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### 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

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

**SLO 2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113) (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)**
Students display financial accounting knowledge

**SLO 3: Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210) (G: 2) (M: 16, 17, 18)**
Students display knowledge about Managerial Accounting

**SLO 4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310) (G: 2) (M: 19, 20, 21, 22)**
Students display knowledge about accounting information systems

**SLO 5: Taxation (ACCT 4510) (G: 2) (M: 23, 24, 25)**
Students display knowledge about Taxation

**SLO 6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610) (G: 2) (M: 26, 27, 28, 29, 30)**
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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Mean ranged from 62% to 93%. For 2011/2012, we had two primary objectives: (1) improve attendance and (2) increase the number of students who attend the accounting lab. Although average attendance remained at 75%, we had a definite improvement in the number of students who attended the accounting lab. First, the number of hours the accounting lab was open increased from 15 hours per week to 30 hours per week. In fall 2011, 203 students visited the accounting lab a total of...
In spring 2012, 193 students visited the accounting lab a total of 1,023 times. In previous semesters total visits averaged 220 with approximately one third of the visits from a handful of students. Another possible effect of the accounting lab was that the withdrawal rate for the course dropped to 9% compared to 10 – 11% in earlier years as students get more personalized help.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Mean ranged from 50.5% to 79.7% For 2011/2012, we had two primary objectives: (1) improve attendance and (2) increase the number of students who attend the accounting lab. Although average attendance remained at 75%, we had a definite improvement in the number of students who attended the accounting lab. First, the number of hours the accounting lab was open increased from 15 hours per week to 30 hours per week. In fall 2011, 203 students visited the accounting lab a total of 865 times. In spring 2012, 193 students visited the accounting lab a total of 1,023 times. In previous semesters total visits averaged 220 with approximately one third of the visits from a handful of students. Another possible effect of the accounting lab was that the withdrawal rate for the course dropped to 9% compared to 10 – 11% in earlier years as students get more personalized help.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Mean ranged from 47.2% to 81.9% For 2011/2012, we had two primary objectives: (1) improve attendance and (2) increase the number of students who attend the accounting lab. Although average attendance remained at 75%, we had a definite improvement in the number of students who attended the accounting lab. First, the number of hours the accounting lab was open increased from 15 hours per week to 30 hours per week. In fall 2011, 203 students visited the accounting lab a total of 865 times. In spring 2012, 193 students visited the accounting lab a total of 1,023 times. In previous semesters total visits averaged 220 with approximately one third of the visits from a handful of students. Another possible effect of the accounting lab was that the withdrawal rate for the course dropped to 9% compared to 10 – 11% in earlier years as students get more personalized help.

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 65% or more on exam questions
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Mean ranged from 75% to 86%

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 65% or more on Exam questions
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Mean ranged from 75% to 94%

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
Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)
Mean of 65% or higher on exam questions
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Mean ranged from 71% to 84%

M 7: Time Value of Money (ACCT 4111) (O: 2)
Apply time value of money concepts to financial accounting measurements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Target for O2: Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Mean Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Assets (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Mean of 65% or more on exam questions</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>66% to 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Liabilities (ACCT 4112) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Lease Contracts (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Mean of 70% or higher</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record deferred tax assets and liabilities (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Mean of 70%</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Pensions (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions</td>
<td>Not Reported This Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Shareholders Equity (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14: Advanced Statement of Cash Flows (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</td>
<td>Prepare an advanced level statement of cash flows with complex transactions</td>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</td>
<td>Mean of 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> Not Reported This Cycle</td>
<td>Topic was not done in class due to lack of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 15: Apply theory, standards and judgment (ACCT 4113) (O: 2)</th>
<th>Apply financial accounting theory, professional standards and judgment to record business transactions</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2:</strong> Financial Accounting (ACCT 4111, 4112, 4113)</td>
<td>Mean score of 70% or higher on a case assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>Mean score was 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 16: Develop performance measures (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)</th>
<th>Develop appropriate financial and non-financial performance measures for effective planning, evaluation and control of organizations' business processes.</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)</td>
<td>Mean of 65% or more on exam questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>Mean is 66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 17: Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)</th>
<th>Evaluate the appropriateness of alternative costing systems and methods by considering the unique context of specific product and service organizations.</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)</td>
<td>Mean score of 73% or higher on exam questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>Mean is 72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Structure and model business problems (ACCT 4210) (O: 3)</th>
<th>Structure and model business problems to evaluate alternatives, conduct sensitivity analysis on assumptions, and analyze outcomes to determine causes and variances.</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3:</strong> Managerial Accounting (ACCT 4210)</td>
<td>Mean score of 65% or higher on exam questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> Not Met</td>
<td>Mean is 63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Query Databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)</th>
<th>That students query databases to provide insights about business operations and performance</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4:</strong> Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)</td>
<td>Exam score for new WheelsNow case: In process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>Because a new case was developed for assessing database query performance, no direct comparison with the prior year's performance is possible. The case needs to be revised before establishing target scores next year. The new case has two parts, one for improved spreadsheet skills and one for distinguishing between spreadsheets and databases for specific analytical applications as it develops students' querying skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: Design Business Processes (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)</th>
<th>That students design business processes and represent them with documentation tools</th>
<th>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)

