice.

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

Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

90% of students will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 48% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of clinical practice. See table below: Med.clinical practice (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL and reading pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses. 11 12

M 5: Dispositions (O: 4)

Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

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

Target for O4: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions using the unit-wide dispositions rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 87% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of dispositions. Med.Dispositions (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of others; trust learner’s capacity for change; believe others can and will rather than can’t or won’t. Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of self; possess a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; have positive expectations of self 18 2 3

M 6: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 5)

Effects on P-12 Student Learning are assessed through course work and clinical practice.

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

Target for O5: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

90% of students will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 30% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning Med Effects on PK-12 student learning (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have made impact on the P-12 students’ learning of reading. 1 6 16

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
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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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**Embed Standards**
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:**
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Embed standards for portfolio**
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:**
- **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

**Improving clinical practice**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Improving content knowledge**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher...
improving content knowledge. Reading

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in Reading. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: Expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving dispositions

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

Implementation Description: expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving effects on P-12 student learning

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners’ learning in P-12. This means that candidates will successfully learn content knowledge, on which they plan and implement rigorous lessons, which are followed by critical reflection on their teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

Implementation Description: Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

improving planning

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving planning. This means that candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Planning Performance | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

Implementation Description: Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Content knowledge has been strengthened as a result of close monitoring of students’ work in the courses and in the program.
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?  
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?  
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - Have what been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?  
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?  
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:  
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g. revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.  
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:  
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?  
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:  
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?  
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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  
2010-2011 Reading, Language, & Literacy (ESOL) TEEMS MAT  
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.) 

Mission / Purpose  
The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.
Goals

G 1: Content knowledge
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

G 3: Impact on student learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2)
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum).

SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (M: 3, 4, 5)
Candidates create learning environments which support ESOL students' cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families (Goal 2). (Key Assessment- Planning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction); Key Assessment- Clinical Practice: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions (M: 6)
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision (Goal 2). (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

SLO 4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students (M: 7)
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores (O: 1)
Candidate performance on GACE tests for English to Speakers of Other Languages (forms 119 and 120). * * Data for students who pursued a certification only is included.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge
GACE Scores are still pending as of 5/10/2011.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Our passing rate for GACE tests for 2010-2011 is 100%, which indicates that our students are able to take and pass the content tests.

M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
95 % of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge
in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. On the four categories for content knowledge, a minimum of 24% and a maximum of 33% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4).

**M 3: Planning Performance (O: 2)**

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The following results are for each area: Contextual Factors: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Goals: 100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Assessment Plan: 94% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 69% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Design for Instruction: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 89% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 2)**

Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 24% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Environments: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 38 % scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Assessment: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 19% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Planning and Instruction: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 19% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 5: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 2)**

Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)

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

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at endpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The following results are for each area on the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 83% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Environments: 89% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 78% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Assessment: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 72 % scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Planning and Instruction: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 83% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Professionalism: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 78% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 6: Dispositions (O: 3)**

Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Among the five categories assessed for dispositions (Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful and Purposeful Vision), candidates scored 100% of candidates demonstrated an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and a minimum of 47% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).

**M 7: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 4)**

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning (EDCI 7680).
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

### Increase Collaboration and Communication

The PSCNCATE 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,

### Increasing content knowledge as well as professional and pedagogical skills

1. Though 95% of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages (ESOL) content area, a minimum of 24% and a maximum of 33% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4) on the four categories for content knowledge. In order for our candidates to meet higher levels of knowledge (Score 4 or 5) in the ESOL content area, we plan to integrate more various kinds of learning tasks, assignments, and activities into ESOL content area courses. For instance, from fall 2010, both TSLE 7240 and 7250 have already incorporated research and practice readings and in-depth discussions about the role and use of multimodality and technology to classes. In TSLE 7250, a group of students (a cooperative learning team) are asked to make a presentation about weekly readings in a multimodal and creative manner (e.g., critiquing readings and presenting discussion questions for the class, showing video clips that are related to weekly readings, and preparing activities to learn abstract and difficult theoretical concepts). In addition, TSLE classes plan to hold a mini-conference about students' final projects or papers at the last class. By doing so, our candidates will have an opportunity to share their academic interests and experiences with the entire classmates, increase theoretical and practical knowledge about the learning and teaching of ESOL, and will be more likely to become an active member in an academic community.

2. 100% of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) in professional and pedagogical skills through the "Clinical Practice at Midpoint"; however, a minimum of 19% and a maximum of 38% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4 or higher). Thus, in order to help our candidate increase their professional and pedagogical skills, ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in discussions and reflections about four areas, (a) knowledge of students and learning, (b) learning environments, (c) assessment, and (d) planning and instruction. More specifically, in TSLE classes, our candidates are asked to observe and interview English language learners about their language acquisition, to analyze interviews for a brief report, and to investigate the context where learning may take place. In addition, in EDRD reading classes, our candidates are asked to assess pre-k-12 students' English language and literacy (especially reading) skills and conduct lessons based on their assessment of students' language and literacy skills. By doing so, our candidate are likely to increase their knowledge of professional and pedagogical skills in ESOL.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in various kinds of learning tasks, assignments, and activities into TSLE content area courses and EDRD reading courses. Detailed descriptions are seen in the section "Description" above.
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL
**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty.
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this**
academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Though we have not made any major change in the assessment process, we have phased portfolio assessment into the course throughout the program so that we have been able to see the progress of our candidates learning in the program.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The findings indicate that we are doing well in general, but we would like to do better. Our scores in assessment reflected some weaknesses with some of our candidates so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty members are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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
2010-2011 Real Estate BBA
(Ast 12/13/2010 @ 11:17 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.

SLO 2: To develop business communication skills (M: 1)
The student should be able to communicate real estate decisions and recommendations effectively.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Average 79%. 79% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Fall semester average 87%. 100% of students met the target. Spring semester average 90%. 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Fall semester average 84%. 92% of students met the target. Spring semester average 81%. 78% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
Fall semester average 83%. 83% of students met the target. Spring semester average 82%. 75% 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 outcome measured achievement will be reviewed.

  - **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
  - **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
  - **Priority:** High
New Learning Outcome Framework
BBA (Major in Real Estate) - Student Learning Outcome Matrix Assessment conducted using embedded examination questions or project work. Outcome Measures Criteria Assessed within (course) Outcome 1. Develop creative decision-making skills M1 Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations Understand investment principles. Apply knowledge of investment analysis techniques to real property. RE4160 M2 Evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances Understand the methods of financing real estate. Effectively compare the types of financing instruments, RE4150 M3 Use knowledge of real estate development to layout efficient project development plans. 1. Understand design, construction, and analysis procedures 2. Appreciate the impact of changing technical and economic activities on space needs and the form and design of physical structures. RE4050 Outcome 2 Develop business communications skills M1 Formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions 1. Identify, evaluate and assemble arguments based around real estate problems 2. Persuasively communicate interpretations and solutions to real estate problems RE4700

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Adopt new framework for assessment and recording of learning outcomes with progressive implementation during 2011-2012.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Paul Gallimore

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section 2010-2011 Real Estate MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science in Real Estate degree is designed for individuals who are principally interested in careers in the real estate industry and those who will use real property in business decision making. It provides the student with both general and specialized real estate knowledge and analytical skills. The MSRE program is based on a synthesis of legal, physical, market and financial considerations that affect the real property decision process. The primary objectives of the program are for students to develop and integrate: (1) analytical skills for decision making associated with the real estate industry (2) leadership skills, and (3) interpersonal skills that contribute to teamwork.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Understand the real estate framework (M: 1, 2, 3)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Outcome 1. Understand the framework within which real estate markets operate and the interaction of the components of that framework

SLO 2: Apply theoretical principles and skills (M: 4, 5, 6)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Outcome 2 Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems

SLO 3: Organize and communicate effectively (M: 7, 8)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Outcome 3. Organize and communicate effectively in all stages of the real estate problem solving process

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Real estate as a financial and operational asset (O: 1)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 M1 Understand real estate as a financial and operational asset and its market Criteria (and course location of assessment): Appreciate the nature and working of real estate markets and the motivations of various participants (investor, developer, finance-provider, occupant etc). (REB020) Understand the role of finance in real estate markets (REB030) Recognize impact of regulatory and institutional frameworks upon markets and assets within markets and the role of real property law as a risk management process in the acquisition, management and disposition of built space (REB040) Understand the processes and techniques used to analyze supply and demand for real estate (REB060).
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework
2.0

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Target Averages on this Measure C1 8020 2.36 C2 8030 2.40 C3 8040 2.40 C4 8060 2.30

M 2: The markets for capital (O: 1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M2</th>
<th>Understand the markets for capital and related financial assets</th>
<th>Criteria (and course location of assessment): Understand the nature and working of markets for financial capital (RE 8030) Understand the dynamic inter-relationships between capital markets and real estate markets (RE8020)</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>Target Averages on this Measure C1 8030 2.70 C2 8020 2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met** | Target Averages on this Measure C1 8030 2.36 C2 8020 2.36 C3 8050 3.00 |

| 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met** | Target Averages on this Measure C1 8020 2.36 C2 8020 2.14 C3 8060 2.60 |

| M 5: Application to real estate financing problems (O: 2) | Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills** | 2.0 | **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met** | Target Averages on this Measure C1 8030 2.10 C2 8030 2.80 C3 8030 2.70 |

| M 6: Application to real estate development problems (O: 2) | Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills** | 2.0 | **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met** | Target Averages on this Measure C1 8050 3.00 C2 8050 3.00 C3 8050 3.00 |

| M 7: Skills in investigation design and organization (O: 3) | Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Target for O3: Organize and communicate effectively** | 2.0 | **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met** | Target Averages on this Measure C1 8050 3.00 C2 8050 3.00 C3 8050 3.00 |
**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure

C1 8070 2.79  
C2 8070 2.79

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Target Averages on this Measure

C1 8090 2.80  
C2 8090 2.70

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Rehabilitation Counseling MS**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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: 2011-2012 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 related to assisting people with disabilities. Disability is broadly defined to include people with physical, cognitive, and/or emotional diagnoses.

**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. In Georgia, typical licensing is as a professional counselor. Certification is typically Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (national).

**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 or boards, 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 rehabilitation counseling 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice ethical codes consistent with Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) requirements and state of Georgia licensing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Work with clients with disabilities (G: 3) (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate competence in rehabilitation counseling with individuals and with groups of clients with physical, cognitive and/or emotional disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations (G: 1, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, and other relevant special issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Successfully secure employment (or continue educ) (G: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 per cent of students will successfully located relevant employment within six month of graduation. Others may choose to continue their education or delay entry to the work force in order to parent children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Certification tests and major exams (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Passing the national certification exam (CRC) by students/graduates, and b) passing master's comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence

90% pass rate on first attempt is expected

**Findings 2010-2011** - Target: **Met**

The last report by the national certification board (Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification) indicates that GSU students far exceed the national average of scores (GSU ~95% vs national average ~80%).

#### Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice

90% of students will pass the comprehensive exam and 85% will pass the CRC exam on the first attempt

**Findings 2010-2011** - Target: **Met**

All students passed the masters comprehensives. The last CRCC report indicates ~95% CRC certification exam pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviews during classes CPS 6050, 6450, 7430, 7660, 7680 as assessed by taped samples, site supervisor evaluation, forms 1005, 1006, comprehensives and CRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence

Successfully complete the internship sequence as judged by faculty and site supervisor.

**Findings 2010-2011** - Target: **Met**

One student was required to repeat an internship sequence. All other students successfully completed the internship on schedule.

#### Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice

Students will demonstrate knowledge about psychological diagnosis.

**Findings 2010-2011** - Target: **Met**

The new DSM diagnosis class was implemented as expected and all students successfully achieved passing grades.

#### Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities

All students will select an internship site that provides services to people with disabilities

**Findings 2010-2011** - Target: **Met**

All sites were approved. New sites were visited by the department's internship coordinator.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students successfully completed the class.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All students successfully completed the requirements.

Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities
Successful completion by all students of helping skills, group and internship classes

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
One student was required to complete additional work with regard to role playing by submitting supplemental video examples.

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Evaluation will occur through site practicum/internship class supervisors and faculty. All students will successfully accomplish this goal.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
One student was required to engage in additional internship experience before graduating from the program.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Evidence was accumulated through practicum and internship classes as well as an evaluation of person with a disability with oversight by a professional partner arranged by the assessment of rehabilitation potential professor.

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Students will obtain the foundation for this measure by taking and passing at least one class relating to cultural and diversity. Additionally, practice will be accomplished through role play in helping skills related classes and practicum/internship classes.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Students successfully completed a class on diversity. With regard to helping skills, one student was required to complete extra work. With regard to practicum/internship, one student was required to complete extra hours of practice.

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

Continued accreditation
The program will meet accreditation requirements and a community 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. This is an on-going process.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Roger Weed

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. This is an on-going process.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct | 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

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Some learning outcomes have been updated or slightly modified. The adding of DSM diagnosis, as a required class, has been implemented. The introductory class has been revised to specifically enhance the education on the topic of ethics.

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

Curriculum changes were planned during the pervious cycle and implemented during this cycle. No additional changes appeared to be required. The occasional student who does not meet expectations has been required to completed extra work or participate in remedial education.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

How the department used the results rests with the Chair. In general, the program utilizes questionnaires of graduates and off-campus supervisors as well as a community advisory board to remain contemporary and relevant. Minor chnages are on-going with major academic changes planned annually (such as the previous year’s addition of the DSM diagnosis class as well as a revised introductory class to include additional content on ethics).

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Basically that the rehabilitation program is an asset to Georgia State University and that we are providing quality instruction that is valued by employers. Even in this challenging economy graduates are able to find suitable employment.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The primary strategy is for instructors in the rehabilitation program is to remain vigilant to needs and problems as they arise (a well established tradition). Personally I am satisfied with the program planning and operation. Our accreditation is secure and employers have expressed accolades regarding our graduates.
**Mission / Purpose**

In the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline was widely acknowledged by legislators and citizens across the nation. While resistant to any notion that the academic study of religion should be reduced to, or even motivated primarily by, an interest in religiously sanctioned violence, the Department of Religious Studies shares the conviction that educated students in a university with a strong commitment to the Humanities need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate educational setting. The Department also is committed to the view that such students need to gain this knowledge, not from those who are already and necessarily committed to a particular set of beliefs and practices, but rather from comparative scholars who are trained in the histories, languages, and practices of more than one religion. Public universities are one of the few public settings in which such education about religion (rather than “religious education” itself) is currently available. Given this fact, it is perhaps not surprising that Religious Studies has enjoyed remarkable national growth in the past decade. But it is important to note that the field has been growing for decades, with new degrees (graduate and/or undergraduate) in Religious Studies being established during the last twenty years at such schools (to use the Southeast as an example) as the University of Georgia, Florida State University, Florida International, University of South Florida, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Clemson University, Duke University, UNC-Greensboro and Wilmington, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, among others. Georgia State University’s diverse student body and the University’s Strategic Plan (with its emphasis on globalization, international study abroad opportunities, and multi-cultural outreach in the city of Atlanta) contribute to making its Religious Studies Program absolutely essential for the realization of its larger aims and aspirations. Although it would be an overstatement to say that University projects like the new programs in Middle East Studies, Jewish Studies, and Asian Studies would not exist without Religious Studies participation, it is safe to say that these programs would be far weaker. The Department of Religious Studies is currently one of three participating members of the 2nd Century Initiative on Transnational Violence and its faculty are important contributors to the thriving intellectual life of this University.

In order to contribute to the realization of its curricular mission, the Department of Religious Studies offers an impressive range of courses in service to the General Humanities curriculum in the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as its own thriving undergraduate and masters programs. Long admired for the quality of its instructional efforts, the Department is particularly interested in promoting a better factual knowledge base, more robust critical thinking skills, and the essential experience of developing high quality independent research projects for all students.

**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge of the Academic Study of Religion**

It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate knowledge in each of the following areas (parenthetic lists are suggestive, not inclusive or mandatory): 1) Religious Traditions of the World (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto, Mesoamerican religion, Greek and Roman religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam) 2) Foundational Thinkers in the World Religions (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Homer, Sophocles, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Muhammad) 3) Contemporary Religious Thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King Jr, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.) 4) Major Theorists in the Study of Religion (Mircea Eliade, W.C. Smith, Sigmund Freud, William James, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Max Weber, Mary Daly, Mary Douglas, Jonathan Z Smith, Clifford Geertz, etc.) 5) Critical Theoretical Methods and Theories (historical, anthropological, philological, philosophical, sociological, psychological, ethical, feminist, etc.) 6) Fundamental Technical Categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.) 7) Comparative Themes (ethics, mysticism, sex and gender, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.) 8) Historical Place of 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 fairly, identifying conclusions charitably, contextualizing authors and texts, 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, scholarly synthesis, etc.)

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: General Knowledge of Religious Histories and Traditions (M: 2, 4)**

The Department of Religious Studies aims to promote students’ ability to extrapolate a general working knowledge of the great historical religious traditions, among them Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

**SLO 3: General Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers, Modern Theorists of Religion and Comparative Methods (M: 1, 2, 4)**

The Department of Religious Studies aims to promote students’ ability to understand, contextualize, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers within a specific tradition, as well as the major representatives of the modern comparative study of such religions.

**SLO 8: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression (M: 3, 4)**

The Department of Religious Studies aims to promote students’ ability to think critically, and to write persuasively, within the academic study of religion.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 9: Experience in Conducting Scholarly Research in Comparative Religion (M: 3, 4)**

The Department of Religious Studies aims to promote students’ ability to conduct effective research in the comparative academic study of many of the world’s religions.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Theoretical) (O: 3)

Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final year in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated by members of the Assessment Committee (normally consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to theoretical content, i.e., knowledge of critical theory in the study of religion, scholarly categories, comparative method, etc.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: General Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers, Modern Theorists of Religion and Comparative Methods**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of graduating seniors submitted capstone papers in this cycle. 100% of these papers received a score of 2.7 or higher from the Assessment Committee, and 66% received a score of 3.3 or higher.

#### 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 year in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated by members of the Assessment Committee (normally 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: General Knowledge of Religious Histories and Traditions**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of graduating seniors submitted capstone papers in this cycle. 80% of these papers received a score of 2.7 or higher from the Assessment Committee, and 50% received a score of 3.3 or higher.

**Target for O3: General Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers, Modern Theorists of Religion and Comparative Methods**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of graduating seniors submitted capstone papers in this cycle. 80% of these papers received a score of 2.7 or higher from the Assessment Committee, and 50% received a score of 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 year in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated by members of the Assessment Committee (normally consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) for evidence of technical research and writing 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

87% of graduating seniors submitted capstone papers in this cycle. 100% of these papers received a score of 3.3 or higher.

**Target for O9: Experience in Conducting Scholarly Research in Comparative 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

86% of graduating seniors submitted capstone papers in this evaluation cycle, but none of these submissions constituted a full-fledged research paper amenable to evaluation under this rubric.

#### 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 is 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 to write critically, etc. Students rank goals on a five-point scale, with 1 being the lowest, and 5 being the highest ranking.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O1: General Knowledge of Religious Histories and Traditions**

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

Only 11% of graduating seniors filled out an exit questionnaire, making assessment in this cycle more difficult. Student surveys averaged 4.0 in the assessment of their historical preparation, and 5.0 in the assessment of their comparative skills. Specific mention was made of a perceived shortage of coursework in Buddhism.

#### Target for O3: General Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers, Modern Theorists of Religion and Comparative Methods

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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Only 11% of graduating seniors filled out an exit questionnaire, making assessment in this cycle more difficult. Student surveys averaged 3.0 in the assessment of their theoretical preparation, and here once again specific mention was made of a perceived shortage of coursework in theoretical aspects of the study of Buddhism.

#### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Only 11% of graduating seniors filled out an exit questionnaire, making assessment in this cycle more difficult. Student surveys averaged 5.0 in the assessment of their comparative skills, and 5.0 in the assessment of their technical training and the enhancement of their critical skills.

#### Target for O9: Experience in Conducting Scholarly Research in Comparative 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.

### 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.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Goals

G 1: Fluency in the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies achieve fluency in the academic study of religion, so that they may go on to doctoral work in the field, teach religious studies in a community college or high school, or bring what they learned here to bear on whatever field they pursue. This entails basic knowledge of the religious traditions of the world (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam), fundamental historical religious figures (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) major religious thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.), major theorists in the study of religion (Elaidé, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, J.Z. Smith, etc.) representative critical theories and methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological, ethical, feminist, etc.), fundamental technical categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, myth, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.), common comparative themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.), and the historical role of religion in culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, syncretism, art and music, etc.).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of History of Religions (M: 1, 5)
Ability to understand the role religion plays historically in both popular and elite culture, to extrapolate a general working knowledge of at least four religious traditions and to synthesize a detailed knowledge of two traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

SLO 2: Knowledge of Theories of Religion (M: 2, 5)
Ability to explain, critique, and apply principles of at least three theorists or thinkers in the academic study of religion, and to demonstrate fluency in major terms and concepts in the field.
### SLO 3: Methodological Approaches to Religion (M: 4, 5)
Ability to understand and apply at least two critical and methodological approaches to the study of religion.

### SLO 4: Comparative Approaches to Religion (M: 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

**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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Critical Reading/Writing Evaluation of M.A. Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Reading Scholarly Texts
Responsible Person/Group: Molly Bassett

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Respiratory Therapy BS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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: Critical and Ethical Thinkers
To develop a deep and broad understanding of respiratory care content based on sound clinical decision making.

G 2: Professional Issues in Respiratory Care
To be aware of and concerned about being well-informed regarding the issues and factors affecting the professional practice of respiratory care.

G 3: Positions of Leadership
Students are prepared for leadership positions in healthcare settings where respiratory care is practiced

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Communication Skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
In order to discern that our students are critical and ethical thinkers, 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. 2. communicate in writing using medical terminology by addressing patient care plans to improve patient outcomes.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate
comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

5.0 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.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
3. Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1. Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
2. Establish a Student Success Center.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5.1 Create an International Consortium of Universities for Critical Issues Challenging Cities.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)**

Students are to think logically and in meaningful ways so that their actions reflect their critical thinking.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 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.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

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

**Strategic Plan Associations**

1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
1.2 Establish a Student Success Center.
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 3: Registry Credential (G: 3)**

To prepare for leadership positions in healthcare settings, students will demonstrate mastery of advanced level respiratory care knowledge.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 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.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student retention
2. Student promotion and progression
3. Timely graduation

**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**

1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
3.5 Enhance Georgia State's contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Case Presentation (O: 1, 2)**

Case presentations allow students to actively learn in their discipline while solving problems like the ones they will encounter in the real world when they graduate. This requires students to draw upon their abilities to manage time while synthesizing information by organizing relevant information and discarding information that is not useful.

To demonstrate mastery of this goal, all students will 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

During fall semester 2010, 33 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 86 to 99. 70 is the highest score based on rubric used by faculty but is calibrated to 0 to 100 score for grading purposes. Average score was 93 with 27 out of 32 (84%) meeting the target score. For spring semester 2011, 14 students out of 34 (86%) achieved 90% or higher. Scores ranged from 80 to 100 with the average score = 91%.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Student scores on a professional issue paper ranged from 75 to 97 after three revisions allowed. Lowest grades improved from 75 to 80.

**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. This exam allows for licensure in the State of Georgia. 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

33 of 33 students (100%) passed the CRT on first attempt. From review of the score report, RT students average score on this competency was 4.21 while the national average was 3.28. The highest possible scores was 5.0. For this competency, 26 of 33 (79%) students scores 80% or higher.

### 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

32 of 33 or 97% passed the WRRT on the first attempt. From review of the score report, the average score on this competency was 2.97 with the national average at 2.61. For this competency, 4.0 was the highest possible score. 25 of 33 (76%) students scored 80% or higher.

### 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. Rubric added for review. RT Seminar Oral Presentation of Case Study  
Student ____________________________  
Disease ____________________________  
Semester ____________________________  
CATEGORY EXCELLENT 10 Points

Good 9 Points Fair 8 Points POOR 7 Points Power Point Presentation Score ________  
Presentation is clear, concise and easily follows oral presentation. Does not deviate from content. Follows PowerPoint presentation majority of the time with minimal deviation from content. Follows PowerPoint presentation most of the time with some deviations from content. Fails to follow PowerPoint presentation with excessive deviation from content. Visual Aids Score ________  
All illustrations such as diagrams, tables, charts, x-rays, and other illustrations are appropriate for content presentation. Most illustrations such as diagrams, tables, charts, x-rays, and other illustrations are appropriate for content presentation. Some were inappropriate. Most illustrations such as diagrams, tables, charts, x-rays or illustrations were inappropriate for content presentation. Organization Score ________  
Excellent flow and transition from topic to topic. Very organized and refers to slides or other notes appropriately. Does not read slides verbatim. Good flow and transition from one topic to topic. Organized and refers to slides or other notes appropriately. Does not read from slides most of the time. Some difficulty with flow and transition from topic to topic. Disorganized and refers to notes inappropriately. Reads verbatim from the slides most of the time. Poor flow from topic to topic. Very disorganized and reads constantly from notes or slides. Reads verbatim from the slides all the time. Content Knowledge Score ________  
Demonstrates full understanding of the topic. Answers majority of questions correctly. Demonstrates some understanding of parts of the topic. Answers most questions correctly. Does not seem to understand the topic very well. Unable to answer questions correctly. Presentation and Professionalism Score ________  
Is professional in delivery; looks confident; establishes eye contact. Presents with clear voice and excellent pronunciation. Everyone can hear the presentation. Well dressed. Slightly nervous and less confident. Establishes eye contact. Presents with clear voice and good pronunciation and hearing presentation. Well dressed. Seems nervous. Establishes eye contact but not confident. Some difficulty with precise pronunciation and hearing presentation. Well dressed. Very nervous, does not make eye contact and lacks confidence. Difficult to understand presentation with imprecise pronunciation and cannot hear presentation. Inappropriate dress. Spelling/Abbreviations Score ________  
No misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. Few misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. Several misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. Numerous misspelled words and/or incorrect abbreviations. References Score ________  
2 total; 8 from refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; fewer than 1 approved website 6 total; 4 from refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; 3 approved website < 4 refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; 4 approved website Comments: Total Score ________  
Grade ________  
Faculty ________  
Date ________  
Grading: 70-63=A, 62-56 =B, 56-53 =C, < 52=F  
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Finished  
Priority: Medium
**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

**NBRC CRT 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:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Respiratory Therapy MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

In support of the mission of Georgia State University and the Brydine F. Lewis School of Nursing and Health Professions, 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**

To develop a deep and broad understanding of respiratory care content based on sound clinical decision making.

**G 2: Knowledge of professional issues in respiratory care**

To be aware of and concerned about being well-informed regarding the issues and factors affecting the professional practice of respiratory care.

**G 3: Leadership and educational positions**

Students are 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)**

In order to discern that our students are critical and ethical thinkers, our 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 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**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 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.

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1 Student retention
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

**Standard Associations**

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
3 Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 2: Critical thinking in the application of research (M: 2)**

An entry-level understanding in the design, interpretation and ethical conduct of research.

**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.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All current entry-level integrated master’s students have completed oral presentations as required in the core curriculum.

**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 study to thesis committee or directed study project to faculty members.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Six students completed thesis research successfully.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Of total of 14 MS students in 2010-2011 academic year, 8/14 or 57% completed the thesis option.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Twelve students successfully completed HHS 8000 with scores higher than 85%. Scores ranged from 86 - 99.

### 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:** 06/2012
  **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

  **Additional Resources:** Will track for need for additional faculty member to assist with thesis advisement and course work.

#### Appreciation of the thesis process
Thesis advise can be time consuming. Many of the MS students are international students in which English is not their first language. Faculty are reviewing GRE scores to determine if higher verbal scores should be required. Along with the newly required statistics course, students will be advised starting in the first term of study with the literature course being moved from summer semester (3rd semester of program) to spring semester (2nd semester of program) to provide more time for topic development and literature review. Will also monitor for the need for an additional graduate courses and the need for an additional faculty member in respiratory care to assist with thesis advisement and teaching of master's courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Demonstrate appreciation for the research process | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking in the application of research

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Robert Harwood

#### HHS 8000
Will continue to monitor. Consider another method of measurement since instructor in respiratory therapy no longer teaching course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Understanding Health Policy in the US | Outcome/Objective: Understanding Health Policy in the United States

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Robert Harwood

#### Thesis research and project advisement
A new statistics course was developed and offered for the first time during spring semester 2011. Students who express interest in thesis research are required to take this course in order to complete thesis option. Students who plan to complete the project option are not required but are advised to consider completing course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Demonstrate appreciation for the research process | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care
  - Measure: Critical thinking in the application of research

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Robert Harwood

#### Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care
Oral and written communication will continue to be a high priority. Faculty assigned to core curriculum courses will continue to assign patient case studies, literature reviews, and debates that require a higher level of problem solving and discernment of ideas.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Demonstrate appreciation for the research process | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care
  - Measure: Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Robert Harwood
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Risk Management & Insurance (Mathematical Risk Management) MS
As of 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(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.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
**M 1: Exams in MRM 8320 (O: 1)**
Each student will demonstrate expertise in the quantification and analysis of operational stochastic risk exposures through responses to selected questions from course exams in MRM 8320 Introduction to Stochastic Risk Management Models.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
M 2: Selected student projects in ECON 8780 (O: 1)
Through performance on selected projects in ECON 8780 Financial Econometrics, each student will demonstrate technical expertise in mathematical and statistical theory to quantify and analyze various financial stochastic risk exposures.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 3: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 (O: 2)
Through performance on selected projects and exam questions in MRM 8610 Financial Engineering, each student will demonstrate the technical expertise in economic and financial theory to determine the value of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities and to document the risks associated with the securities.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 4: Selected student case work in RMI 8370 (O: 3)
Through performance on selected case work in RMI 8370 Financial Risk Management, each student will demonstrate the ability to recommend appropriately the risks that should be managed and the tools available that will most efficiently achieve the firm's objectives.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 5: Selected projects in MRM 8620 (O: 3)
Through performance on selected projects in MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Models, each student will demonstrate the ability to identify the limitations of the risk management models and therefore the associated risks of those limitations along with strategies to manage these exposures.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

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

Continue retention of exams/projects
Continue to retain selected student exams and projects for four years. Aggregate increasing collection of annual data until achieve four-year data sample. Maintain rolling four-year data sample thereafter.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure:Projects and exams in MRM 8610 | Outcome/Objective:Economic and financial theory expertise

Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Course Faculty and MRM Assessment Group
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Retain and evaluate student work
Retain selected samples of applicable student work from 2009-2010 course offerings. Perform preliminary analysis of the same for 2009-2010 assessment report.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure:Exams in MRM 8320 | Outcome/Objective:Mathematical and statistical theory expertise
- Measure:Selected projects in MRM 8620 | Outcome/Objective:Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models
- Measure:Selected student case work in RMI 8370 | Outcome/Objective:Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models
- Measure:Selected student projects in ECON 8780 | Outcome/Objective:Mathematical and statistical theory expertise

Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Faculty and MRM Assessment Group
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
**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**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Risk Management & Insurance BBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*

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

**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...
Students will be able to take an uncertain situation and determine the nature of the problem(s) to be solved.

**SLO 2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)**

Students will be able to take an uncertain situation, and: (1) recognize mathematical, financial and/or statistical tools to be used in solving, and (2) use quantitative tools to model risks and craft alternatives to address them.

**SLO 3: Comprehension of the business risk management process (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)**

Students will have technical comprehension of the business risk management process, including the identification and evaluation of loss exposures, the analysis of the various risk control and financing techniques available to manage the exposures, decision making under conditions of uncertainty, control mechanisms to monitor the results of the risk management program.

**SLO 4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process (G: 1, 5) (M: 3)**

Students will have theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. Students will be able to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Performance on selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2)**

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

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

**Target for O1: Identification and structuring of risky situations**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**Target for O2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**M 2: Selected Projects and identified exam questions in RMI 4300 (O: 3)**

Students will be given the task of identifying and prioritizing the hazard risks of a given business organization through the use of a Risk Mapping approach to risk assessment.

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

**Target for O3: Comprehension of the business risk management process**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

**M 3: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 (O: 4)**

Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 Enterprise Risk Management theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process and the ability to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

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

**Target for O4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process**

A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

### 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

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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.

In the 2010-2011 AY the Robinson College undertook the development of a new strategic plan for the College that builds on the GSU strategic plan. In the Summer of 2011 a task force, building on the RCB strategic plan, began developing a set of recommendations to be made to the College Executive Committee that will significantly update the BBA program. It is anticipated that as a result of this larger process a new Mission Statement will emerge for the BBA program.

Goals
G 2: Communications Capabilities
Students graduating from the Robinson College of Business with a BBA degree will be effective business communicators.

G 1: Analysis Capabilities
Students graduating from the Robinson College of Business with a BBA degree will be effective and efficient business problem analysts in their major.

G 3: Team Work Capabilities
Students graduating from the Robinson College of Business with a BBA degree will be able to function effectively as team members.

G 4: Life-long Learning
Students graduating from the Robinson College of Business with a BBA degree will demonstrate a desire for life-long learning

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Effective Analytical Skills (G: 1) (M: 6)
Students will demonstrate analytical skills in solving business problems.

SLO 2: Effective Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 7)
Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.

SLO 3: Effective Use of Computer Technology (G: 1, 2) (M: 7)
Students will show the ability to effectively use and manage technology of business related purposes.

SLO 4: Effective Team Membership (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)
Students will show the ability to function as effective members of a team.

SLO 5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning (G: 4) (M: 1)
Students will exhibit a positive attitude toward continual learning upon completion of the BBA program.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 6: Ethics and Social Responsability (G: 1, 4) (M: 8)
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Further Education -- Self Report (O: 5)
This measure reports the number of students anticipating continuing formal education after completion of their BBA degree.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O5: Appreciation of Life-long Learning
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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The RCB did not conduct the Educational Benchmark Service exit survey in the 2010-2011 cycle. It is anticipated that it will be conducted in the Spring of 2012.

M 2: Ability to Work on Teams (O: 4)
Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Rarely gives task support to other members. Leadership: Consider the leadership activities. Consistently displays good leadership skills. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Occasionally displays exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No new assessment was done in the 2010-2011 cycle. Team events (participation, member selection, evaluation) are a major part of the RCB strategic plan revision in the 2011-2012 cycle.

M 3: Ability to Function in a Team Environment (O: 4)
Category for Evaluation Possible Scores 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of Work: Consider the degree to which the student team member provides work that is accurate and complete. Produces unacceptable work, fails to meet minimum group or project requirements. Occasionally produces work that meets minimum group or project requirements. Meets minimum group or project requirements. Regularly produces work that meets minimum requirements and sometimes exceeds project or group requirements. Produces work that consistently exceeds established group or project requirements. Timeliness of Work: Consider the student team member's timeliness of work. Fails to meet deadlines set by group. Occasionally misses deadlines set by group. Regularly meets deadlines set by group. Consistently meets deadlines set by group and occasionally completes work ahead of schedule. Consistently completes work ahead of schedule. Task Support: Consider the amount of task support the student team member gives to other team members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Rarely provides task support to other members. Leadership: Consider the leadership activities. Consistently demonstrates team leadership. Occasionally demonstrates exemplary leadership. Occasionally demonstrates exemplary leadership. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.
includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2: Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to the project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Effective Team Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

No new assessment was done in the 2010-2011 cycle. Team events (participation, member selection, evaluation) are a major part of the RCB strategic plan revision in the 2011-2012 cycle.

**M 4: Oral Communications Skills (O: 2)**

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 Communications Skills: Oral Communication Skills Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i Alignment of Material Presented with the Audience Student aligns the material with the audience in the presentation at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student aligns the material with the audience in the presentation at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student shows a weak ability to align the material with the audience in the presentation at hand. ii Synthesis and Arrangement of the Content Presented Student synthesizes and arranges the content in the presentation at hand with a high degree of accuracy and clarity. Student synthesizes and arranges the content in the presentation at hand with an effective degree of accuracy. Student shows a weak ability to synthesize and arrange the content in the presentation at hand.

**Target for O2: 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No new assessment was done in the 2010-2011 cycle. Development of oral presentation skills throughout the undergraduate experience is a major part of the RCB strategic plan revision in the 2011-2012 cycle.

**M 5: Written Communication Skills (O: 2)**

The rubric for this item was modified in the 2010-2011 cycle. The prior rubric as well as the current rubric are linked in the Document Repository. For this item the rubric titled "New Rubric of Assessment of CTW papers on Assessment Criteria for Written Communications" was used. For this item 33 students papers produced for the CTW classes in the Spring Semester of 2011 in the RCB were selected. Of these papers 32 were assessable using the rubric developed for this and other questions in assessment. The results of that assessment with the names removed are included in the results matrix for the 2010-2011 cycle and are linked here from the Document Repository.

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

**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

On the effective writing criterion we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0. Measurement will be done by applying the Rubric on Assessment Criteria for Written Communications to Critical Thinking through Writing assignments collected from the second (i.e. senior level) CTW designated class in each major in the Robinson College of Business.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 32 assignments in CTW classes were used in this assessment. Two papers were not usable and the 30 that remained were scored by a single, trained rater using the written communications rubric. The results showed that 6 of the 30 usable papers were rated a (4), 18 were rated a (3) and 6 were rated a (2). We the scored exams are used then the average hits the minimum level of 3.0 in the target. However, if the two unusable submission are included in the database, then the average score dips below the target. As a result of the mixed results the decision was taken to mark this as “partly met.”

**M 6: Effective Analytical Skills (O: 1)**

The rubric for this item was modified in the 2010-2011 cycle. The prior rubric as well as the current rubric are linked in the Document Repository. For this item only the measure "Systematically & Logically Interpret Data” were used. For this item 32 students papers...
produced for the CTW classes in the Spring Semester of 2011 in the RCB were selected. Of these papers 30 were assessable using the rubric developed for this and other questions in assessment. The results of that assessment with the names removed are included in the results matrix for the 2010-2011 cycle and are linked here from the Document Depository.

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

**Target for O1: Effective Analytical Skills**

We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0 on both sub-parts of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making rubric first used in the 2010-2011 cycle.

---

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

A total of 32 CTW assignments were selected from three different CTW classes in the MGS department. These were in Entrepreneurship, Business Analysis on Service Operations Management. Of these, a total of 30 papers were usable. These 30 papers were all assessed based on the two measures of the Assessment Criteria for Decision Making Measure of the CTW rubric. On the first dimension the measurement of students’ ability to make systematic inferences there were 5 students that scored a (4), 10 students that scored a (3) 13 students that scored a (2) and 2 students that scored a (1). This average of 2.59 is well below the target average of 3.0. On the second dimension measuring the students’ ability to draw conclusions and make recommendations there were 6 students that scored a (4), 14 students that scored a (3), 14 students that scored a (2) and 6 students that scored a (1). This average of 2.44 is well below the target average of 3.0.

---

**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

---

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The RCB did not conduct the Educational Benchmarking exit survey on the 2010-2011. Thus, no new results are obtained. The RCB remains concerned about the student communication capabilities and this is reflected in the Action Plan and in the Initiatives for the new RCB Strategic Plan.

---

**Target for O3: Effective Use of Computer Technology**

On both of these questions students should score above the mean for the classifications of Select Six Peer Institutions, Carnegie Class Institutions, and All Participating Institutions. On both of these questions student scores will improve year-on-year.

---

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The RCB did not conduct the Educational Benchmarking exit survey on the 2010-2011. Thus, no new results are obtained. The RCB remains concerned about the students’ ability to use technology and this is reflected in the Action Plan and in the Initiatives for the new RCB Strategic Plan.

---

**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 analysis. 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.

---

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

A selection of 30 papers were reviewed for assessment purposes. These papers were randomly selected from ten different sections of BUSA 4980 from the 2010-2011 academic year. The rubric established in the summer of 2010 following the first year of this exercise was applied. The results showed that 26 out of the 30 students identified a behavior problem at Citic Pacific in their case analysis at a level of (3) or higher. Of these 26 13 were at the level of (4) in terms of being able to identify the sources of the ethical lapses both individually and organizationally but lacked completeness in there conclusions and/or recommendations. Another six were deemed to be very effective and rater a (5) on the rubric. That left seven at the level of (3). The remaining seven were given the rating of (2). Thus, 19/30 were at the level of (4) or (5), which is slightly below the target goal of 80% of the students being able to not only identify some ethical and legal issue but also being able to provide analysis as to the cause and to make recommendations as to the responses that should occur.

---

**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 ethic orientations throughout the undergraduate curriculum.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Ethics and Social Responsibility | Outcome/Objective: Ethics and Social Responsibility
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)

Communication Skills
The assessment process of 2008-2009 showed that Communication skills were not being effectively assessed. This was traced to two areas of concern: 1) The quality of the activates, written and oral, being assessed were not of a high enough quality in terms of their suitability for being assessment vehicles, and 2) the rubrics developed for the assessments were not adequate. In the recommendations to the RCB Executive Committee communications initiatives that would significantly change the development of communication skills in RCB were presented under the charge that RCB students are "ready to execute." Specifically the sub-committee recommended curricular changes that would: Develop, use, receive feedback on, and be evaluated on their oral presentation skills across the entire curriculum, not just in selected and isolated classes. Develop, use, receive feedback on, and be evaluated on their prose writing (not outlining or bullet-pointing) skills across the entire curriculum, not just in selected and isolated classes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Ability to Use Technology | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
Measure: Oral Communications Skills | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
Measure: Written Communication Skills | Outcome/Objective: Effective Communication Skills
Implementation Description: Beginning in the 2009-2010 cycle the RCB undertook the process of developing a new strategic plan, which included reviewing the undergraduate program as a whole. Existing action plans were subsumed in this effort and new thrusts proposed. The Summer 2011 report from the undergraduate sub-committee to the RCB Exec. Committee is attached here.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2017
Responsible Person/Group: BUSA 4980 Instructors, RCB Assessment Committee, RCB Undergraduate Steering Committee, RCB Executive Committee, RCB Dean’s Office
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Technology Skills
The College will initiate a new focus on the undergraduate Students’ Skill in the use of Technology. The current assessment mechanisms were found to be wanting in terms of telling the College Assessment Committee the level of skills on different software packages, i.e. spreadsheets, database, word processing. Specifically the sub-committee recommend an initiative to: Develop, use, receive feedback on, and be evaluated on their applied business technology skills (e.g. Excel) across the entire curriculum, not just in selected and isolated classes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Ability to Use Technology | Outcome/Objective: Effective Use of Computer Technology
Implementation Description: Beginning in the 2009-2010 cycle the RCB undertook the process of developing a new strategic plan, which included reviewing the undergraduate program as a whole. Existing action plans were subsumed in this effort and new thrusts proposed. The Summer 2011 report from the undergraduate sub-committee to the RCB Exec. Committee is attached here.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2017
Responsible Person/Group: BUSA 4980 Instructors, RCB Assessment Committee, RCB Undergraduate Steering Committee, RCB Executive Committee, RCB Dean’s Office
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
In the 2010-2011 AY the Robinson College undertook the development of a new strategic plan for the College that builds on the GSU strategic plan. In the Summer of 2011 a task force, building on the RCB strategic plan, began developing a set of recommendations to be made to the College Executive Committee that will significantly update the MBA program. It is anticipated that as a result of this larger process a new Mission Statement will emerge for the MBA program.