Performance on 24-Seven part 1 case questions: 72.2

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The least-squares mean of 68.7 was not significantly different from the target. FY2011 was the second year a new case was used for developing business process skills. While it was not associated with improved performance on the learning objective, scores on its sub-parts were significant predictors of performance on the learning objective.

M 21: Design and Implement Databases (ACCT 4310) (O: 4)

That students design and implement well-structured databases to enable business processes

Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)

Better than 2006-07 performance on BloomScape case questions (62.2)

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The least-square mean of 62.9 was not significantly different from the target. Students have a really hard time assimilating a large volume of information about a business situation and making sense of it.

M 22: 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

Target for O4: Accounting Information Systems (ACCT 4310)

Exam score for 24-Seven Part 2 questions: 62.3

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

The least-squares mean of 55.2 (4% less than the mean in FY2011) was below the target. This year’s decline in performance is likely attributable to one week less class time devoted to the learning objective due to an additional week being spent on database querying at the beginning of the term.

M 23: Identify Tax issues (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)

Identify tax issues in unique fact patterns

Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)

Mean of 75% or higher on exam questions

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Mean was 75%

M 24: Select and Apply Tax Laws (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)

Select and apply appropriate tax laws to unique fact patterns

Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)

Mean of 75% or higher on exam questions

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Mean was 76%

M 25: Make Investment Decisions using Tax Law (ACCT 4510) (O: 5)

Make investment decisions requiring knowledge of the tax law and its effect

Target for O5: Taxation (ACCT 4510)

Mean of 75% or higher on exam questions

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Mean was 77%

M 26: Differentiate among the various types of auditing (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)

Differentiate among the various types of auditing and the procedures applied on the financial statements audits and audits of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 27: Evaluate the components of audit risk (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the components of audit risk and the appropriate audit approach to address the risks identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 70% or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 28: Apply the opinion formulation process (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 70% or more on exam questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 29: Understand evaluate the auditor's responsibility (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and evaluate the auditor's responsibility on the audit engagement and determine whether that responsibility was adequately fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 70% or higher on exam questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 30: Evaluate, integrate and apply different types of audit information (ACCT 4610) (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Audit and Assurance (ACCT 4610)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score of 75% or higher on team project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** A. Faye Borthick

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Cathy Patridge

ACCT2101 and ACCT2102
See Action Plan for Measure 1

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Cathy Patridge

ACCT2102 and ACCT2102
See Action Plan for Measure 1.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Clark and Cathy Patridge

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

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

ACCT4210
See Action Plan for Measure 8

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

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

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

ACCT4510

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

Delete Course and Revise Curriculum
In ACCT4410, students performed below target in a significant number of sub-learning outcomes pertaining to Measures #26 and #27. ACCT4410 relies a lot on the material learnt in ACCT4110. You cannot analyze certain parts of the financial statements if you dont know how to prepare or understand those parts of the financial statements. Since ACCT4110 omitted many important topics, students were ill-prepared for ACCT4410 on these topics and performed poorly on them. The above two issues indicate an urgent need to revise the curriculum to include more financial accounting. Given that there is a course similar to ACCT4410 at the graduate
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