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 be decision makers who effectively incorporate global, ethical, and culturally diverse perspectives.

G 3: Leadership
Graduates of the Robinson College of Business MBA Programs will be effectively leaders.

G 4: Teamwork
Graduates of the Robinson College of Business MBA Programs will be effective as members of teams.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions (G: 1, 2) (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.

Relevant Associations:

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

SLO 2: Students can Propose Alternative Solutions (G: 1, 2, 3) (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.

Relevant Associations:

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

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Critical Success Factor Analysis (O: 1)

Measure 1 Students Can Analyze Relevant Questions: Critical Success Factor Analysis Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) 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 can not prioritize 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. iii Focus On Critical Success Factors 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Students again did not meet this goal. As is prior years the first item was by far the strongest and about 70% of students were able to identify the critical success factors. However, as in prior years the ability of the students to prioritize and build recommendations around the critical success factors remains in the 60% range.

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 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.
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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Students did not meet the goal of 80% scoring at 3 or 4 on item i with a total of 60.5%. This is consistent with prior years. Performance on the second item reverted to the levels of 2008-2009 with about 68% of students scoring 3 or 4.

**M 3: Student Ability to Develop Corporate Strategies (O: 2)**

Measure 3 Students Can Propose Alternative Solutions: Ability to develop corporate strategies

Students Can: Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1)

I Integration of functional dimensions

Student fully and effectively integrates all major functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative. Student includes multiple functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative. Student only includes some of the functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative. Student fails to include functional dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative. II 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 only includes some of the global dimensions into the development of a strategic alternative. Student fails to include 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

This goal was not met. The ability to get students to incorporate the global, legal, and ethical dimensions without prompting them in asking the question remains very limited. Only with respect to the multi-functional perspective did students come close to the goal of 80% with a score of 75%. The global dimension was raised without prompting in only about 30% of the answers analyzed. Legal and ethical considerations were not mentioned in over 80% of the answers analyzed. Again, there was no prompting in the questions to look for legal or ethical issues and the cases did not overtly raise issues of law or ethics.

**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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** RCB MBA Steering Committee; RCB Assessment Committee

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Leadership and Team Skill Measurement**

The assessment process on the measures of Leadership and Group Participation was not helpful in terms of providing results to the College that will enable them to target specific aspects of both skill sets for improvement. Analysis of the rubric used for these measurements indicated a sophisticated measure embedded in a good measurement devise for both measures. Analysis of the data collected from students indicates, however, that students were using the measurement instruments in a very elementary way. For the 09-10 assessment cycle it would be preferable if the assessment instrument can be retained. The challenge is to elicit more thoughtful and reflective responses from students in their completion of the assessment instrument. The College will work with the faculty members in the Strategic Management class to try to improve participation quality in this class.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

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

Measure: Environmental Opportunity Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** RCB Assessment Committee; MBA Steering Committee

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Robinson College of Business PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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 cmajor field and quantitative/research methods coursework, all students will be given a comprehensive examination over all coursework. This examination is written, supplemented in some cases by an oral examination. Students will not be permitted a second attempt to pass the preliminary examination except upon recommendation, by majority vote, of the group of faculty members who graded the examination. A maximum of two attempts is permitted to pass the preliminary examination.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

M 3: Internal monitoring (O: 1, 2, 5)
Each academic unit is encouraged to develop internal measures of academic performance such as additional papers and examinations. Students are encouraged to submit papers to academic journals and conferences.
M 4: The Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 5)

Students must demonstrate the ability to conduct a research program leading to a significant contribution to the discipline. The student’s dissertation proposal must be defended orally and include a summary of the following: The purpose of the study; the nature of the subject to be investigated and its importance; a brief review of the literature; the theory if any, to be developed; the empirical methodology, techniques, and data sources, if any, to be used; the nature of the hypotheses to be developed or tested, where appropriate; and a time frame for completion of the dissertation. When the dissertation committee judges the dissertation to be complete, it must be defended orally in a final dissertation defense. A unanimous decision of the committee is required to pass both the proposal and the final oral defense.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 5: Conference presentations and participation (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)

Students are encouraged to present original research at academic and professional conferences. The College helps fund student travel to such conferences. Participation in such activities often leads to offers of employment in tenure track positions.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 6: Research papers (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6)

Students are encouraged to do original and collaborative research and to submit papers for publication in academic journals.

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

M 7: Teaching assignments (O: 1, 4)

Students serve as graduate teaching assistants (GTAs). The student evaluations from the courses taught is used as feedback for honing teaching techniques. Students holding GTAs are registered for BA 9510. At the end of the semester, their performance is evaluated and they are assigned a grade of S or U.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 8: Research performance (O: 2)

All Ph.D. students are given research assignments within their academic units. They are expected to maintain a consistent level of quality work. Students with graduate research assistantships (GRAs) are registered for BA 8510. At the end of the semester, the students' performance is evaluated and grade of S or U is assigned.

Source of Evidence: Performance (rectal, 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
Mission / Purpose
The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose over arching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel, to advocate for students and parents, to evaluate school counseling programs, and to coordinate the resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, program evaluation, advocacy and the curriculum of the school.

Goals
G 1: P-12 Student Learning and Development
School counselors are committed to their students and to their learning, growth and development. To this end, school counselors use their skills to assist students in individual, small group, and classroom guidance settings. School counselors also monitor and evaluate student learning and development to provide the most effective school counseling programs.

G 2: Professional Practice/Experience
School counselors reflect on their practice and learn from that experience.

G 3: Learning Communities
School counselors are participating members of learning communities. This participation allows them to share their expertise and to gain valuable ideas from other practicing school counselors.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)
School counselors understand and practice effective counseling skills that contribute to P-12 student learning and development.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 2: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev (G: 1) (M: 2)
In order to assist all P-12 students in school success, school counselors must monitor, manage, and evaluate student learning and development. Student learning and development as assisted by school counselors takes place through school counselors’ leadership in individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance activities, parent and teacher consultation, using community resources, and advocating for students.
Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

SLO 3: Professional Reflection and Learning (G: 2) (M: 3)
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
2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 to their peers.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the feedback provided to their peers.

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

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling Faculty will monitor student`s grades on projects and other measures used to assess competence. In addition, this faculty will consider other ways to assess competence with regard to the outcomes and objectives.

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

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

- Measure: Action Research Project | Outcome/Objective: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev
- Measure: Audio Tape of Counseling Skills | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills
- Measure: Small Group Feedback of Audio Tapes | Outcome/Objective: Participates in Learning Communities
- Measure: Supervision Session Summary Form | Outcome/Objective: Professional Reflection and Learning

**Implementation Description:** The School Counseling faculty will monitor the outcomes/objectives.

- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling Faculty
- Additional Resources: At least one additional school counseling faculty member.

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling Faculty will monitor students' 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 PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process is very specific and comprehensive because of new requirements by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP 2009). Students are assessed on standards in eight core areas: professional orientation and ethical practice; social and cultural diversity; human growth and development, career development; helping relationships; group work; assessment; and research and program evaluation. Students seeking the Ed.S. in School Counseling must demonstrate that they have the knowledge, skills and practices necessary to promote the academic, career, and personal/social development of all P-12 students. School Counseling Program standards require assessment of knowledge, skills and practices in the areas of foundations; 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 the internship as well as in school counseling specific classes that students are required to complete. The assessment process itself is monitored to determine if it is effective for assessing student progress. The School Counseling faculty will continue to 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. Currently no changes have been made in the assessment process.

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

100% of Ed.S.-seeking 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**

**2010-2011 School Counseling MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The School Counseling program within the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University is dedicated to training professional school counselors who are prepared to use school data to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally appropriate school counseling programs that promote academic, vocational and personal/social success for all K-12 students. Student learning occurs in the following areas: student data collection in diverse K-12 schools, delivery of counseling and guidance services, collaboration and consultation with parents and other educators, and the design, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program. Our model for school counselor preparation is based on the American School Counselor Association’s (ASCA) National Model for School Counseling Programs 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 systemwide 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
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Knowledge of Foundations of School Counseling (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the foundations of school counseling including history and philosophy, professional identity, roles and credentialing, and ethical and legal standards related to the profession on a comprehensive exam in CPS 6020/6030.

Relevant Associations: The Council for Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

SLO 2: Demonstrates Skills in Counseling and Guidance (G: 2) (M: 2)
During CPS 7661 and CPS 7681 (practicum and internship) students must demonstrate individual and small group counseling skills. Individual counseling skills include understanding counseling theories related to the school setting, using a consistent model to conceptualize student concerns and selecting appropriate counseling interventions, structuring the session, establishing and maintaining open and honest communication, responding empathetically, using appropriate questioning techniques, reflecting content and feelings, allowing silence when appropriate, identifying and disclosing mistaken goals of behavior, offering alternatives when appropriate, 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, and suicide risk, etc. Small group counseling skills include understanding the theoretical and experiential aspects of group purpose, development, dynamics, counseling theories, group counseling methods and skills, using group process observations within the group setting to facilitate student growth and development, using a consistent theoretical model or approach when planning group strategies, effectively structuring group sessions, facilitating the establishment of group norms/clear ground rules and consequences, maintaining an open/relaxed atmosphere, reflecting content and feelings of group members, inviting and/or encouraging all group members to participate, using appropriate summary/closure techniques, and effectively terminating the group experience. Students use individual counseling and small group counseling to promote academic development, career development and personal/social development.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

SLO 3: Demonstrates Interpersonal Skills used in Counseling (G: 2) (M: 3)
Students demonstrate interpersonal skills learned during CPS 6410 including building rapport, reflecting feeling and content, summarizing, setting goals, planning interventions, and closure.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

SLO 4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Diversity (G: 3) (M: 4)
Research indicates that a significant contributor to multicultural competencies is experience with culturally diverse individuals. Towards this end, students enrolled in CPS 7340 will create a field experience plan that will allow opportunities to combine theory with practice, extend learning and reinforce concepts gained through reading, lectures, and class participation. Students must attend a social event or cultural happening focusing on a group whose race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation differs from their own. Students must observe verbal and non verbal behaviors and initiate social interactions. In addition, students will read journal articles or book chapters that relate to the cultural group identified in the field project. The experience will be described in a paper.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

SLO 5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship (G: 3) (M: 5)
Interns must demonstrate their ability to respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests. Interns must be sensitive to school, community and cultural norms, understand the counselor’s role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution, and effectively use knowledge of culture, advocacy, and social justice to create academic, personal/social, and career development programs that meet the needs of diverse populations.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

SLO 6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal (G: 4) (M: 6)
In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, selected instruments and rationale for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations.

Relevant Associations: Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

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 foundations and 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 2010-2011 - 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 2010-2011 - 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 at or above the cut-off score of 25.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a score at or above the cut-off score of 25. On the first try, 94% of the students earned this score. One student earned at least 25 on the second try.

**M 4: Multicultural Experience Activity (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 activity.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the multicultural experience activity.

**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 articulate, model and advocate for an appropriate school
counselor identity and program; demonstrate a commitment to helping all students excel; appreciate and value human diversity; show respect for students' varied talents and perspectives by designing and implementing prevention and intervention plans related to the effects of atypical growth and development, health and wellness, language, ability level, multicultural issues and factors of resiliency on student learning and development; respect students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and with different skills, talents, and interests; sensitivity to school, community and cultural norms; help students feel valued and learn to value each other; understand the counselor's role in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution; be culturally self-aware and understand the impact of biases, prejudices, processes of intentional and unintentional oppression and discrimination on the student's academic, personal/social, and career development; 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; and other aspects of multicultural awareness, advocacy, and leadership in the school setting.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2010-2011 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Appraisal Case Study (O: 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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Knowledge of Indiv &amp; Group Approaches to Appraisal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the case study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2010-2011 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Students 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldrshp, Action Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students will earn 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2010-2011 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students earned 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Site Supr. Eval. of Classroom Guidance Skills (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate the students on the following classroom guidance skills: uses needs assessment data to develop lessons/units, clearly defines session goals, effectively structures the group, uses age appropriate activities and materials, uses a variety of activities to achieve lesson goals, kept group on task, uses effective classroom management skills, paces lesson according to student needs, effectively processes activities, uses appropriate summary/closure techniques, utilizes classroom guidance to promote academic success, career development and person/social development, implements strategies and activities to prepare students for home-to-school, school-to-school, and school-to-work transitions and for a full range of postsecondary options and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> 2010-2011 - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for classroom guidance skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 9: Consultation Quizzes (O: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: Knowledge of Consultation &amp; Collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At least 80% of the students will earn a B or better (80% or higher) on Quiz 1 and 2 combined.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

92% of the students earned a B or better on Quiz 1 and 2 combined.

**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: understands strategies and methods of working collaboratively with parents, guardians, families, communities, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel, establishes effective working relationship with consultee(s), knows a general framework for understanding and practicing consultation, effectively structures the interview, responds empathetically, reflects content, gives encouragement/support, clearly identifies goal for consultation, defines and focuses on problem areas, helps develop a plan of action or treatment strategy, 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for consultation and collaboration skills.

---

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

**Maintain and Monitor**

The School Counseling faculty members meet regularly (twice per month - or more) in order to assess other issues that may arise that are not currently being addressed in our training program. This is a portion of our continuous improvement plan that we implement in accordance with our national accrediting bodies: NCATE and CACREP. As we maintain and monitor our training program, we make decisions collectively, and in accordance with our national standards, when courses or other training experiences need to be altered.

- **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 PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process is very specific and comprehensive because of new requirements by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP 2009). Students are assessed on standards in eight core areas: professional orientation and ethical practice; social and cultural diversity; human growth and development; career development; helping relationships; group work; assessment; and research and program evaluation. CACREP also requires program specific standards (89 specific standards over 8 areas). Students who are preparing to become school counselors must demonstrate that they have the knowledge, skills and practices necessary to promote the academic, career, and personal/social development of all P-12 students. School Counseling Program standards require assessment of knowledge, skills and practices in the areas of foundations; 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. Each student is assessed on each standard (core and program) to determine if remediation needs to take place. At the end of each semester the program faculty will assess how well the standards are being taught and will make any necessary changes in the curriculum. The assessment process itself also will be monitored to determine if it is effective for assessing student progress.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**

What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) 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). Also, a course in crisis intervention was added to the curriculum because of new CACREP standards pertaining to this topic. Because of Board of Regents regulations that Master's program must be no more than 48 semester hours, a course in multicultural education was dropped to make room for crisis intervention. Multicultural education is covered in another course in the CPS Department.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

The students met all of the assessment requirements set by the program; thus, we believe our program curriculum is meeting the needs of M.Ed. students effectively. From informal evaluations, it was found that the students wanted their site placements earlier so that they could become familiar with their school site during the summer before their placement began. In this way they could more easily satisfy the requirements that are based on school data.
**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) |
| Students will understand the development of socialization skills and life competencies in school-age children. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

| SLO 2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) |
| Students will understand the developmental progress of Cognitive and Academic skills in children. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

| SLO 3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3) |
| Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

| SLO 4: Implements Data Based Decision Making (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) |
| Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

| SLO 5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4) |
| Student will understand responsibilities related to professional, legal, and ethical duties. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

| SLO 6: Effectively utilizes technological applications (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3) |
| Students will understand and utilize information technology effectively. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

| SLO 7: Understand diversity, development, & learning (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3) |
| Student will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools. |
| Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE |

**Strategic Plan Associations**
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children's mental health.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

**SLO 11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Students will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.
Relevant Associations: NASP & NCATE

---

### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Internship Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
The Internship Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports consultation reports, assigned activities, the site-based supervisors' rating and university-based supervisors' rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.

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

**Target for O1: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
  - 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
  - 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
  - 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
  - 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
  - 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications**
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

- **Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
  - 100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.
### Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, & learning
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### M 2: Practicum Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
Practicum Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports, consultation reports, assigned activities, the site-based supervisors' rating, and the university-based supervisors' rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's acquisition of required skills and competency in targeted areas.

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

### Target for O1: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.
Target for **O6**: Effectively utilizes technological applications  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Target for **O7**: Understand diversity, development, & learning  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Target for **O8**: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Target for **O9**: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Target for **O10**: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Target for **O11**: Understands Research and Program Evaluation  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of Ed.S. practicum students received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**M 3: Supervisor Ratings (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**  
Practicum and Internship site-based supervisor's rate the students' skill and acquisition of school psychology knowledge and skills across the identified objectives of the EdS program.  
Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

Target for **O1**: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies  
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Target for **O2**: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills  
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Target for **O3**: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration  
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**  
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

Target for **O4**: Implements Data Based Decision Making
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, & learning
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O8: Effective at Consultation & Collaboration
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, & Climate
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O10: Understands Prevention & Crisis Intervention
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation
100% of internship and practicum students will receive a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
100% of internship and practicum students received a rating of "3" or higher from their field-based supervisor for this area of competency.

### M 4: PEF Disposition Survey (O: 5)
Students complete the Professional Education Faculty's unit-wide Student Disposition Survey at multiple points in the program (prior to practicum, at the conclusion of practicum, exit from the program, and 1 year post-graduation).

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

#### Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities

---

[Note: This text seems to be a draft or an excerpt from a larger document. The table structure and content are consistent with the text provided.]
Student survey responses will demonstrate an understanding of their professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities as school psychologists.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This survey was in development by the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF) during the 2010-2011 school year.

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

Administration of PEF Student Disposition Survey
This survey is currently being finalized by the appropriate PEF committees.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: PEF Disposition Survey | Outcome/Objective: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities

Implementation Description: We hope to implement this during Spring 2012.
Responsible Person/Group: School Psychology Faculty
Additional Resources: Administrative support for moving assessment materials and data to LiveText

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Professional Education Faculty has moved from using faculty and student ratings on the STARS to a unit-wide survey of students’ dispositions. Our assessment measures have been revised to reflect these changes. In addition, we are in the process of moving (with the rest of the College of Education) to full implementation of the LiveText assessment management program. The use of LiveText will facilitate and improve our ability to collect and analyze data on student learning and outcomes.

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

School psychology has a long history of using data on student performance for evaluating our degree program. We have used this data to make changes to the program in previous years, but have no curriculum or course changes to report for the current year.
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Mission / Purpose
The GSU school psychology PhD is an innovative program that seeks to develop and amplify the role of the school psychologist beyond their traditional roles and functions. Training is oriented toward developing students who are proficient practitioners and researchers. Students refine their knowledge and skills in assessment, prevention/intervention, and consultation. Students develop a cognate that reflects their particular interests and intended area of specialization. PhD school psychology students are also trained to be producers of research.

Goals

G 1: Goal 1: Professionalism
To prepare our graduates to ground his/her practice in basic science and to conduct legal and ethical practices in a pluralistic, diverse society.

G 2: Goal 2: Scientific and Research Foundations for Professional Practice
To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly research regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.

G 3: Goal 3: Professional Strategies Targeted to the Needs of Learners, Their Parents, and Their Schools
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at intervention, consultation, and assessment.

G 4: Goal 4: Area of Sub-Specialization
To ensure that our graduates, in addition of professional preparation as a school psychologist, has a subspecialty.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are informed about and committed to legal and ethical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Understand the practice of psychology (G: 1) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates practices are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates demonstrate knowledge of advanced principles of psychology and school psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Use and conduct research (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Intervention (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing preventative and remedial intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Consultation (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Psychoeducational Assessment (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing psychological assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization (G: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates acquire and demonstrate adequate mastery of a subspeciality that strengthens their skills as psychologists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: Diversity Awareness &amp; Sensitive Service Delivery (G: 1) (M: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work as professional school psychologists in a pluralistic, diverse society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: APA &amp; NASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research (O: 5)
PhD students must complete a pre-dissertation research project as part of the program and prior to taking the comprehensive exam.

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

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**
100% of students will successfully complete their pre-dissertation.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students who attempted this component of the program during the 2010-2011 school year were successful.

#### M 2: Successful completion of dissertation research (O: 5)
A doctoral dissertation that represents independent scholarly research is required.

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

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**
100% of students who defend their dissertation will be successful.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students who attempted this component of the program during the 2010-2011 school year were successful.

#### M 3: Successful completion of comprehensive examination (O: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
A comprehensive examination that assesses knowledge of advanced principles of psychology, school psychology, ethics, and professional practice must be passed prior to graduation.

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

**Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate the ability to follow tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
During 2010 and 2011, 84% of school psychology doctoral students passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt; 94% passed on their first or second attempt.

**Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of the principles of psychology and school psychology.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
During 2010 and 2011, 84% of school psychology doctoral students passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt; 94% passed on their first or second attempt.

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of the use and conduct of research.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
During 2010 and 2011, 84% of school psychology doctoral students passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt; 94% passed on their first or second attempt.

**Target for O6: Intervention**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective intervention practices.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
During 2010 and 2011, 84% of school psychology doctoral students passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt; 94% passed on their first or second attempt.

**Target for O7: Consultation**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective consultation practices.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
During 2010 and 2011, 84% of school psychology doctoral students passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt; 94% passed on their first or second attempt.

**Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment**
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of psychoeducational assessment.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

During 2010 and 2011, 84% of school psychology doctoral students passed their comprehensive examination on the first attempt; 94% passed on their first or second attempt.

**M 5: Readiness for Entry into Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

Our graduates are assessed evaluating all program goals during his/her pre-doctoral internship. Licensed site supervisors are asked to evaluate each student utilizing a 5 point likert scale. 5= Student demonstrates outstanding and/or advanced performance on this objective and competency, 4= Student demonstrates satisfactory performance on this objective and competency. 3= Student’s performance on this objective and competency is developing. 2= Student’s performance on this objective needs improvement; remediation plan may be required. 1= Student’s performance on this objective and competency is unsatisfactory; remediation required.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Diversity Awareness & Sensitive Service Delivery**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O3: Understand the practice of psychology**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O5: Use and conduct research**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O6: Intervention**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O7: Consultation**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment**

100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of doctoral interns received a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

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

Consider modification of comprehensive examination process
The school psychology faculty will review student performance on previous and up-coming administrations of our doctoral comprehensive examination. Based on our review, revisions may be made to the examination structure and/or scoring process.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Review of comprehensive examination results; discuss and possible development of alternate comp procedures.  
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013  
Responsible Person/Group: School Psychology Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 to our assessment process this year. No changes are planned for the upcoming academic year.

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

No changes were made to the program this year. Some changes in the course sequence are anticipated during the current year based on changes at the college level in the doctoral core.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Science Education MEd**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

**Goals**

G 1: Exploring issues of equity in the science classroom

Exploring issues of equity in the science classroom

G 2: Becoming reflective practitioners

Becoming reflective practitioners through the use of inquiry/action research

**Outcomes/Objectives**

O/O 1: Constructs and uses assessments effectively (G: 2) (M: 2)

Teachers of science construct and use effective assessment strategies to determine the backgrounds and achievements of learners and facilitate their intellectual, social, and personal development. They assess students fairly and equitably, and require that students engage in ongoing self-assessment.

O/O 2: Promotes science in the community (G: 1) (M: 9)

Teachers of science relate their discipline to their local and regional communities, involving stakeholders and using the individual, institutional, and natural resources of the community in their teaching. They actively engage students in science-related studies or activities related to locally important issues.

O/O 3: Strives for continuous professional growth (G: 2) (M: 10)

Teachers of science strive continuously to grow and change, personally and professionally, to meet the diverse needs of their students, school, community, and profession. They have a desire and disposition for growth and betterment.

O/O 4: Engages learners in the nature of Science (G: 2) (M: 3, 6)

Teachers of science engage students effectively in studies of the history, philosophy, and practice of science. They enable students to distinguish science from nonscience, understand the evolution and practice of science as a human endeavor, and critically analyze assertions made in the name of science.

O/O 5: Promotes learners’ safety and welfare (G: 1) (M: 1)

Teachers of science organize safe and effective learning environments that promote the success of students and the welfare of all living things. They require and promote knowledge and respect for safety, and oversee the welfare of all living things used in the classroom or found in the field.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Portfolio Element: Safety Certification (O: 5)**

The teacher candidates will be required to attend the safety certification course at Georgia State University. Students will attach a copy of the certificate in their portfolio using the format provided below. The safety certification will be used as satisfactory way to meet the safety standard. Students will either attach a copy of the completion certificate or scan your certificate and insert it at the bottom of this document.

**Target for O5: Promotes learners’ safety and welfare**

100% of teacher candidates will attend and 90% will successfully complete the safety certification workshop.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of students successfully completed the safety certification workshop.

**M 2: Portfolio component: SSI lesson plan (assessment) (O: 1)**

Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. This lesson plan will focus on student assessment. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

**Target for O1: Constructs and uses assessments effectively**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**M 3: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan (O: 4)**

Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

**Target for O4: Engages learners in the nature of Science**
Teacher candidates will identify a minimum of 5 peer-reviewed articles that encompass student and teacher interactions (for e.g. classroom management, modification for ESOL learners, science teaching in urban settings, and technology integration etc.). The students will summarize the articles, reflect on the findings of the articles, and discuss the implications for a classroom. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation, 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the student has not met the criteria.

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

**Target for O8: Can engage learners in inquiry**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**M 5: Portfolio Element: Peer teaching/Reflection paper (O: 9)**

Teacher candidates use one of the lesson plans in the SSI unit to do peer teaching. For the purpose of Peer teaching, they the lesson plan must include: objectives to be taught; activity materials; development of a problem-solving experience for the students; contextualizing the lesson plan in a specific context. The peer teaching will take place in class between 15 to 20 minutes. Post peer-teaching, the teacher candidates will document reflective thoughts about the lesson (two pages). They will answer the following questions: To what extent did you achieve the objectives, rationale, or purpose of the lesson? What did you feel were the strengths of the lesson? The weaknesses of the lesson? What was your perception of the classroom climate? How would you describe the students’ behavior during the presentation? What would you suggest for improvement in teaching the lesson? The peer teaching is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 5 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the components of effective teaching in their peer teaching with a strong emphasis, 4 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 3 indicates that the teacher candidates taught the lesson ineffectively using various components, and rating of 0-2 indicates that the teacher candidates did not demonstrate various components of effective teaching in their peer teaching.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘4’ or higher on element rubric.

**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 5 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, 3 indicates that the teacher candidates taught the lesson ineffectively using various components, and rating of 0-2 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

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

**Target for O4: Engages learners in the nature of Science**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**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: Knows and can apply modern science content**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.
**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 expectactions, 2 indicates that the teacher candidate 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: Knows and can apply modern science content**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**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

**Target for O2: Promotes science in the community**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Target for O7: Understand issues in science and technology**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**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

**Target for O3: Strives for continuous professional growth**

90% of students attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher’ on element rubric.

---

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low

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

- Measure: Portfolio Element: Safety Certification | Outcome/Objective: Promotes learners’ safety and welfare
- Measure: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit | Outcome/Objective: Promotes science in the community
- Measure: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan | Outcome/Objective: Engages learners in the nature of Science
- Measure: Professional Growth Plan | Outcome/Objective: Strives for continuous professional growth

**Implementation Description:** As the program is ending after this semester, this item is now closed.

**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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: As the program is being deactivated and students are all graduating this semester, this item is no longer active.
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: Finished
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
Responsible Person/Group: The adviser of the one remaining student has been meeting regularly with the student and keeping in close contact until she graduates in December, 2011.

Faculty and Student Communication
As this program draws to a close, the one remaining student and faculty member/adviser will work together in the portfolio completion and review process. At this time, all candidates have finished coursework and have graduated except for this one particular student who in her last semester.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Email and telephone contact.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen, Adviser

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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. There is no plan to change our assessment process in the coming year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) 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 continue on improving communication between faculty and candidates throughout the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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
2010-2011 Science Education Online MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The mission for the Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line) is parallel to the mission statement of the Georgia State University Professional Education Faculty. The GSU PEF is unique in that it 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, the mission of the MEd. Online Program in Science Education is to prepare science teachers 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 communities. Specifically, the mission for the Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line) is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices. Candidates develop knowledge, teaching expertise, and dispositions related to the Standards set forth by the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA).

Goals
G 1: Goal/Purpose Statement
Candidates who are admitted to this program have basic science knowledge; therefore the goals of the program to develop candidates who are: 1. Highly competent science teachers who have the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to advance the learning of students in science grades 6-12. 2. Prominent science teachers who utilize assessment strategies to determine the impact of their teaching on student learning in grades 6-12. 3. Highly qualified science teachers with exemplary knowledge of science.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (M: 1)
Aligned with Goal 1; Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Exit Portfolio Standard – Skills of Science Candidates will be able to: Utilize a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement; use advanced technology to extend and enhance the learning of all students; and use prior conceptions and student interests to create communities of diverse learners who can construct meaning from their science experiences.

SLO 2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (M: 2)
Aligned with Goal 2; Key Assessment – Effects on K-12 Learners: Exit Portfolio Assessment and Impact on Student Learning Candidates will be able to: Use a variety of contemporary and traditional assessment strategies to evaluate the intellectual, social, and personal development of the learner in all aspects of science, and engage in reflective practice by using outcome data to guide and change instruction.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 3: Content Knowledge (M: 3)
Aligned with Goal 3; Key Assessment – Content Knowledge; Exit Portfolio Standard: Content Candidates will be able to: Unify concepts and processes in the teaching of science as an interdisciplinary unit; utilize their knowledge of life, physical, earth and space sciences such that they can teach science as inquiry, incorporate technology, and relate science teaching to the personal, historical, and social perspectives of life.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (O: 1)
Candidates are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Exit Portfolio Standard Skills of Science. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of pedagogical knowledge which will include planning, instructional skills, and content knowledge. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Measure: Measure for Content Knowledge
- Outcome/Objective: Content 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.
Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

Effects on P-12 Learning

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

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)

Content Knowledge

Linked to Content Knowledge: Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 62.5% scored at the exceeds expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Measure for Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio. Students will be notified of the sessions through email.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All Science Education Faculty.
Additional Resources: No additional resources are needed.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Effects on P-12 Learning

Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 12.5% at the exceeds level, and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
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

Implementation Description: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio. Students will be notified of the sessions through email.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All Science Education Faculty.
Additional Resources: No additional resources are needed.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds and exceeds expectation levels and 25% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirement for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400 which meant that the students completed the portfolio requirement while enrolled in a methods course. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)  
Outcome/Objective: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

Implementation Description: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio in order to minimize the number of revisions to obtain an acceptable document.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011

Responsible Person/Group: All Science Education Faculty

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

---

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

NA

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

NA

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

NA

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

NA

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Students submitted the exit portfolio as a culminating project which included artifacts to document the effects that their teaching had on P-12 learners. Data showed that 50% of the students scored at the meets expectation level which is acceptable. This also indicates that there is a need to improve in this area; therefore, students were asked to develop an assessment plan in which they were expected to collect their students' performance data, analyze the data, and modify their instructional practices based on the findings. This assessment plan was designed to help them reflect on their teaching practices and ultimately improve the performance of the students that they teach. It also afforded the students an opportunity to improve the assessment instruments that they were using to evaluate the work of their students. More emphasis will be placed on alternative assessment models in EDSC 8400.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:

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

Students are challenged to examine their students' performance data as revealed by the documents submitted in their portfolios. Data from portfolio assessment indicated the need to focus more on assessment and assessment types. With this in mind, a section on assessment was included in EDSC 8400 with an assignment to develop an assessment plan for their students who were not performing at an acceptable level. Students struggled with this assignment; therefore, in the future more time and resources will be devoted to teaching the assessment unit. Special attention will be given to alternative assessment and the development of alternative assessment instruments.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

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

NA
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) in Secondary Science is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which 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, the mission of the MAT Secondary Science program is to prepare educators 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.

Goals
G 1: Content Knowledge
1. Candidates will be seen as more knowledgeable others in their classrooms, in their schools, and in their communities with regard to their understandings of the content and ways of knowing within the disciplines of science

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 6 - 12 science classrooms.

G 3: Impact on student learning
3. Candidates will be reflective professionals with the capacity to analyze the effect that their teaching practices have on the learning of the students in their grades 6 - 12 science classes.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.

SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)
Candidates will be able use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.

SLO 3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates will be able to coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.

SLO 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (G: 3) (M: 6)
Candidates will be able to design and utilize a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners and support learners in engaging in the process of self-assessment.

SLO 7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (G: 3) (M: 7)
Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (G: 2) (M: 4)
Candidates will be able to create engaging learning environments where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.

O/O 5: Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)
Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge (O: 1)
There will be three sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. The candidates’ performance on the GACE Broadfield and / or discipline-specific content exams. 2. Supervisor ratings on the Standard 1: Content Knowledge components of the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Reviewer ratings on the content and curriculum standard in the final e-portfolio.

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

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
1. For the GACE tests, the target is for 100% of the candidates to pass both the Middle-level Math and Middle-level Science exams. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
1. The GACE scores for the current cohort of students have not been completed as many students will be taking the exams in the summer of 2011. 2. For the Mid-term evaluation, the candidates averaged above a 3.5 on all 4 elements of the Content Standard and only 1 student received a rating below Adequately Demonstrated (and only on a single element); for the Final Evaluation, the candidates averaged above a 3.5 on all 4 elements of the Content Standard (achieving averages which were higher than those attained on the Mid-term despite having moved from middle-school to high-school settings) and no student received a score below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge (O: 2)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Design for Instruction and Instructional Decision Making assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by supervisors on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation related to this area 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

**Target for O2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge**

1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 17 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

1. For the Learning Goals assignment the overall candidate average was above 17, as none of the candidates received a score below this value. (It may be necessary to raise the target for this assignment.) For the Design for Instruction assignment, the overall candidate average was 27.92, with only four students receiving scores below the target average that was set. 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.57, with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements; for the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.57, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and, again, with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

**M 3: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences (O: 3)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Design for Instruction and Instructional Decision Making assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessment 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of this section of the e-portfolio.

**Target for O3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences**

1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 13 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the overall candidate average was 27.88 with six candidates scoring below the target average score (a small concern). For the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the overall candidate average was 13.62 with seven candidates scoring below the target average score (a small concern). 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.49, which is slightly below the target average; specifically, on two of the elements -- Lesson Plan & Instruction and Overall Assessment of Planning & Instruction -- the student means were 3.38 and 3.35 respectively. Further, on Monitoring & Adjustments, 3 candidates (14%) received ratings below Adequately Demonstrated. For the Final Evaluation, improvements were seen as the overall candidate average was 3.66, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

**M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (O: 4)**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluations of the Contextual Factors assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluations by the reviewer of this section of the electronic portfolio.

**Target for O4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments**

1. For the For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 21 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the overall candidate average was 21.8 with eight candidates scoring below the target average score (a small concern). 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.61, with no more than 2 students receiving ratings below Adequately Demonstrated on any element; for the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.69, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term...
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: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environment

M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions (O: 5)
There will be two sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Ratings by the supervisor on the Dispositions Key Assessment 2. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O5: Professional Dispositions
1. For the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the candidates achieved an overall average above the target score, with only one candidate receiving a score below this value. 2. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment (O: 6)
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment
1. For the Assessment Plan assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the overall candidate average was above the target average with only two candidates receiving a rating below this value. 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.48, with only 1 student receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated (which indicates the target may have been set a little high). 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection (O: 7)
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection
1. For the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
1. For the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment, the overall candidate average was 22.9 with six candidates scoring below the target average score. 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.86, with only 1 student receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on each element; for the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.78, with fewer students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.
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
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
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: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

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: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

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
Responsible Person/Group: All science education faculty

Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: Assistance with Teacher Work Sample
A. Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: The results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) indicate that students need additional assistance in the following areas: Instructional design and planning and assessment. Data showed that students needed clearer explanations of the TWS and the integrated nature of the assignments. The following actions will be taken to help students improve their knowledge and skills in assessment, instructional planning and instructional design. Students will receive more assistance with the TWS assignment in the methods courses and the methods course assignments will be aligned with the TWS. During Professional Advisement Week, students will also receive help with the TWS.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences

Implementation Description: Students will receive more assistance with the TWS assignment in the methods courses and the methods course assignments will be aligned with the TWS. During Professional Advisement Week, students will also receive help with the TWS.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Using Assessment Data

Impact on Student Learning and Assessment: Students showed acceptable performance on this standard; however, closer examination of the data revealed that there are some minor deficiencies with the interpretation of student assessment data. In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a class.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

Implementation Description: In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a class.

Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All science education faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
NA

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Reflection on student performance data for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) indicated that some modifications were needed. The TWS was implemented as a means to create a cohesive and interrelated set of assessments which included some alternative types of assessment for performance based assignments. Several of the instruments used for alternative assessment were refined to provide better reliability among the supervisors performing the student ratings. In addition, the curriculum for the methods courses was revised in order to make assessment instruments and their interrelationships clearer to students.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In an effort to meet both national and local standards, the faculty reviewed the curriculum for the MAT Secondary Science Program. The curriculum was revised so that the students would see the relationships between state / national standards, scope & sequence of curriculum documents, learning goals and objectives as part of curriculum planning, and a flow of actions related to developing larger curricular units and then translating that into individual lessons that build on each other. The methods courses will focus more on different forms of assessment as a means of creating a more holistic picture of individual and group learning. The Instructional Technology course was eliminated as a requirement and replaced with a set of suggested options based on the developmental needs of the candidates.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
MISSION: The master's degree in Social Foundations of Education expands and deepens students' critical understandings that challenge traditional educational authority and accepted practices for advanced graduate work and professional lives.

Goals
G 1: Designs and Conducts Research
The student demonstrates the ability to design a major research study, appropriate at the Masters level.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: The student will complete a thesis or project (G: 1) (M: 1)
The student has completed a thesis or project advancing an original point of view as a result of Social Foundations research.

Strategic Plan Associations
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Masters Scoring Activity (O: 1)
A faculty advisor and two committee members are responsible for directing the master's thesis research or master's projects. During the last academic term of coursework, each student will be required to complete an oral examination. The candidate's committee will administer the oral examination, which is not to exceed two hours. The committee will complete the scoring rubric after the oral exam (see Document Repository). The criteria are:
1. Understands the concepts and tools of inquiry in foundational disciplines
2. Demonstrates knowledge of previous research or literature in the field
3. Makes normative or critical judgments that are insightful and detailed
4. Provides evidence of quality written work (see Analytical Writing Guide)
5. Conducts a quality oral defense
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: The student will complete a thesis or project
95% of MS Social Foundations students will meet or exceed expectations as outlined in the scoring rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
Four students graduated during the reporting period.

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

MS thesis and project options
Monitor the quality of students who select the thesis or project option.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Masters Scoring Activity | Outcome/Objective: The student will complete a thesis or project
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MS Program Coordinator
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

MS Thesis and Project
The program faculty will continue to monitor the assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Masters Scoring Activity | Outcome/Objective: The student will complete a thesis or project
Responsible Person/Group: MS program coordinator

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We created an analytical rating guide (uploaded) to inform our evaluation of students' written work. We revised the thesis/project rubric to identify work that the program faculty could signify as "honors" level quality. The honoree would receive a certificate at COE honors day.

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

No planned revisions to curriculum and courses at this time. We will receive further assessment data from OIR for the APR report, and use that to inform our program goals and objectives.

---

Georgia State University
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which 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, the mission of the MED Social Studies program 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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Goal: Leadership**
1) Leaders in their Social Studies communities;

**G 2: Goal: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**
2) Creators of democratic, socioconstructivist learning environments for diverse students using appropriate pedagogical content knowledge and innovative technology; and,

**G 3: Goal: Scholarship**
3) Scholars of educational theory and research as applied to social studies education.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**
1) Content Knowledge Standards: Candidates demonstrate deep subject knowledge in a minimum of two social studies content areas: 1) multiculturalism (required) and 2) one of the following: history, world geography, economics, civics, sociology, and/or psychology (Goal 1, 2 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 2: Curriculum Standards (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)**
2) Curriculum Standards: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major concepts, issues, and processes of inquiry relevant to social studies as well as articulates major theories, debates, and issues in social studies education (Goal 1, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 3: Learning Environment (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)**
3) Learning Environment: Candidates establish a positive and engaging learning environment for all students within the field of social studies education (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 4: Knowledge of Students (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)**
4) Knowledge of Students: Candidates possess deep knowledge of students and adaptations to their individual situations to provide for optimal learning (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**SLO 5: Assessment (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
5) Assessment: Candidates demonstrate use of efficacious and appropriate assessment tools (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment:
Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT’s Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students’ portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program. It is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Content Knowledge

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

**Rubric:** CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Social Studies Content Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 0 1 0 1 0 2.00 1.00 Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.00 Civic Action - Option 2 1 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Civic Action - Option 2 1 (100%) Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1 (100%) Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

Target for O2: Curriculum Standards

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

**Rubric:** CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Curriculum Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Curriculum Resources 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2 (100%) Curriculum Resources 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

Target for O3: Learning Environment

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

**Rubric:** TEACHING PERFORMANCE: Learning Environment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Responsive Practice 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Communication & Technology 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Community Resources 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Classroom Management 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Culturally Responsive Practice 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Communication & Technology 2 (100%) Community Resources 2 (100%) Classroom Management 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

Target for O4: Knowledge of Students

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

**Rubric:** IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Knowledge of Students Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev High Expectations and Differentiation 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Family Communication 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 High Expectations and Differentiation 2 (100%) Learning Theory 2 (100%) Family Communication 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment

Findings 2010-2011
Target for O5: Assessment

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Std Dev Data-driven Assessment 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Student Self-Assessment 0 2 0 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Data-driven Assessment 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Student Self-Assessment 2 (100%) Grading Procedure 2 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

M 2: Unit-Wide Dispositions Rubric (O: 6)

Faculty evaluate candidates on demonstration of empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O6: Disposition

All students will achieve a (4= Strength, that means that the disposition is a pervasive trait of the student or 3 = Developing that means the student is aware of and values that trait.)

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

All students assessed received either a 4, or 3 on all portions of the dispositions rubric indicating a met target.

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
Projected Completion Date: 04/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Social Studies Faculty
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Social Studies Faculty
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Content Knowledge - Action Plan

All students did not achieve the exemplary or accomplished level of Content Knowledge. This is demonstrated in the program portfolio and program faculty should revisit this section of the portfolio to clarify the guidelines governing this section. Additionally, this M.Ed. is being collapsed into a more comprehensive M.Ed. program which will better address the issue of diversity. This new M.Ed. is expected to begin in Spring 2012.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge
Responsible Person/Group: COE Program Faculty / SS Program Faculty
Additional Resources: n/a

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this
academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Faculty have collaborated to create an innovative M.Ed. program which spans two departments (MSIT / EPS). The new M.Ed. allows students to gain content knowledge in their area of specialty - but also to obtain coaching and leadership endorsements. This M.Ed. encompasses a field component - all of which will address weaknesses in the current SS M.Ed. program and better utilize faculty resources.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Data analysis provides insight to strengths and weaknesses in the program. As highlighted by the content knowledge/diversity target not being met, program faculty need to develop ways in which students can better demonstrate their knowledge.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Goals
G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in their knowledge of the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.

G 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to develop an understanding of the purposes and history of the field of social studies.

G 3: Student Learning
Our candidates will be effective educators who create learning environments that have a positive impact on student learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
**SLO 1: Content and Curriculum (G: 1) (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: Planning (G: 2) (M: 2)**

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 seeks resources to improve instruction and increase student achievement; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

**SLO 3: Clinical Practice (G: 2) (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 4: Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 4)**

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.

**SLO 5: Impact on Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 5)**

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: Content and Curriculum (O: 1)**

Data for the objective of Content Knowledge are taken from the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final StudentTeaching Evaluation Instrument. The midyear evaluation takes place prior to clinical practice, at or near the end of the Practicum I (field experience). The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum II/III (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student's mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors.

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

**Target for O1: Content and Curriculum**

100% of students will score at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 80% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated on this standard. 81% of the students received the an Effectively Demonstrated rating on this standard. The mean was 3.81 with a standard deviation of 0.39.

**M 2: Planning (O: 2)**

The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

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

**Target for O2: Planning**

100% of students will score at the level of Proficient and 80% of students will score at the level of Exemplary on this standard.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated on this standard. 80% of the students received the an Effectively Demonstrated rating on this standard. The mean was 3.80 with a standard deviation of 0.38.

M 3: Clinical Practice (O: 3)
Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students’ clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students' clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is given at or near the end of Practicum I. The emphasis in Practicum I is to familiarize candidates with the school through immersion in a middle school setting. Candidates are encouraged to observe a wide variety of settings within the school and to learn as much as possible about the school context, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate’s teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates’ semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent in a high school (grades 9-12), the teacher candidates gradually takes on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

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

Target for O3: Clinical Practice
100% of students will score at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 60% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated on this standard. 64% of the students received the an Effectively Demonstrated rating on this standard. The mean was 3.65 with a standard deviation of 0.48.

M 4: Dispositions (O: 4)
The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Social Studies MAT programs, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

Target for O4: Dispositions
100% of students will score at the level of Acceptable and 70% of students will score at the level of Exceptional on this standard.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Acceptable on this standard. 77% of the students received the an Exceptional rating on this standard. The mean was 3.78 with a standard deviation of 0.42.

M 5: Impact on Student Learning (O: 5)
The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

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

Target for O5: Impact on Student Learning
100% of students will score at the level of Proficient and 80% of students will score at the level of Exemplary on this standard.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Acceptable on this standard. 94% of the students received the a Proficient rating on this standard. 86% of the students received an Exemplary rating on this standard. The mean was 4.84 with a standard deviation of 0.40.

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

Maintain Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to 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 devout 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: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

To improve the assessment process for our program, we have included the Teacher Work Sample. This assessment is designed to address the overall program goals and serve as one of the program's key assessments. It was necessary to provide a clear and concise assessment that would directly align with the state and national standards for Social Studies and Teacher Education. As we continue to review and streamline the assessment process, modifications or additions to the Teacher Work Sample, and overall program course of study will be implemented. We understand the need to constantly evaluate the effectiveness of our assessments in hopes of providing quality educational experiences for all of our aspiring Social Studies teachers.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The assessment data indicated that our program efforts to impact pre-service teachers content knowledge and planning have been successful. Our Social Studies pre-service teachers performed at adequate and proficient levels on their evaluations in regards to planning and content knowledge. These results indicate that our increased and focused efforts within the coursework and practicum on content and planning of instruction were well received. We will continue to emphasize these areas within our courses, and in addition, provide more instruction on effective classroom management skills for our students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT 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**
**2010-2011 Social Work BSW**
*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST*
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
To prepare students for generalist social work practice in a range of roles and services that deal with the existing and developing challenges that confront individuals, families, groups, and communities.

**Goals**

**G 1: Professional Identity**
Students will identify as a professional social worker, and conduct themselves accordingly with the standards of practice

**G 2: Social Work Ethics**
Students will be able to apply social work ethical principles to guide their professional practice

**G 3: Critical Thinking for Professional Judgments**
Students will demonstrate their ability to critically analyze various types of information to be able to communicate professional judgments to clients, colleagues and other constituencies in social work practice.

**G 4: Engage in Research**
Students will be able to engage in research informed practice, and practice informed research

**G 5: Knowledge of Human Behavior**
Students will be able to apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Professional Boundaries (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to understand the context of their practice, and how their behavior embodies the values of the social work profession. This is especially critical within their relationship with clients and professional colleagues.

**SLO 2: Manage personal values (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students will be able to recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice

**SLO 3: Appraise and Integrate Knowledge (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Students will be able to distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom.

**SLO 4: Use Research Evidence (G: 4) (M: 4)**
Students will be able to use research evidence to inform practice.

**SLO 5: Critique and Apply Knowledge (G: 5) (M: 5)**
Students will be able to critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: SW 4950 Log on Professional Boundaries (O: 1)**

Students prepare a 4 pages log on their interactions with clients and colleagues at their internship site. They have to assess their ability to uphold their social work professional boundaries; that is, be able to act in a professional manner that represents the mission and auspice of their internship site.

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

**Target for O1: Professional Boundaries**

90% of students will receive 24 out of 30 points (80%) on the rubric for the assignment

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average score was 27.1 which is above the target of 24 points.

**M 2: SW 3700 Self Reflection Paper (O: 2)**

Students prepare a self reflection paper on their experience of doing role plays and tapes on working as a counselor with various client issues.

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

**Target for O2: Manage personal values**

80% of students will receive 8 points for the paper (80%).

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

The average grade on the paper was 93% so the goal of 80% was exceeded

**M 3: SW 3200 Historical Biography (O: 3)**

Students research a historical figure in social work / social justice and prepare a summary of that person's life and impact on social work. Multiple sources are used to look comprehensively at the contribution and impact of the individual on the field.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Appraise and Integrate Knowledge**

80% of students will receive 64 points (80%) or more on the assignment

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

The average point score on this assignment was 77.3 so not all students met this outcome

**M 4: SW 3500 Library Assignment (O: 4)**

Library assignment on research

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

**Target for O4: Use Research Evidence**

90% of students will achieve at least 8 out of 10 possible points on the paper

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

This assignment was offered in Fall and the average grade as 95% and again in the Spring and the average grade was 88% so this goal of 90% was met.

**M 5: SW 3330 Case Review Paper (O: 5)**

Case review paper where students must complete a literature review and synthesize material to apply findings to a case study

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

**Target for O5: Critique and Apply Knowledge**

80% of students will receive 80% of points on the assignment

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

81% of the students reached 80% of points on this assignment

**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:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Begins in Fall 2009
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
### Field Research
Additional content on research and evidence based practice will be included in the field seminars that accompany the internships to assist students to integrate this content in their placement sites.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

### Theory
This assignment will be included in the first semester CTW course. Problems in student performance were a combination of understanding content, as well as being able to organize content in a meaningful way within the paper. Starting next academic year, students will have the opportunity to rewrite the paper, as well as turn in drafts prior to a final version.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

### Theory Early Life
This course is the first CTW offering for students within the major. Additional opportunities to submit paper drafts and rewrite the assignment will be included. In addition, writing consultants will be used in all sections to provide additional one-on-one consultation for student support with their papers.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

### Theory Field
The range in performance evaluations by section ranged from 73% - 88%. This area was the lowest ratings across all areas of the internship evaluations. To increase ability to use theory to guide practice, additional content on theory will be added to the field seminar course which runs concurrently with the internship. These changes will include additional overview of theoretical content, and practice on integration of theory with cases within presentations and written assignments.
- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

### Orientation
Orientation to major
- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Expend additional teaching resource to have 3 sections of policy
### Research

**Summer Course**
- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Continue to offer research methods in summer with expanded enrollment
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of School

### CTW Revision

During spring semester when this course is offered, students were required to enroll in two CTW courses. We received feedback, and analyzed CTW assignment grades, and made the decision to eliminate one of the Spring semester CTW courses. That leaves one CTW requirement in Fall, and only one in Spring. The SSW is also doing some additional training of CTW instructors around requirements.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** SW 3200 Historical Biography
- **Outcome/Objective:** Appraise and Integrate Knowledge
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mary McLaughlin, BSW Director

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Social Work MSW**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST

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

### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the MSW program is to prepare students for social work leadership roles in the effort to solve, in partnership with others, the existing and developing challenges that confront communities and the people within these communities.

### Goals

**G 1: Critical Thinking**
- Students will be able to apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments

**G 2: Community Partnerships**
- Students will engage in community partnership practices that are responsive to diversity and difference

**G 3: Social and Economic Justice**
- Students will develop skills to advance human rights and social and economic justice.

**G 4: Context that shape social work practice**
- Students will develop skills to assess and shape macro contexts that influence the practice of social work

**G 5: Intervention Skills with Communities**
- Students will develop skills to be effective social work practitioners within community settings

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Evaluate & Integrate Multiple Sources of Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**
- Students will be able to evaluate and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge and practice-generated knowledge

**SLO 2: Theory and Practice with Communities (M: 2)**
- Students will read a book that describes a case example of an urban area that is undergoing transformation. They will write a paper that integrates theory and practice concepts with this case example.

**SLO 3: Power and Privilege (M: 3)**
- Students will analyze ways which differential power and privilege shape communities and society

**SLO 4: Leadership in Community Change (M: 4)**
- Students will develop leadership skills in promoting changes to improve community well being

**SLO 5: Community Collaboratives (M: 5)**
Students will develop skills to develop, monitor, and strengthen collaborative relationships that build healthy communities

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Eval prop (O: 1)**
Students will construct and submit an evaluation proposal that integrates learning from their evaluation course with experiences that they are having in their internship site.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Evaluate & Integrate Multiple Sources of Knowledge**

The class average for the proposal will be 90% or higher on SW 8200, Evaluation & Technology course.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The class average on the proposal was 90%

**M 2: Common Ground (O: 2)**
Student read a book on gentrification and community change titled, Common Ground, and write a paper that integrates concepts from community theories and practice to understand this experience.

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

**Target for O2: Theory and Practice with Communities**

The class average for the integrative paper on Common Ground will be 90% or higher

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The class average for the paper was 100%

**M 3: Power & Privilege (O: 3)**
Students write a reflection paper that analyzes how concepts of power and privilege within organizations, communities, and society within SW 8300, Leadership & Management

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

**Target for O3: Power and Privilege**

The class average for the paper on power and privilege will be 90% or higher in the Leadership & Management course.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The class average on the paper on power and privilege was 92%

**M 4: Dissemination of Community Project (O: 4)**
Students do presentation and associated final paper about their experience working with a community partner on a service learning project

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O4: Leadership in Community Change**

The class average for the paper and oral presentation on the community projects will be 90% or higher

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The class average for the oral presentation and paper was 98% on their community projects

**M 5: Community Skills (O: 5)**
Students will write a paper on skills development for social work practice at the community level.

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

**Target for O5: Community Collaboratives**

The class average for the paper that outlines community practice skills in SW 8100 Skills and Techniques of Community Partnerships course, will be 90% or higher

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
The class average for the paper on community collaboratives was 90%

**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
**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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have totally changed our assessment protocol. The major issue was that we needed to align our WEAVE assessment with the new accreditation standards in social work that are competency based.

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

We have resequenced some of the courses and have modified the numbers to be more representative of progression in the students' programs of study.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

We set up faculty work groups that looked at the data in depth across curriculum sequence areas. That is, foundation year of the graduate program (Year 1) and progression to the advanced year (Year 2). As a result of setting up this new review structure, there is a more thorough analysis of our curriculum and structure.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

Some of the content that we had “packaged” in the foundation or advanced year needed to be resequenced. In addition, we moved some of the content and assignments across areas within the curriculum to better integrate the academic and internship components of the graduate social work program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you
With a more concerted structure between reaccreditation requirements and the WEAVE protocol, we are collecting data that is more meaningful and has direct relevance to our curriculum design. We anticipate that the current administrative structure of review by faculty will continue - which broadens the overview from the responsibility of the curriculum committee to the full faculty.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
Restructure of the assessment protocol to a competency based approach which is aligned with the new assessment standards in social work.

**International Activities**
We offered our first study abroad elective this past year. We hope to expand this course and continue to offer as an elective.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Sociology Assessment of Core**
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Acquisition of knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Common embedded questions on objective exams are designed to allow students to demonstrate their knowledge of key sociological concepts and theories, and about social conditions and problems.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

**SLO 2: Analysis of Contemporary Problems (G: 2)**
Through common embedded questions on objective exams, students demonstrate their ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems, both locally and globally.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

7.0 Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments.

8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: SOCI 1101 and SOCI 1160 embedded exam questions (O: 1)**

SOCI 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions The goal assessment categories here are "Sociological Perspective," "Multicultural Issues," and "Global/International Issues." Five multiple-choice questions were designed to assess competence in each goal area. Instructors in all sections of Soci 1101 and Soci 1160 were requested to select at least one multiple choice in each of the three sections 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 993 students from 11 sections of 1101 (637 students), and 7 sections of 1160 (354 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 96% of students in 1101 and 89% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 95% of students in 1101 and 92% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues correctly," 95% of students in 1101 and 90% in 1160 answered questions correctly. Edit Finding Add Action Plan Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) 1. 2007-2008 Help

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Acquisition of knowledge**
At least 80% of students should answer questions correctly.
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

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

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

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

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
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Sociological Theory (SOCI 3030) Final Exam or Paper (O: 1)

This measure is derived from professors' evaluations of how well, in their exams or papers, students articulated key sociological concepts or theories. 84 students in two sections were evaluated. Professors judged that 38% of their students were doing work they considered excellent (a score of 4); that 25% were doing work they evaluated as very good (a score of 3); that 15% were doing work they saw as good (a score of 2); and that 21% were doing work they considered to be poor (a score of 1). Our target is to have 70% of students assessed as excellent or very good in this measure; we fell short of this, at 63%.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: not met; 63 % of students were assessed as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their paper or exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 2: SOCI 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)

Assessment is based on professors' evaluations of: students' course papers (in which they develop research proposals) and/or final exams. Students' work is assessed on each outcome/objective measure. Fifty students (in 2 sections of the same professor) were assessed based on their course papers. The professor evaluated 42% of these papers as excellent (a score of 4) at demonstrating students' "acquisition of knowledge"; 34% were judged to be "very good" (a score of three) in this area; 12% were judged to be "good" (a score of 2) and 12% were judged to be poor (a score of 1). In terms of communication skills, the professor assessed 42% of students' papers as excellent; 34% as very good; 12% as good, and 12% as poor. In terms of demonstration of "critical thinking," the professor assessed 42% of students' papers as excellent; 34 as very good; 12% as good, and 12% as poor. In terms of demonstrating "analytic skills," professors assessed 42% of students' papers as excellent; 34% as very good;12% as good; and 12% as poor.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their papers/exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: met; 76% of students were assessed as &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their papers/exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their analysis of social problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: Met. 76% of students were judged as doing &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; work, in terms of their analyses of social problems in their papers/exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Communication Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: Met. 76% of students were judged as doing &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; work, in terms of their communication skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 % of the students will score &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; in their critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: Met. 76% of students were judged as doing &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;very good&quot; work, in terms of their demonstration of critical thinking in their papers/exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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. Forty students (in one section) were evaluated. The professor assessed 12.5% of students to be excellent (a score of four) in their demonstration of analytic skills (appropriate computer skills); 50% were assessed as very good, 25% as good, and 12.5% as poor in this area. The professor judged 25% to be excellent in their demonstration of critical thinking skills (able to analyze and interpret data). She assessed 50% of students as very good; 12.5% as good; and 12.5% as poor in this area.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: data collection and data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of analytic skills (appropriate computer skills) on their final exams.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Target: not met. 62% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in terms of their analytic skills.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

Target: Met. 75% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of critical thinking skills on their final exams.

**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 111 students (in three sections) was assessed. In the area of "acquisition of knowledge," professors judged 28% of students' work to be excellent; 23% to be very good; 41% to be good, and 9% to be poor. In the first measure on analyzing contemporary problems, professors judged 28% of students’ work to be excellent; 23% to be very good; 41% to be good; and 9% to be poor. In the second (global) measure, professors judged 28% of students’ work to be excellent; 23% to be very good; 41% to be good; 9% 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Target: Not met. 51% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in terms of their acquisition of knowledge.

**Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems**

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

Target: Not Met. 51% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in terms of their analyses of social problems on their finals exam.

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

**focus on students' abilities to demonstrate knowledge acquisition**

Professors will continue to focus on helping students to articulate their acquired knowledge and to their analyses. We are not far below our target, in these areas. The variation from year to year of professors' assessments of student work may have more to do with changes in evaluators than with any significant change in quality of students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: data collection and data analysis
- Measure: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge
- Measure: Analysis of Social Problems
- Measure: Sociological Theory (SOCI 3030) Final Exam or Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge

---
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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</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 4)</td>
<td>The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)</td>
<td>The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5: Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</td>
<td>The student is able to analyze and interpret data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6: New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1, 3, 4)</td>
<td>The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1)</td>
<td>The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Masters Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)</th>
<th>The student's original Masters Thesis and Thesis Defense are used for assessment by the Thesis Chair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Data Collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for</th>
<th></th>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O2: Analytical Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3: Research Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4: Formulating Hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5: Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6: New Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7: Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8: Writing Conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9: Concepts and Theories</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10: Facts and Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11: Use of Data Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12: Social Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “excellent” on this item by the Thesis committee chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Global Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O3: Research Reports**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
92.9% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
92.9% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O6: New Research Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O7: Written Communication**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O8: Writing Conventions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item, by the course instructor.

**M 4: Research Methods Course (O: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11)**
The student's performance in the required M.A.-level Social Research Methods course is used for assessment. The professor bases his/her assessment on the student's course paper or final exam grade.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source of Evidence</strong>: Academic direct measure of learning - other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Data Collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the course instructor on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Research Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the course instructor on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the course instructor on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: New Research Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not reported this cycle -- instructor left these questions blank.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O7: Written Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the course instructor on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: Writing Conventions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the course instructor on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O11: Use of Data Sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; by the course instructor on this item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Ordering Changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order for M.A.-level students to perform better in their Social Research Methods courses, Social Statistics courses, and in their Masters theses, the Sociology department has made some modifications to the ordering of M.A.-level methods and statistics courses. This re-ordering of the statistics and methods courses will require students to complete the courses in a more timely, less spread-out, manner. (Previously, students would sometimes delay their progression through the course sequences, which would affect their learning and retention.) This re-ordering will also make it easier for students without sufficient prior knowledge or coursework in these areas to take undergraduate-level prerequisite courses, without getting behind their fellow students in their graduate cohort. However, part of the reason that this objective was not met is because only three assessments were made regarding M.A. Theses this year. Of those three assessments, two were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; (one was rated as &quot;good&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle</strong>: 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status</strong>: Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority</strong>: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Masters Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description</strong>: The re-ordering of courses has already been planned for the 2009-2010 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date</strong>: 07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group</strong>: Dr. Dawn Baunach, Director of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Resources</strong>: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Amount Requested</strong>: $0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We set up an action plan to reorder our statistics and methods courses, which has been going well. We have also agreed as a faculty to increase the rigor of all of our required courses in statistics, methods, and theory.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

We are able to see by the time students work on their Masters theses that their critical thinking skills have vastly improved.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We don't feel at this time that our CTW program needs additional development. There hasn't been a problem in the implementation of our “course ordering” plan. No assistance is necessary.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

No changes have been made since last year; this year we maintained our previous change and monitored it. At the Masters level, we haven't made any changes since last year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We haven't made changes since last year. We made a change last year and are monitoring it. There will be a new Director of Graduate Studies next year; I am unaware what changes in the assessment process she will make in the future.

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

We have been satisfied with the results of the graduate assessments. The changes we have made would have been made without the assessment findings. The faculty stay involved with the degree program regardless of the assessment outcomes or procedures. At this point we are just continuing to monitor the changes previously put in place. The new Director of Graduate Studies may change things next year, that I do not know.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

We didn't have to use them -- we met and exceeded our goals. We keep track of our program beyond these assessment reports.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

That our Masters program seems to be humming along nicely.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

I do not know. There will be a new Director of Graduate Studies in a few months. She may change things or may not.
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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</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)</strong> The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td><strong>Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)</strong> The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td><strong>Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1)</strong> The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td><strong>Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</strong> The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td><strong>Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)</strong> The student is able to analyze and interpret data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 6</td>
<td><strong>New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1)</strong> The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7</td>
<td><strong>Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1)</strong> The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8</td>
<td><strong>Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1)</strong> The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 9</td>
<td><strong>Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)</strong> The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 10</td>
<td><strong>Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)</strong> The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 11</td>
<td><strong>Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1)</strong> The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 12</td>
<td><strong>Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)</strong> The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 13</td>
<td><strong>Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)</strong> The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Doctoral Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>83.3% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; and 100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Analytical Techniques</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for</strong></th>
<th><strong>Findings 2010-2011</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O3: Research Reports</strong></td>
<td>83.3% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; and 100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O4: Formulating Hypotheses</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O5: Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O6: New Research Questions</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O7: Written Communication</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O8: Writing Conventions</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O9: Concepts and Theories</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>83.3% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; and 100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O10: Facts and Information</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O11: Use of Data Sources</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O12: Social Problems</strong></td>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
<td>100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of doctoral students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the dissertation chair.

**Target for O13: Global Questions**
75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.7% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; and 100% of doctoral students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the dissertation chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Theory Qualifying Exam (O: 9, 10, 12, 13)**
The student's performance on the Theory Qualifying Examination is used for assessment.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**
50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Theory was given five times in 2010-2011. Of those five attempts there were 3 (60%) failures, 1 (20%) conditional pass (to be rewritten in August 2011), and 1 (20%) pass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O10: Facts and Information**
50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Theory was given five times in 2010-2011. Of those five attempts there were 3 (60%) failures, 1 (20%) conditional pass (to be rewritten in August 2011), and 1 (20%) pass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Social Problems**
50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Theory was given five times in 2010-2011. Of those five attempts there were 3 (60%) failures, 1 (20%) conditional pass (to be rewritten in August 2011), and 1 (20%) pass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O13: Global Questions**
50% of students will pass the Theory Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Theory was given five times in 2010-2011. Of those five attempts there were 3 (60%) failures, 1 (20%) conditional pass (to be rewritten in August 2011), and 1 (20%) pass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Methods Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)**
The student's performance on the Statistics and Methodologies Qualifying Examination is used for assessment.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O1: Data Collection**
50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Methods and Statistics was given six times in 2010-2011. Of those six attempts there were 4 (66.7%) failures and 2 (33.3%) passes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**
50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Methods and Statistics was given six times in 2010-2011. Of those six attempts there were 4 (66.7%) failures and 2 (33.3%) passes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**
50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PhD Qualifying Examination in Methods and Statistics was given six times in 2010-2011. Of those six attempts there were 4 (66.7%) failures and 2 (33.3%) passes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Data Analysis**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We decided to reorganize our PhD doctoral exams, as previously described. The course ordering changes that we put in place a couple of years ago have been monitored as well. They seem to have worked. The students who failed last year’s doctoral exams had been in the program for a long time and had taken these course prior to our reordering. Students who matriculated into the program more recently and have been subjected to the course ordering changes seem to do better on the doctoral exams.

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

By the time a student starts to work on (and finish) their dissertation there is vast improvement in their critical thinking skills.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

We’ve put a change in place this year (changing the doctoral exams and increasing the rigor of our required courses in statistics, methods, and theory) that we will continue to monitor. The department has also agreed and affirmed to all instructors that methodological content should be increased in all substantive graduate courses, and not leave methods/statistics instruction to just the specific courses in those topics. Thus, we are also taking steps to improve our instruction in this area. We also added an additional course requirement on methods/statistics.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

50% of students will pass the Methods/Statistics Qualifying Examination.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

The PhD Qualifying Examination in Methods and Statistics was given taken six times in 2010-2011. Of those six attempts there were 4 (66.7%) failures and 2 (33.3%) passes.

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

**Statistics/Methods Instruction**

The department decided last year (to go into effect August 2011) to change its doctoral examinations from qualifying examinations in statistics, methods, and theory to a specialty examination. This past year (2010-2011) we offered the last two exams in the old, qualifying exam, format. The new, specialty exam format will go into effect in August 2011; it represents a major change in our doctoral instruction that will bring our requirements more in-line with our peer institutions. Although there were six attempts at the qualifying exam in methods/statistics, that represents just three students. Three students took the exam in January 2011, and all three failed the exam. The students retook the exam in May. Of those three students, one failed the methods/statistics exam for a second time (and is being scholastically terminated from the program, per College rules) and the other two passed. Although the department decided last year to change the doctoral examinations, we continue to take very seriously our instruction in sociological statistics and methods. The department has also agreed and affirmed to all instructors that methodological content should be increased in all substantive graduate courses, and not leave methods/statistics instruction to just the specific courses in those topics. Thus, we are also taking steps to improve our instruction in this area. We also added an additional course requirement on methods/statistics.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  

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

| Measure: Methods Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Techniques  
| Data Analysis | Data Collection | Formulating Hypotheses |

**Implementation Description:** The new exams go into effect next month, in August. The increased instruction in methods/statistics (and the increased emphasis on these topics in other courses) went into effect this past academic year, 2010-2011.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dawn Baunach

**Theory Instruction**

The department decided last year (to go into effect August 2011) to change its doctoral examinations from qualifying examinations in statistics, methods, and theory to a specialty examination. This past year (2010-2011) we offered the last two exams in the old, qualifying exam, format. The new, specialty exam format will go into effect in August 2011; it represents a major change in our doctoral instruction that will bring our requirements more in-line with our peer institutions. Although there were five attempts at the qualifying exam in theory, that represents just three students. Three students took the exam in January 2011. Of those three, two failed and one passed. The two students who failed the exam in January retook the exam in May. Of those two students, one failed the theory exam for a second time (and is being scholastically terminated from the program, per College rules) and the other is rewriting a conditional pass answer in August. Although the department decided last year to change the doctoral examinations, we continue to take very seriously our instruction in sociological theory. Just this week a group of faculty has decided to hold a working discussion group to discuss our two theory courses. The department has also agreed and affirmed to all instructors that theoretical content should be increased in all substantive graduate courses, and not leave theory instruction to just two specific courses. Thus, we are also taking steps to improve our theory instruction in the two theory courses and in all substantive courses.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  

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

| Measure: Theory Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Concepts and Theories  
| Facts and Information | Global Questions | Social Problems |

**Implementation Description:** The new exams are going into effect next month. The increased theoretical standards of all courses went into effect this past academic year. The working theory group will begin having meetings next month.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dawn Baunach
We have completely changed the format of our doctoral exams, including their timing, method, and content. All faculty have been involved in the creation of the new exam format. Many faculty have already been involved in the administration of the new exams. Additionally, the faculty who teach the required courses in statistics, methods, and theory have been involved by increasing the rigor of their courses.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We haven't changed any of the learning outcomes, measures, targets. But we have changed what are being used to evaluate those targets (i.e., the doctoral exams have changed). There will be a new Director of Graduate Studies in a few months, so I don't know what changes she may make to the assessment process.

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

We have changed the doctoral exams and have decided to increase the rigor of our required courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

Although we largely met our goals, we decided for the good of the program more generally (and to bring it more in line with our peer departments) to change our doctoral exams. Our decision to increase the rigor of our required graduate courses (in statistics, methods, and theory) was made not because of the assessments results (which we had met), but just because we want to increase the rigor of our program (produce stronger graduates, etc.). We decided this as a department independent of the assessments.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

We didn't meet some of our goals because two (of only three) students taking the doctoral exams this past year were "hold-overs" from many years ago. Most doctoral students in the program elected to wait to take the exams this year (as opposed to last year) because of the new, better format. Some of those who took the exams last year were some of the weaker students admitted many years ago. (In one case, admitted ten years ago.) Since then our admissions standards have increased quite a bit. One of the students who failed the exam would not be admitted into the program today and would not have made it through our more rigorous courses (and the two "C" rule that went into effect a couple of years ago). The other two students who took the exams last year came to our PhD program without Masters degrees in Sociology. In the old system they were allowed to move on to doctoral courses without having to take additional masters-level courses. This too has changed in the past few years. In sum, many of the changes we have made more generally to the program in the past few years (increasing admissions standards, enforcement of grade requirements, enforcement of prerequisites, increased course rigor, etc.) have produced a better, stronger group of doctoral students. The students who failed the exams last year, did not really experience these general program changes, and thus were some of our weaker students. In the end, we believe that all of the changes we have made to the program in the past few years have vastly improved it.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

I don't know. In a few months there will be a new Director of Graduate Studies.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Spanish BA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST (Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)*

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department is, through the study of modern and classical languages, cultures and literatures, 1. to provide students the opportunity to improve their critical thinking skills; 2. to better appreciate universal humanistic values; 3. to encourage them to acquire an international perspective; 4. to equip them to function as global citizens; 5. to prepare them, through the various majors in modern languages, for future careers as teachers, translators and interpreters, as well as for important positions in international business.

**Goals**

**G 1: Knowledge of Hispanic Literature**

Student will understand the particularities of 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 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 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 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 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
During this period, 4 courses of Spanish 3307 (Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts) were taught. Students majoring in Spanish achieved the results of 8.2, 8.3, 8.6, 8.6.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Spanish MA**
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Department is to give students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the Spanish language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of Spanish speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in Spanish, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the literatures and cultures of Spanish speaking countries, and in linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

**Goals**

**G 1: Goals for 2010-11**
In Fall 2010, I began as Director of Graduate Studies for MCL. Previous to my tenure as DGS, no work had been done on establishing rubrics or developing measures for direct and indirect assessment of graduate student learning in our department. MCL had already established a series of outcomes dating back to 2004-05. According to those outcomes, I began to develop a means for directly assessing student work: seminar papers, theses, non-thesis papers, written exit exams, and oral exit exams. I have accumulated this data into excel sheets which I have placed in the document repository. I have also included there the Milestone Evaluation used to assess this work. In Spring 2011, I began to develop indirect assessment measures including a survey for our MA students, a similar survey for our faculty (to gauge the difference in perception between faculty and students), and an annual report for students to inform me of their professional and academic activities relevant to our MA program (All of these documents are available in the Document Repository). These indirect assessment were put online via Google Docs to make it easier for individuals to do the survey and easier for me to track the results that were loaded directly into an Excel format. All of my focus toward assessment in 2010-11 was dedicated to the development of clear rubrics that were easy to follow and easy to use for the faculty of MCL, but that also created concrete data that would lead to clear conclusions about the ability of MCL to meet our stated goals and desired outcomes with regard to student learning. Now that I have begun to accumulate data and faculty are on board with the measures I have devised, I will be focused this year on tracking the data, assessing it, and developing an action plan through WEAVE.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research and Data Collecting Skills (M: 1)**
Students are able to read and understand research, acquire skills to collect data and utilize key data sources that provide literary and linguistic information and research findings.
**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)**
Students demonstrate competence in the analysis of literary texts and the evaluation of critical thinking in literature.

**SLO 3: Acquisition of Knowledge (M: 1)**
Students articulate key literary and philosophical concepts and theories, apply the most up-to-date facts and information in resolving literary and linguistic issues and demonstrate appropriate literary, linguistic, historical and cultural knowledge.

**SLO 4: Effective writing, communication and editing (M: 1)**
Students demonstrate communicative competence in written and oral Spanish.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Direct and indirect assessment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

Direct Assessment:
1. M.A. Thesis: The thesis must be original work by the student. The proposal must be approved by faculty members.
2. M.A. Research paper: The aim of this project is for the candidate to apply theoretical concepts to her or his present or future professional practices (integration). Candidates will present the results of their research in a 12-20 page paper. Candidates have a choice to write the project in either their target language or in English, under the direction of their graduate advisor.
3. M.A. General Examination: After completing all course work for the degree, candidates are required to pass a written and an oral General Examination based on a reading list. Candidates in the literature concentration must be prepared to discuss all the works listed in their chosen areas both individually and in relation to each other and to the period in which they are written. The written exam requires candidates to choose three fields from Spanish reading list. 4. Oral Exam: For the oral examination Spanish candidates are responsible for one additional area of their choice from the reading list, one additional area based on course work taken in culture or literature, and the three areas covered in the written exam. This examination is scheduled 7 to 10 days following successful completion of the written exam. It lasts a minimum of one hour and is conducted by an M.A. Committee. Indirect Assessment: Student evaluations, annual reports, and teaching portfolios are evaluated by the Department’s executive committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

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

**Encourage Scholarship**
Supervise student work that can be presented at professional meetings.
- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Planned
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

**Mentoring**
Mentor M.A. candidates who express a desire to continue graduate work at the doctoral level.
- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Planned
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

**Professional Activities**
Encourage and oversee M.A. candidates’ initiatives (such as the graduate conference) that contribute to student growth and institution visibility.
- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Planned
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Spanish Faculty

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Speech BA**

*As of 12/13/2016 23:11 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
Speech communication explores the construction, diffusion, analysis, and impact of messages as they occur among individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures in the media age. Students will learn major theories and concepts within this discipline that they will then use to create, perform, and critique the effectiveness of various types of communicative acts.

**Goals**
G 1: Communication Development/Strategy
Students understand the development and strategic aspects of human communication.

G 2: Communication Research
Students understand the communication research tradition.

G 3: Communication Competence
Students utilize communication competence and critical thinking skills.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Human Communication Models (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students can identify competing models of human communication.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 2: Communication Variations (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students can describe variations in communication across age, gender, race, culture, and/or disability.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

Strategic Plan Associations
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

SLO 3: Use of Power (G: 1)
Students can explain the use of power in various human communication situations.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4.0 Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
6.0 Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 4: Communication Competence Requirements (G: 1) (M: 3)
Students can explain various requirements for communication competence.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 5: Research Models/Paradigms (G: 2)
Students can identify different research paradigms/models of research in the field of communication.

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 6: Scholarly Publication Summarization (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students can effectively summarize scholarly publications of various kinds.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate
comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 7: Research Process/Results Comprehension (G: 2)
Students can appropriately critique the research process and arguments/conclusions presented in scholarly publications.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 8: Verbal/Nonverbal Skills (G: 3) (M: 5)
Students demonstrate effective verbal and nonverbal delivery skills.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 9: Writing Skills (G: 3) (M: 6)
Students demonstrate effective writing skills.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 10: Adaptation to Diversity (G: 3) (M: 7)
Students demonstrate competent adaptation to diverse audience and communication situation.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

SLO 11: Message Critique (G: 3) (M: 8)
Students appropriately critique the content, structure, and style of oral, written, and mediated messages in a variety of contexts.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Strategic Plan Associations
1.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Comm and Gender Final Exam Question (O: 1)
Students in 4490 Communication and Gender Fall 2010 answered a final exam question asking them to identify four separate theoretical paradigms and how each addressed the question of gender development. Students' answers were coded using the attached rubric. The Competing Models of Communication rubric assesses 3 categories on a 1-5 scale with 1=Poor and 5 = Excellent. The three categories are 1) Identification of four distinct theoretical approaches/paradigms; 2) Explanation of four distinct theoretical approaches/paradigms; and 3) Identification of theories associated with each approach/paradigm.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Human Communication Models
Average of 4 (out of 5) by the majority of the students
### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students in 4490 wrote answers to an essay exam in class and were evaluated using this form in the Fall 2010 semester. Of the 18 students evaluated, 11 students achieved a 4 or higher on the competing models rubric.

### M 2: Intercultural Communication Paper #3 (O: 2)

Students in 3750 Intercultural Communication wrote a paper which asked them to critically analyze an aspect of the English-Only movement in the state of Georgia from at least two perspectives using intercultural concepts and theories. Specifically, students studied various cultural issues surrounding the English-Only Driver's License debate here in Georgia. Students were asked to state as neutrally as possible at least two sides to the issue. Then, students were asked to identify and analyze the cultural issues impacting the debate. Last, students had to take a side on the issue and argue their rationale. The attached rubric assesses students’ ability to understand the variations between cultures that are influencing the immigration debate as it pertains to English-only Driver's License tests. The rubric is a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5 with 1 = Poor and 5 = Excellent. The rubric assesses 1) The ability of student to engage in perspective-taking by fairly and accurately stating more than one side to the debate; 2) The ability of students to identify intercultural concepts particular to this debate; and 3) The ability of students to apply intercultural concepts to this particular debate.

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

**Target for O2: Communication Variations**

Average of 4 (out of 5) by the majority of the students

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students in 3750 Intercultural Communication wrote papers and were evaluated using this form in the Spring 2011 semester. Of the 25 students evaluated, 18 students achieved a 4 or higher on the Situational and Demographic Communication Variations Rubric.

### M 3: Comm & Aging Frasier Character Analysis (O: 4)

Students in Communication and Aging answered a question which required them to analyze the popular Sitcom Frasier to determine the level of communication competence the characters exhibited. Scores were ranked from 1-10, with 1 being poorly answered and 10 being excellently answered.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: Communication Competence Requirements**

7 out of 10 by majority of the students

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students in Communication and Aging wrote a paper which analyzed an aspect of the English-Only debate in the State of Georgia. A writing rubric was developed with analyzed writing based on organization (intro, body, and conclusion elements) and style (grammar, spelling, and APA formatting). The rubric scores students from 1-3 with 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Satisfactory, 3=Good. See attached rubric for further details. Two categories (introduction/conclusion and body) are averaged together to form the Verbal Skills; three categories (use of voice, use of body, rapport with audience) are averaged together to form the Nonverbal Skills.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O8: Verbal/Nonverbal Skills**

Average of 2 (out of 3) by the majority of the students

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

This rubric was used for students in SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity for both the fall and spring semesters. Of the 28 students evaluated, only 7 students achieved an average of 4.0 or higher.

### M 4: Comm & Diversity Annotated Bibliography (O: 6)

This rubric has three items and was applied to an annotated bibliography assignment. The three items include: clear writing style (lack of grammar, spelling and typographical errors), concise explanation of the research, and informative. Each item was measured on a 1-5 Likert Type Scale; see attached rubric.

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

**Target for O6: Scholarly Publication Summarization**

Average of 4 (out of 5) by the majority of the students

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students in SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity gave formal presentations in class and were evaluated with this form in the spring semester. Adapted “The Competent Speaker” evaluation form, a form created by the National Communication Association; assesses 3 categories on a 1-3 scale with 1=unsatisfactory, 2=satisfactory, 3=good. See attached rubric for further details. Two categories (introduction/conclusion and body) are averaged together to form the Verbal Skills; three categories (use of voice, use of body, rapport with audience) are averaged together to form the Nonverbal Skills.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O8: Verbal/Nonverbal Skills**

Average of 2 (out of 3) by the majority of the students

### M 5: Comm and Diversity Presentation (O: 8)

Students in SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity gave formal presentations in class and were evaluated with this form in the spring semester. Of the 14 students evaluated, 11 students achieved a 2.0 or higher on the Verbal Skills Dimension. Of the 14 students evaluated, 11 students achieved a 2.0 or higher on the Nonverbal Skills Dimension.

### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students in SPCH 3750 Intercultural Communication Spring 2011 wrote a paper which analyzed an aspect of the English-Only debate in the State of Georgia. A writing rubric was developed with analyzed writing based on organization (intro, body, and conclusion elements) and style (grammar, spelling, and APA formatting). The rubric scores students from 1-3 with 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Satisfactory, and 3=Good. See attached rubric for more details.
### Target for O9: Writing Skills

Average of 2 (out of 3) by the majority of students

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met

Students in SPCH 3750 Intercultural Communication wrote a paper analyzing an aspect of Georgia's English-only debate. They were required to have proper organization and style usage. Of the 25 students evaluated, 12 of them achieved a 2 or higher on the Writing Rubric.

### M 7: Targeted Health Message (O: 10)

Students studied a particular group all semester, and as part of their final assignment, they created a "targeted health message" for their group. This required identifying a specific health issue, explaining that health issue and articulating how that health issue was appropriate for their group; in addition, they were expected to identify the format of this health message (e.g., banner ad on website, print advertisement in paper, public service announcement on the radio, etc.), explain the details of the message format, and articulate how this message format was appropriate to their selected group. A rubric was created to measure these 6 items on a 1-5 Likert Type Scale. See attached rubric.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

### Target for O10: Adaptation to Diversity

Average of 4 (out of 5) by the majority of the students

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

This rubric was used for students in SPCH 4800 Communication and Diversity for both the fall and spring semesters. Of the 32 students evaluated, 19 students achieved an average of 4.0 or higher.

### M 8: Persuasion Response Paper #13 Obama Campaign (O: 11)

Students in Persuasion wrote a Paper which they analyzed message efficacy in a specific context. The assignment was as follows: “Based on the information provided in the extra reading and the explanation of political campaigns in the textbook, explain why Obama's campaign was more effective than McCain's campaign during the 2008 presidential election. (Effectiveness is based on the fact that Obama won).” Students were evaluated on their ability to connect the persuasion theory/concept to the given situation. Students were awarded between 0 and 10 points. This was not the grade given on the assignment, but was, rather, a portion of the whole grade. (The other sections included explained the concept, explained situation, grammar/spelling, and source citation. These elements are not included in this measure.)

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

### Target for O11: Message Critique

Target Level: 7 (out of 10) by a majority of the students.

#### Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Students in Persuasion wrote a paper analyzing message efficacy in the Obama and McCain campaigns. They were required to apply Persuasion theories to the assigned situation. Of the 21 students evaluated, 21 achieved a score of 7 or higher on this measure.

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

#### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Early Fall Semester 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Speech faculty

#### Develop Measure for Objective #3: Power

One of our objectives is for students to be able to explain the use of power in various human communication situations. For this cycle, we did not collect data to measure this objective. For the next cycle, we need to identify specific courses and assignments that could give us the necessary data to measure this objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Discuss with Speech Faculty courses in which "power" is taught. Identify assignments that can be used for data and develop plan for gathering that data.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty

#### Develop Measure for Objective #5: Research Paradigm Identification

One of our objectives is to teach students to identify different research paradigms in the field of communication. For this cycle, we did not collect data to measure this objective. For the next cycle, we need to identify specific courses and assignments that could give us the necessary data to measure this objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
Develop Measure for Objective #7: Research Critique

One of our objectives states that we want students to be able to appropriately critique the research process and arguments/conclusions presented in scholarly publications. For this cycle, we did not collect data to measure this objective. For the next cycle, we need to identify specific courses and assignments that could give us the necessary data to measure this objective. Also, we will discuss the annotated bibliography assignments with faculty teaching upper division/research courses. We will encourage faculty to move beyond having these be summary assignments to having them require research critique.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Meet with Speech Area faculty to discuss classes and assignments that will give us the necessary measures.

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Area Faculty

Gather additional data

One of the goals of the Speech Major is equip students to summarize scholarly research. The target was not met for this objective. To better understand whether this an ongoing and/or widespread issue with our students, we should gather more data from additional assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comm & Diversity Annotated Bibliography | Outcome/Objective: Scholarly Publication Summarization

Implementation Description: Have discussion with faculty teaching upper division, especially research courses, which assignments best assess ability to summarize research and make a plan to gather student work to analyze for next year's assessment. Also have discussion about assigning annotated bibliographies as first-round assignments in classes that require a term paper.

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty

Writing Rubric Design

I would like to revise the writing rubric scale. The current scale ranges from 1 to 3. Revising the scale will allow it to more accurately reflect the range of students' current ability levels. Also, this will allow the assessor to understand in which areas students need further training. Further, the rubric should also assess the content of the paper to see that the content is accurately and thoroughly explained. The current rubric does not assess content.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Intercultural Communication Paper #3 | Outcome/Objective: Writing Skills

Implementation Description: Assessment Coordinator for Speech will research potential writing rubrics to use in writing courses and decide upon one to use for next year's assessment data.

Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator for Speech

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

- We significantly revised our assessment plan from last year. We did this in three ways. First, we revised our mission statement to be specific to the Speech Area rather than using the Communication Major's mission statement. This more accurately reflects the Speech track and differentiates our mission from the other tracks in the department. Second, we revised our goals. A few of our goals were too broad. We narrowed our focus and picked measurable goals. This allowed us to discuss as a faculty what our focus was and what we felt students should leave knowing/understanding. Last, we worked to tie our goals and objectives to the both the university's strategic plan and the general education curriculum. Because we changed all of these things, this was our first attempt to assess our new objectives.

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

Based on this year's assessment data, we will engage in discussions that center around the following:

Improving assignments, developing a rubric that cuts across classes, assigning annotated bibliographies in more classes, and working on developing broader knowledge of discipline in Persuasion course. One way we can improve based on this data is to adapt the assignments we give students to enhance student learning. In two specific instances, the faculty will discuss ways in which assignments can move from basic summary or description assignments to assignments that require critique and synthesis. The targeted health message will move from just being described to being developed. The annotated bibliography will move from requiring just a summary to requiring a critique of the article. A second way we can improve based on this data is to develop a writing rubric that cuts across classes. Students in our major are clearly struggling with writing skills. If we create a rubric which students grow accustomed to seeing and faculty grow accustomed to using, the goals and expectations will become increasingly clear. We could then pinpoint in which areas students struggle more. Having a shared rubric could allow us to have more beneficial discussions about gaps in student learning. A third way we discussed improving is (potentially) assigning annotated bibliographies in more courses as a precursor to term papers. In addition to giving students more writing opportunities and exposure to scholarly research, the faculty are also discussing whether we should build modules into lectures wherein we teach students how to read and understand research articles. A fourth goal for improving students learning based on this data is to more consciously use the Persuasion course (one of our CTW courses) as a class to develop a broader knowledge of the communication discipline.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Sports Administration MS**

(Include 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.

**Standard Associations**

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

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

**Standard Associations**

1. Outcomes of administrative support services (3.3.1.2)

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)
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)

O/O 6: Socio-cultural Aspects of Sport (M: 4)
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.

O/O 8: , (M: 4)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Major Projects (O: 1, 2, 5)
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).
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

M 2: Papers (O: 1, 2, 7)
Papers in each course will be evaluated by the instructor of that course. Evaluation emphasis will be on writing skills, coverage and accuracy of the content, and accurate citation with review of literature. Evaluation will be of equal parts of each item. 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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 3: Presentations (O: 1, 2, 5)
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.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 4: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8)
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.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2010-2011 Sports Medicine MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The program for the major in sports medicine prepares students for career opportunities in the field of athletic training. The program includes course work and laboratory experiences in the 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

**O/O 1: Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice (G: 5) (M: 1, 3, 6)**
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.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 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.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

### Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

### Standard Associations

4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

### Strategic Plan Associations

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**O/O 2: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 2, 4, 6, 7, 8)**
Students develop advanced proficiency in the acute care and management of activity related injury and illness.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

5.0 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.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

### Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

3 Timely graduation

### 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

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

**O/O 3: Demonstrates effective Sports Medicine Administration (G: 1, 3) (M: 4)**

(Draft/In Progress) Students through daily participation, demonstrate administrative functions in a variety of athletic settings.

### General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

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

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

3 Timely graduation

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

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Institutional Priority Associations

2 Student promotion and progression

Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
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1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
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Standard Associations

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

Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
2 Student promotion and progression
3 Timely graduation

**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**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

### 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 will submit an abstract for poster or oral presentation at a scientific conference.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 27 students successfully presented 5 times a semester providing relevant research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Understands importance of professional development and service to the profession**
All students will complete 4 "shadows" of various sports medicine professionals. Also complete 2 volunteer sports coverages in the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 27 students completed 4 &quot;shadows&quot; of various sports medicine professionals. Also completed 2 volunteer sports coverages in the state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: Acute Care Certifications (O: 2)**
Students will obtain American Red Cross Professional CPR certification and 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 27 students are currently certified by the American Red Cross in Emergency Response, CPR, and First Aid. All 27 student are currently certified by the NATA BOC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of graduating student completed acceptable research project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Clinical Site Evaluation (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)**
Site evaluations are performed twice yearly. Meetings are held between student and clinical supervisors to discuss strengths and challenges within clinical setting and profession.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care**
Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Demonstrates effective Sports Medicine Administration**
Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation</strong></th>
<th>Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students received a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: Case Study (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6)**

Students will demonstrate proficiency in completing all aspects of the case study by the end of the graduate program. The case study was designed to incorporate all aspects of health care charting, teaching the various means of initial injury evaluation, (all five essential components), the main components of treatment planning, and then the primary components of treatment and rehabilitation progression. The template was also designed to meet both collegiate setting requirements and state and federal reporting mandates.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O1: Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O5: Understands importance of professional development and service to the profession</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must complete a case study every semester and present it to peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: Proficiency Exam (O: 2, 4, 6)**

Students must demonstrate clinical proficiency in all areas of sports medicine.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O2: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must receive a B or better on exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must receive a B or better on exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation**
Students must receive a B or better on exam.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
91% of students received a B or better on their initial attempt and therefore did not require a second attempt. 9% of students fell below a B or better and therefore received a B- or less in the course.

**M 8: Final Competency Exam (O: 2, 4, 6)**
Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of curricular material
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care**
All students pass the sports medicine portion of the comprehensive exam with a 3.5 or better on two injury based case studies.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
All students taking the comps passed with a 3.5 or better.

**Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**
All students pass the sports medicine portion of the comprehensive exam with a 3.5 or better on two injury based case studies.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
All students taking the comps passed with a 3.5 or better.

**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 injury based case studies.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
All students taking the comps passed with a 3.5 or better.

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

**Maintain and Monitor**
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2008-2009 academic year

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Acute Care Certifications | **Outcome/Objective:** Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care
- **Measure:** Case Study | **Outcome/Objective:** Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- **Measure:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice
- **Measure:** Clinical Site Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates effective Sports Medicine Administration
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- **Measure:** Professional Presentations | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
- **Measure:** Orthopedic Assessment and Injury Rehabilitation | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities

**Implementation Description:** Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities | Knows orthopedic Assessment and Evaluation Mgt.

**Evidence based research project**
Students will identify, critique, and present current literature on various topics related to athletic training practice. Students will also get into small groups and select a topic of interest related to athletic training practice and perform a system review. Project purpose, methods, results, and conclusions will be presented to class. The systematic review projects will take place during the Evidence Based Medicine Course.

- **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

**Implementation Description:** Presentation assignments have been added to Rehabilitation and Modalities classes.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Shelley Linens
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Since last year’s assessment report, we have fine tuned the research project to have clearly defined expectations and due dates throughout the entire year. These changes were made to improve the quality of research. We will further fine tune the research process with an Evidence Based Medicine class in the first summer semester and have added a special section, just for our students, of the basic research course required by the College of Education. This class will better address our students’ needs in quantitative analysis. We have also changed the credit hours associated with our Rehabilitation class from 2 hours to 3 hours in order to better prepare our students for rehabilitation of a wider variety of injuries and for the rehab components of the final competency exam. We have also decided to have only one biomechanics course, instead of 2, because biomechanical concepts are not a primary focus of our program and therefore shouldn’t require a second course. This new course will be created for the Sports medicine professional.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
No changes will be made based on this year’s assessment data. Curriculum and course changes were submitted during the year and will go into effect in the next year. Changes include: Evidence Based Medicine Course add Credit hours have been increased for Rehabilitation class, from 2 to 3. There were 2 biomechanics courses, but there will only be one in the future. Course has been streamlined and will be directed to only our students.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
We have continued to meet most of our goals and have submitted curriculum and course changes in hopes of better preparing our students to meet all of our goals.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Implementation of curriculum and course changes submitted during this assessment period. We anticipate a 5% improvement in Final Competency scores and final grades in Rehabilitation course.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
President of National Association visited campus and gave a presentation. Five curriculum changes were submitted and accepted. Website updated. Began annual alumni party at Annual Sports Medicine Conference.

Challenges for Next Year
Offering a cadaver lab for the Graduate Anatomy class.

Publications and Presentations
One graduate student presented at Regional Sports Medicine conference.

Academic Teaching Activities
Three teaching assistant positions are open each semester to assist with undergraduate anatomy course and athletic training lab class.

Service to the External Community
Two students presented taping and splinting skills to local physicians. Seven students volunteered for medical coverage at the Peachtree Road Race. Six students volunteered for medical coverage at the Georgia Games.
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 and Physical Rehabilitation, Exercise Physiology, and Exercise Psychology 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

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

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

O/O 4: Grant writing and management (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 5)
Graduates are prepared for careers that involve grant writing and management skills

O/O 5: Cultural sensitivity (G: 3) (M: 6)
Graduates are prepared to work with individuals who are culturally and individually different

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 2010-2011 - Target: Met
All eligible students passed their comprehensive exams. All graduating students received professorships.

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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
50% of students met this requirement.

Target for O2: Understanding of research
100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

50% of students met this requirement

**M 3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)**

Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understanding of research**

100% of the students will complete this requirement

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All students taking statistical/research design courses 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 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

75% of students have successfully completed their cognate. The remaining 25% of students are on track to complete their cognate.

**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 managment**

95% of students will meet this requirement

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

100% of the students have completed seminars addressing grant writing/management and/or have written grant proposals. At least one student had their proposal 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 2010-2011 - 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
**Measure:** Seminar and professional development | **Outcome/Objective:** Grant writing and management

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
**Responsible Person/Group:** Kinesiology faculty

**Research presentations**
Kinesiology faculty need to review research programs to insure that doctoral students are participating and presenting research prior to dissertation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) 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 students. This program insures that students are making adequate progress in their program, as well as in their residency requirements.

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

This year’s analysis indicated that a small percentage of our students may not be meeting the requirement related to research presentations before their dissertation. A meeting among the Kinesiology faculty will address whether this perceived deficiency is real or an artifact.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Taxation MTX**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 04:11 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).

**SLO 2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge (M: 4, 5)**
Students will demonstrate technical knowledge of tax law in the key areas of corporations and partnerships.

**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
### 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: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**

Average score of 70 on questions of Identifying Issues.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

- Fall 2010: 71.63
- Spring 2011: 75.96
- Summer 2011: 67.98

#### 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: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**

Average score of 70 on Locating Authority self-tests.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

- Fall 2010: 53.79
- Spring 2011: 66.05
- Summer 2011: 57.41

#### 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: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**

Average score of 70 on Evaluating Authority self-tests.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

- Fall 2010: 82.63
- Spring 2011: 79.04
- Summer 2011: 80.43

#### 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: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge**

Class average of 85%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

- Summer 2011: 86 average
- Fall 2011: 84 average

#### 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: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Acquisition of substantive tax knowledge**

Class average of 85%.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

- Spring 2011: 87.8
- Summer 2011: 88.9

#### 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: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Demonstrate professional communications skills.**

Students are assessed on their overall average in the class with a target of 80%.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 90.15

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)

**Locate Authority -- Change Measurement**
Old Locating Authority tests used strict boolean logic requiring the students to use connectors and specific syntax to formulate searches. Most professional research systems now allow "natural language" searching and a less rigid boolean logic. Our previous instrument did not allow the flexibility that is now found in professional research systems, so we have changed the measurement to incorporate modern research methods.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Developed the instrument in Fall 2011. Revised the questions in Spring 2012.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucia Smeal

**Substitute Boolean Logic self-tests with Final Exam Research Questions**
The Locating Authority tests used Boolean logic requiring the students to use connectors and specific syntax to formulate searches. However, most students now use "natural language" or Google-type searches. Thus, while the students were performing adequately on in-class research assignments, they did not do well with purely Boolean searching. As of Fall 2011, we no longer use the Locating Authority website self-tests tests to assess the students. Instead, we are developing a final examination questions with research questions that will allow the students to use more updated methods of locating tax authority.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We will develop a final, take-home exam for TX 8030 which requires the students under time pressure to perform independent research incorporating the elements of each of the first three learning objectives with a focus on locating authority. The target score for the exam is 85%. The exam will function as the Locating Authority assessment in conjunction with continued use of the MTX writing websites for the other two assessments.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Tx 8030 Professor

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2010-2011 Teaching & Learning EdS**

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

### Goals

**G 1: Develop Education Experts in Concentrations**

Accomplished graduates of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning will demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration. Concentration areas include Art Education, English Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, Music Education, Reading...
Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

**G 2: G2: Develop Education Experts, Inquirers & Leaders**

Accomplished graduates of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning will develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders, and instructional specialists in their areas of concentration. Concentration areas include Art Education, English Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 1: O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development (G: 1) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are committed to student learning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are experts in their areas of concentration and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development (G: 1) (M: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate responsibility and expertise in managing and monitoring student learning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 4: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience (G: 1, 2) (M: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 5: O5: Participates in Learning Communities (G: 1, 2) (M: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate how their professional growth is impacted through participation in one or more learning communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target for 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 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

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: Participates in Learning Communities
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

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: Finished
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: Finished
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: Finished
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)

Ed.S. TLG Program Deactivation In-Progress
In September 2010, we submitted 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. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree program.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated. Students are no longer being accepted into the program. Faculty are ensuring that students currently enrolled matriculate through the completion of their degree.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Program Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
NA

### Academic Program Question 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
In September 2010, we submitted 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. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

### Academic Program Question 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
In September 2010, we submitted 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. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

### Administrative Dept Question 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
In September 2010, we submitted 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. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

### Administrative Dept Question 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
In September 2010, we submitted 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. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

### Administrative Department Question 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
In September 2010, we submitted 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. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.
### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

### Goals

**G 1: Develop Researchers in Teaching and Learning**

Accomplished graduates of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning degree program will demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

### Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Research Competence (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Knowledge of Foundations of Education (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Creates New Knowledge in Major (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Extensive Knowledge of Major Field (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Extensive Knowledge in Cognate Area (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Professional Identity and Contributions (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates a professional identity by his/her contributions to the community of scholars and educators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 7: Teaching and Professional Development (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 8: Technology as Tool for Inquiry (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ph.D. candidate understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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: Research Competence**

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings 2010-2011 - 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: 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 2010-2011 - 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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

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.
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.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an in-depth understanding of and expertise in technology 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)

**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:** 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)

**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:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2012
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Department Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1:** Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

NA

**CTW Reflection 2:** Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

NA

**CTW Reflection 3:** Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

NA
Goals

G 1: Urban Teacher Leadership M.S.
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.

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.

**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. Students will also design and conduct a major research study.

Relevant Associations: The National Board for Professional Teaching standards have as one of its core propositions that teachers critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen their knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills and incorporate new findings into their practice. The Standards for Advance Programs in Educational Leadership state that candidate demonstrate the ability to use appropriate assessment strategies and research methods to understand and accommodate diverse school and community conditions and dynamics. The standards also state that candidates demonstrate an understanding of how to use appropriate research strategies to promote an environment for improved student achievement.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Practicum Project Rubric, Reading, Presentation (O: 1, 3)**

EPEL7680 - On the practicum project, students are graded on a portfolio which includes the following: internship plan (0-15 points), internshiplog (0-20 pts.), career development plan (0-10 pts.), personal/leadership profile (0-10 pts.), self-assessment essay relating 8 roles of leadership (0-10 pts.), school improvement action research proposal(0-35 pts.). EPS 8970A-students are graded on class participation(0-50pts),45-50pts- prepared, read assignments, knows material,demonstrates authentic interest in subject matter, participates frequently, 39-44pts - prepared/read assignments, knows most of the material, demonstrates interest in the subject matter, participates frequently, (33-38pts)-semi-prepared, semi-read assignments,demonstrates uncommitted attempt to subject matter, participates only occasionally, (0-32pts) - not prepared and did not read material,does not know the material and does not participate in class. Students are also graded on a position paper and presentation(0-50pts).45-50pts - demonstrates thorough reading of material with carefull analysis and critical insight. Presentation is clear,intersting, engaging and thoughtful. Handout is clear, concise and virtually error-free. (39-44pts)-demonstrates a standard analysis and typical insight. Presentation is generally clear, somewhat engaging, but handout is unclear. (33-38pts) student demonstrates little reading,cursory analysis and vague insight. Presentation is generally unclear and difficult to follow. Handout is unclear and has numerous errors.(0-32pts) demonstrates no reading, poor analysis. Presentation isunrelated to the text. Handout is not present. [Preview Formatting]

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**M 2: Course Activities - Papers, Projects, Presentations (O: 2)**

EPSF7120 - students are graded on interview papers (0-20pts.), peer-reviewed group presentations (0-25 pts.), position papers (0-35pts.), journals (0-20 points). EPEL 7410 - Students are graded on instructional supervision issue (issue paper -(0- 20 pts); issue paper/presentation -(0- 20 pts), mid-term exam -(0- 30 pts), final exam -(0-30 pts). EPSF 7450- students are graded on: reform model curriculum handout (0-10pts) reform model curriculum presentation (0-15pts), educative experience paper (0-25pts.), history of curriculum timeline(0-10 pts) history of curriculum paper (0-15pts), curriculum position paper(0-25pts).

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

**M 3: Research Project (O: 3)**

These are applied courses and the assignments are action oriented. In EPRS7910 - Students are graded on: research journal (20pts.), exam(20pts.), action research project (60 pts.) (0-20pts) research journals; (0-20pts) - action research report; (0-20pts) - action research presentation. In EPS 7980 the students earn credit for supervised development and preparation of the master’s project. Students receive an “S”, “IP” or “F”.

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.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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 school systems in other cities in the United States and abroad. Currently, faculty is planning for school visits in Chicago, IL, in Summer 2010, and London, England, in Summer 2011. By taking part in these experiences, students will have a broader understanding of how systems can vary greatly in how they address student needs.

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

**Maintain and Monitor**
Faculty will continue to implement the program as designed, while monitoring all current student learning outcomes in the 2009-2010 academic year.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Responsible Person/Group: Faculty members

**Practicum (EPEL 7680A and 7680B) Requirements**
Because of changes to programs in the educational leadership unit, the requirements and assignments for EPEL 7680a and EPEL 7680b were modified to better support the roles required of school leaders and teacher leaders. EPEL 7680A now focuses on preparing students to 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

---
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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: 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.

**SLO 2: Thesis Development (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 4)**
Shows the ability to develop a clear and coherent thesis that directs the entire paper or exam response.

**SLO 4: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives (G: 3) (M: 2, 3, 4)**
Apply feminist/womanist perspectives to contemporary sociocultural issues

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 3: Writing skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
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.

**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. In the 2010-2011 cycle, we decided to look only at a sample of the final papers, because we are measuring writing skills in general, and not only those developed in a single class. We also switched the number system so that 5 is high because the old way of doing it confused members of the committee.

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. This time, we only looked at the final assignment, and we switched the scale so that 5 is excellent, and 1 is unacceptable, in the interests of clarity.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**
We found that 91% of students scored at least a 3, and that 55% scored a 4 or 5, so that we met our achievement target.

**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. In terms of our action plan, instead of reworking our targets, we decided to focus only on the later papers this year, in order to measure what they know after they have been in the class.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
On this measure, we found that 73% received at least a 3, and 64% received a 4 or 5. While these results indicate that we did not actually meet our target for basic skills, we were quite close. It also suggests that students either scored quite high or low; there were not a lot of average scores in this section. I suspect that this disparity has as much to do with their writing skills before entering university as it does with the specific results of the class.

**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. Once again, on this target, we also only had samples from the final paper, and we had continued to use the altered scale.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**
In terms of evidence, 91% of students received at least a 3, and 73% scored a 4 or 5, which exceeds our expectations. In terms of sentence-level skills, 73% of students received at least a 3, and 45% received a 4 or 5, which does not quite meet our expectations. This is the first time that I remember students doing better on evidence than on sentence-level skills; perhaps we have spent so much time focusing on how to provide sufficient evidence that we have actually helped students increase their skills, and now we can turn our attention to sentence structure.

**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' 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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

On this measure, we found that 83% of students received at least a 3 (on the switched scale), but only 12% received a 4 or 5, which again suggests that increased attention to Thesis Development is helping students to achieve certain base-line expectations, but not to excel at the rate we would like to see.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

In terms of writing skills, once again we have measured these both in terms of evidence as well as in terms of sentence-level skills. In terms of evidence, 100% received at least a 3, and 50% received at least a 4, which exceeds our expectations. In terms of sentence-level skills, we found that 88% received at least a 3, and 33% received at least a 4, which suggests that we met our expectations in terms of average skills, but not in terms of excellent writing.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In terms of demonstrating knowledge, we found that 100% of students received at least a 3, and 67% of students received at least a 4. This finding exceeds our expectations, which shows, once again, that students are most successful in terms of demonstrating knowledge, especially compared to their development of basic 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In terms of the writing skills, we found that 88% scored at least a 3, and 63% scored a 4 or 5. Here, we have met our goals, once again demonstrating that students often demonstrate stronger writing skills in terms of essay exams than they do on papers. Or, the results suggest that we score their writing skills a bit differently.

**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 2010-2011 - Target: Met

In order to measure how well students demonstrate their understanding of feminist/womanist perspectives, we decided to read these through two rubrics: one measures the responsiveness of the answer to the question, and the other measures their demonstration of general feminist/womanist knowledge. I am happy to report that our target goals were met on both these rubrics. In terms of showing knowledge, 100% received at least a 3, with 88% scoring a 4 or 5. In terms of measuring the response, 100% of these also received at least a 3, with 75% scoring a 4 or 5.

**M 4: Personal Narrative Paper (O: 2, 3, 4)**

Dr. Julie Kubala WST 2010 First Paper Assignment Summer 2011 This handout will outline not only the requirements for the paper, but also give you some guidelines for peer review. 1) Your paper assignment is to write a personal narrative exploring your relationship with gender and/or feminism (identity and/or politics). 2) Although it is a personal narrative, it is important that you include analysis. 3) In order to facilitate the inclusion of sufficient analysis, be sure you can find a clear and focused main point (thesis statement) in your own and others' papers. 4) One way to accomplish this goal is to choose a specific experience to describe and then analyze in the context of its relationship to your identity. 5) One thing to be careful of is to avoid being too broad – you cannot cover your entire life or identity in a relatively short paper!!! 6) Even though the assignment is to write narrative, storytelling should not take up more than half the paper. 7) As with any other essay, it should be concise, organized, and well-written. 8) Because it is a personal narrative, you might not adhere strictly to grammar rules; one way to check whether your writing is sufficiently clear is to ask your peer group to pay particular attention to your sentence structure. 9) In the peer group process, be sure to offer constructive criticism – while it is nice to begin with emphasizing the positive aspects of the paper, simply telling the writer that "this is good" does not really help them. 10) Part of the benefit of peer review involves increasing your own reading skills; ideally, this process should help the reviewer as well as the author of the paper. 11) The paper should be approximately 4-6 pp. long, typed, double-spaced, 12
You do not need a title page (although you do need a title) – simply put your name and course time at the top.

12) You should bring enough copies of your paper to class for your group on June 27. Rubric: 1 2 3 4 5 Clear, focused, analytic main point 1 2 3 4 5 Engaging and significant narrative; relevant to important class topics 1 2 3 4 5 Sufficient and specific evidence; well developed 1 2 3 4 5 Organization – in this, the narrative and analytic sections should be nicely integrated 1 2 3 4 5 Clearly written

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

### Target for O2: Thesis Development

In terms of developing a thesis, we realistically believe that 75% of students should receive at least a 3, with 50% scoring a 4 or 5. In other words, we expect 3/4 to demonstrate basic competence, with half performing well in terms of writing a thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of writing a thesis, we found that 88% scored at least a 3, and 50% scored a 4. While we have met our goals here, we are just at them, so I think we can work further on developing thesis statements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O3: Writing skills

In terms of writing skills, we realistically believe that 75% of students should receive at least a 3, with 50% scoring a 4 or 5. In other words, we expect 3/4 to demonstrate basic competence, with half showing that they have strong writing skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On this rubric, I am happy to report that 100% of students scored at least a 3, and 63% scored a 4 or 5, which meets our target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives

In terms of demonstrating the mastery of feminist/womanist perspectives, we realistically believe that 75% of students should receive at least a 3, with 50% scoring a 4 or 5. In other words, we expect 3/4 to demonstrate basic competence, with half showing that they have a strong ability to apply their knowledge of content to a particular project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2010-2011</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Here, we are also using two measurements: one measures the application of feminist/womanist knowledge, and the other involves students’ ability to combine experience and theory into a clear and coherent analysis. This second rubric, then, provides a somewhat different take on the demonstration of perspectives, involving a more skill-based measurement. In terms of the experience-theory rubric, 88% of students scored at least a 3, and 50% scored a 4 or higher. While that does meet our target, the results here also suggest that while students are doing better at achieving adequacy than excellence. In terms of the applied knowledge rubric, 88% also received at least a 3, and 63% received a 4 or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
- **Implementation Description:** We have done so for the last year.
- **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):**
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:** What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have made a couple of changes in the assessment process within the last year. The primary change we have made is that we have developed a Writing Instruction Sheet that we distribute in order to remind students of several writing techniques. These papers allow us to both further develop our assessment of students' writing skills as well as assessing clear examples of "connecting experience to theory." As we worked on the assessment report this year, we realized that we need to include "connecting experience to theory" as a specific learning outcome. In this year's report, we ended up merging two rubrics: "demonstrating appropriate feminist/womanist knowledge" and "connecting experience to theory"; we need to separate these out, as they really cannot be assessed together. The other revision that we have made in the past year is to slightly rework our targets. We continue to struggle with how to realistically assess what students are learning in our classes, given the wide disparities in writing skills that students have when they enter college.

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

As we continue to assess our introductory classes, we continue to realize that we can work to improve writing instruction within the classroom. While we traditionally have spent a great deal of time focusing on thesis statements, we clearly still need to maintain this focus, as students are still having difficulty with this skill. In terms of sentence-level skills, we have not focused on this issue particularly, as we have not really noticed a problem here before. Or, maybe the other areas are improving so that the slight weakness in this aspect has become more apparent.

**Increased writing instruction**

Given that the two areas in which we did not completely meet our targets were thesis and sentence-level writing skills, we will try to increase our writing instruction in the classroom. While we traditionally have spent a great deal of time focusing on thesis statements, we are still having difficulty with this skill. In terms of sentence-level skills, we have not focused on this issue particularly, as we have not really noticed a problem here before. Or, maybe the other areas are improving so that the slight weakness in this aspect has become more apparent.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

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

Measure: Reading Response papers | Outcome/Objective: Writing skills

**Increased writing instruction**

Since we have found extremely similar results on both of these measures, it seems clear that the action plan that is mentioned for the reading response papers should also be established for the analytical papers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

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

Measure: Analysis Papers | Outcome/Objective: Writing skills

**pilot program with WAC consultants**

In the academic year 2011-2012, we are planning to utilize Writing Across the Curriculum Graduate Consultants in two of our courses in order to see if the availability of more intensive one-on-one tutoring can aid with the persistence of writing problems that we continue to identify. Since students are generally stronger in terms of demonstrating their ability to comprehend and use key feminist/womanist concepts, we are continuing to work on strengthening the writing components of our introductory courses.

*Additional Resources: WAC consultants*

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Julie Kubala
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.

SLO 2: Evidence (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)
Students should demonstrate their critical thinking through writing skills by providing sufficient evidence for claims and developing their arguments clearly and carefully.

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.

SLO 4: Theoretical Perspectives (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Students should be able to demonstrate their knowledge of appropriate interdisciplinary feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives in their written work.

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.

SLO 6: Critical thinking through writing skills (G: 2) (M: 1, 3, 4)
This outcome measures general writing skills, syntax, grammar, punctuation; it focuses on the clear and coherent expression of ideas.

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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
For this outcome, we were pleased to find that 100% scored at least a 3, and 67% scored a 4 or 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Application of skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

In terms of the scores measuring students ability to apply their argument skills well, once again 100% scored at least a 3, and 50% scored a 4 or 5, which does meet our target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Critical thinking through writing skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

For this objective, we found that 100% of our students scored at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5. This results shows that we are meeting our target for basic competence, but not for excellence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Creative Project (O: 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Theoretical Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Application of skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

For this measure, we found that 86% received at least a 3, and 30% received a 4 or 5. Once again, we are finding that we are getting close to our target in terms of people doing basically well, but we are not reaching our target in terms of people doing above competence in terms of developing new research questions.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met**

For this measure, we found that 83% of students received at least a 3, and 36% received a 4 or 5. We are regrettably far from our target here, which suggests that we need to renew the focus on developing research questions more carefully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

On this outcome, we found that 83% of students received at least a 3, and 73% received a 4 or 5. While we did not completely meet our target here, it seems less dramatic than the "research questions" outcome, and we can tie in some writing improvement with the action plan for the previous objective.
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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
Here, we found that all students received at least a 3, and 64% received a 4 or 5. Again, we came quite close to our target 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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met
We are pleased that all of our students received at least a 3 on this rubric, and 82% scored a 4 or 5. As usual, this aspect of our assessment tends to be the strongest, suggesting that students are learning the content well.

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). In the 2010-2011 assessment year, we switched the 1-5 of the scale, because the committee said it was clearer that better scores should be represented by higher numbers.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
On this rubric, we found that all students achieved at least a 3, and 73% received a 4 or 5, coming very close to our target. Nor surprisingly, yet again, students who scored well on demonstrating knowledge also tended to do well in terms of application of skills.

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 poor and 5 as excellent).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
We are pleased to report that 100% of students received at least a 3 on this rubric, and 64% received a 4. Once again, students are gaining basic competence in writing, but we are not having as much success with getting students to go beyond these basic expectations.

M 4: interview/film critique (O: 2, 4, 6)
I'm not sure if I should even include this assignment, because I didn't get a copy of the actual assignment. I'll try to fix this as soon as I can.

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

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 4 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as poor and 5 as excellent).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Not Met
We found that 75% of students received at least a 3, but 0% received higher. I am not sure about using these sample papers, as they are very poor representations, and I am not completely sure what they show.

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 4 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as poor and 5 as excellent).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
We found that 75% of students received at least a 3, and 25% of students received at least a 4. Again, I am not sure about including this sample set within the assessment.

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 4 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as poor and 5 as excellent).

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met
Here, we found that 100% of students received at least a 3, but 0 received a 4 or 5.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assignment Re-selection
Select more appropriate assignments to evaluate; in particular, we should increase the kinds of assignments we evaluate so we can take in the wide variety of pedagogical approaches within our faculty.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: ongoing
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
Additional Resources: time

Improve rubrics
Consider implementing more explicit criteria to define rubrics for student assignments. To do so, we should collectively decide as a faculty what rubrics we would use to evaluate student assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: ongoing
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
Additional Resources: time

Modify assessment
Departmental Conversation about evaluators’ interpretations of measures and/or the measures themselves

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: ongoing
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty
Additional Resources: time

Early intervention
We are designating our 3010 course, Feminist Theories, as a Critical Thinking Through Writing Course, which should focus attention on student writing earlier in the program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: Research Questions
  Implementation Description: Fall 2007
  Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
  Responsible Person/Group: Core faculty (Many of us teach WSt 3010)

Increase critical thinking through writing skills
Given that our assessment targets were not met in two particular areas: organization and evidence, it appears that our students are having the most difficulty in terms of critical thinking through writing skills. Hopefully, given that students will need to take a CTW course earlier in their careers, that will help students improve in these areas. Until the CTW is fully operational, we can work to increase writing instruction throughout our upper-level courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: Research Questions
  Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
  Responsible Person/Group: Core Faculty

Increased writing instruction
We need to develop a plan that will implement early intervention (perhaps a professor approval) of research questions.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Final Paper | Outcome/Objective: Research Questions

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

While we are not proposing a change in our rubric as of yet, we do need to carefully evaluate the effectiveness of our rubrics. One consistent pattern that we have recognized this year is that students are doing well in terms of acquiring basic competence in their
writing skills, but we are not meeting our targets for students to excel at these skills. We should probably more carefully calibrate our rubrics, so we can see exactly what our students continue to have difficulty with, so that we can formulate interventions that will more directly address the problems that they have. I think that our first priority has been to work toward basic competency for all students, and while I agree with this priority, we need to figure out how to encourage already strong writers to improve. One further change that we will make is to decrease the number of measures that we assess. Since our assessment is so strongly focused on writing skills (and rightly so, I believe), then it is not particularly useful to assess the interviews/film critiques, since these formats do not allow students to really show their writing skills. Also, since we had so few examples of this measure, it is hard to derive any useful results from the assessment process. We will continue to assess the longer upper-level papers, since they provide much more reliable information for us to increase our effectiveness in the classroom.

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

This year, we observed that students had the most difficulty with the aspect, "developing new research questions," so we will work on addressing that issue more concretely within our upper-level classrooms. One suggestion for improvement would require students to turn in proposals for their papers, which will include a working thesis and an outline, so that teachers will be able to guide students into strong and well-thought-out thesis statements. In similar CTW classes, we have required a revision component in papers which has been quite effective in terms of increasing students' writing skills. While this would be desirable in these courses as well, we do not have the necessary time to require revisions of all papers. Furthermore, we will encourage all professors to utilize the writing instructional materials that we have developed for the core courses. Although these materials are primarily aimed at lower-level courses, much of the basic information about thesis statements, evidence, organization and sentence structure can prove a useful reminder for all writers (and professors!). Once again, I think it is important to note that we are almost always meeting our targets in terms of students' demonstrating basic competence in their writing. Currently, we are emphasizing meeting our targets for excellent writing, since we have previously been focusing on achieving basic skills. In some ways, it will be far more difficult to achieve these targets since our students do not take a sequence of courses, and since so many of them declare their major so late in their college careers. I would also emphasize that students continue to do well on the aspects of the rubric that measure "demonstrating knowledge" or "applying feminist/womanist skills." It seems clear that our students are learning the concepts that we teach quite well, and that it is their communication of these ideas as well as their writing skills in general, that we should continue to work to improve.

---
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(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>Women's Studies 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. The field therefore makes explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct one's understandings of the world. Furthermore, women's studies analyzes 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, Women's Studies classes emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Research Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Research Questions (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist and/or womanist research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SLO 8: Evaluating Arguments (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)** |
| Students will demonstrate their ability to evaluate the claims, arguments, and chain of reasoning present in texts. |

| **SLO 9: Organization (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)** |
| Students will structure their papers and thesis proposals in a clear and coherent fashion. |

| **SLO 10: Overall Grammar (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)** |
| Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills through effective writing. |
Students will demonstrate proficiency in overall writing and grammar skills, including syntax, punctuation, and citation.

**SLO 11: Theoretical Frameworks (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of key feminist and/or womanist theoretical perspectives and apply them in their own work.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: 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

**Target for O7: Research Questions**

Our target is for all of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Target for O8: Evaluating Arguments**

Our target is for all of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Target for O9: Organization**

Our target is for all of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Target for O10: Overall Grammar**

Our target is for all of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**M 2: final paper for graduate class (O: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)**

Write a 10-12 page paper based primarily on readings outside of class. Your paper will take up such questions as: What is method? How does it work? What are its epistemological and ontological assumptions? What can it offer? What are its limitations? I will evaluate your paper on the basis of the following (with an emphasis on #1): 1) You have a clear thesis and argument that you develop through evidence, example, and analysis. 2) You should be clear in your use of terms (e.g., "feminism", "experience"), through definition, example, or both. 3) You provide (and use) a reference list that includes at least 10 sources. 4) You use standard format (double space, 12 point font), spell check, proof-read, and don't exceed page limits.

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

**Target for O7: Research Questions**

Students will achieve at least a score of 3.5 out of 5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Met**

We found that all of our students met this target, with a range of 3.5 - 4.75. We further tabulated the results according whether the students were first year or second year students, and we found that the first year average was 4.09, while the second year average was 4.56.

**Target for O8: Evaluating Arguments**

Students will achieve at least a score of 3.5 out of 5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

We found that 83% of our students met this goal. We further tabulated the results to separate them out according to first and second year students, and we found that the first year students achieved a score of 3.969 while the second year students achieved a score of 4.75.

**Target for O9: Organization**

Students will achieve at least a score of 3.5 out of 5.

**Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met**

We found that 83% of our students met this target, with a range of 3.25-4.5. We further tabulated the results to separate them out according to first and second year students, and we found that the first year students achieved an average score of 3.94 while the second year students achieved an average score of 4.5.

**Target for O10: Overall Grammar**

Students will achieve at least a score of 3.5 out of 5.
Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

We found that 83% of our students met this target, with a range of 3.25-4.625. We further tabulated the results to separate them out according to first and second year students, and we found that the first year students achieved an average score of 3.875 while the second year students achieved a score of 4.5.

Target for O11: Theoretical Frameworks

Students will achieve at least a score of 3.5 out of 5.

Findings 2010-2011 - Target: Partially Met

We found that 83% of our students met this target, with a range of 3 - 4.625. We further tabulated the results to separate them out according to first and second year students, and we found that the first year students achieved an average score of 3.84 while the second year students achieved an average score of 4.56.

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: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: final paper for graduate class | Outcome/Objective: Overall Grammar
  - 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: Finished
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: thesis proposal | Outcome/Objective: Research Questions
- Implementation Description: We will incorporate more training and workshops on writing a research question in the proseminar. 
  - Responsible Person/Group: the instructor for the Proseminar in consultation with women’s studies core faculty.
  - Additional Resources: none
  - Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: final paper for graduate class | Outcome/Objective: Organization
  - 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)

emphasis on core courses

Like the "evaluating arguments" outcome, in this area first years collectively scored lower than second years (with first years achieving an average of 3.84 compared to second years who achieved an average of 4.56). It makes sense, then, to focus on the core courses, all of which are offered (and required) in the first year. These are already the courses in which students are expected to gain a solid understanding of feminist and womanist theoretical frameworks. Instructors of these courses will be advised to emphasize the theoretical frameworks with our first year students.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** final paper for graduate class  
**Outcome/Objective:** Theoretical Frameworks

**Implementation Description:** Instructors will implement the action plan in a way that makes sense in the context of their course.

**Responsible Person/Group:** All core course instructors.

**Additional Resources:** NA

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Focus on reading for graduate school in core courses**

While the first year students collectively met the goal of achieving a 3.5, it is clear when looking at the separated results that the weakness in this area lies in the first year class (second years scored very high -- 4.75) and could be attributed to the fact of just having entered graduate school. Our plan to address this, then, will be focused on the core classes (WST 8001 Feminist Theories), WST 8002 (Globalization and Gender), WST 8003 (New Directions in Feminism), and WST 8004 (Feminist Methodologies). These are required courses for all first year students, and are the classes in which the largely acclimate to the program and to graduate school. Instructors of these core courses will put a greater focus on teaching strategies for reading at the graduate level, possibly including assignments such as critical responses, in which students must summarize the argument before providing analysis.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: final paper for graduate class  
- Outcome/Objective: Evaluating Arguments  
- Theoretical Frameworks

**Implementation Description:** Instructors for each of the courses will implement this action plan in whatever way makes the most sense for their class, given the structure of their assignments.

**Responsible Person/Group:** All instructors of the WST core classes.

**Additional Resources:** NA

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g., revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

While we maintained the same learning outcomes, we realized that perhaps we were not using the best tool to measure these outcomes. Because the students' weak areas were in grammar, organization, and formulating research questions, we thought these might be better assessed using a regular seminar (final) paper rather than the first draft of the thesis proposal that they produce in the proseminar. Further, we sought a means of accumulating some data about the differences (if any) between our first and second year students, and the thesis proposal only captured first year students. Therefore, this year, we used final papers from a sampling of graduate courses in order to assess a range of students in a more general context. We haven't yet used comprehensive exams as a measure, though the comprehensive exams are the tool we use internally to determine whether students have synthesized the core courses. Since our action plans are beginning to focus on the core courses, it seems logical that the next measure we would use is the comprehensive exams. If possible, we will combine these with a sampling of final papers from regular graduate seminar courses.

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

We have recently made a major curriculum revision in our program, which is to require a Women's Studies proseminar, and we have seen tremendous positive results from that. Because it is a major change, we are still honing the class, and part of that honing has been in relation to the assessment findings (i.e., greater focus on formulating research questions in prosemin). Because this year's action plans focus on putting greater emphasis on our learning outcomes in the core classes, we will implement pedagogy discussions at the departmental level in order to share strategies, successes, and failures regarding the implementation of the action plans.