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.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
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: 08/2010

Reduce grace days and focus on budget analysis
For 2012/2013, we will reduce the “grace days” a student is allowed to miss class. We have been fairly generous in the participation points a student earns by attending class allowing several drops in this category but it may have caused attendance to be lower as students are not motivated to attend class if they have “grace days”. Budgeting and relevant variable analysis continue to be a difficult topics for the students. We will revamp these chapters to try and narrow the focus without losing the learning objectives. It is possible our approach to these topics is too broad; therefore, not allowing us to delve deeply enough into just a few examples of these topics.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
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: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Clark

Reduce grace days and focus on budget analysis
For 2012/2013, we will reduce the “grace days” a student is allowed to miss class. We have been fairly generous in the participation points a student earns by attending class allowing several drops in this category but it may have caused attendance to be lower as students are not motivated to attend class if they have “grace days”. Budgeting and relevant variable analysis continue to be a difficult topics for the students. We will revamp these chapters to try and narrow the focus without losing the learning objectives. It is possible our approach to these topics is too broad; therefore, not allowing us to delve deeply enough into just a few examples of these topics.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Reduce grace days and focus on budget analysis
For 2012/2013, we will reduce the “grace days” a student is allowed to miss class. We have been fairly generous in the participation points a student earns by attending class allowing several drops in this category but it may have caused attendance to be lower as students are not motivated to attend class if they have “grace days”. Budgeting and relevant variable analysis continue to be a difficult topics for the students. We will revamp these chapters to try and narrow the focus without losing the learning objectives. It is possible our approach to these topics is too broad; therefore, not allowing us to delve deeply enough into just a few examples of these topics.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Shift lease chapter to ACCT 4112
Shift lease chapter to ACCT 4112 so that the pensions chapter can be covered in ACCT 4113.

Streamline students’ study
Streamline students' study of internal control to enable them to grasp the essential concepts of internal control more quickly.

Video Tutorials
We will start preparing video tutorials that focus on the more procedural components of the course so that we can spend more time in class on developing problem formulation and critical thinking skills.

Video Tutorials
We will start preparing video tutorials that focus on the more procedural components of the course so that we can spend more time in class on developing problem formulation and critical thinking skills.
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Comprehensive exams (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of comprehensive examinations as judged by a committee of appropriate faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Comprehensive exams</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of students will pass comprehensive exams on their first attempt. Of those failing and allowed to retake the exam, 50% will pass on their second attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the students taking comprehensive exams in the past five years, 84.6% have passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Critical Analysis Seminar and workshops (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Critical evaluation of research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Research with faculty (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Collaborative research activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the six students in their third year or beyond in 2022-2012, four have research projects with faculty members. This is 66.7%, which is below our target of 75%. Of the five graduates in the past six years, four have had active research projects with faculty, which at 80% is above our target for active research projects. However, only two of the five graduates (40%) have had research published or actively under review. This is below our target of 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Research presentations (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will present their research at internal workshops and professional meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Research presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students beyond the second year have presented at least one research project internally. Of the five students who graduated in the past six years, three have presented at research conferences. At 60%, this is above our target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Dissertation Defense (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful defense of the dissertation conducted before a faculty committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Dissertation defense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students who attain ABD status will successfully defend their dissertations before a faculty committee; 75% on their first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of graduates in the past six years defended their dissertations on the first attempt. Of the six students currently ABD status, all are on track to propose and defend their dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Initial placements - research (O: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will accept positions at research institutions, preferably at schools offering doctoral degrees in accounting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O6: Initial placements - research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of graduating students will place at research institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the five students who graduated in the past six years, three (60%) have placed at research-focused universities. This exceeds our target of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students who have entered the program in the past five years have completed the seminar in their first semester, before teaching for the first time in the summer.

**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 minimum 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students currently in the program have taught in their first summer, and after passing their comprehensive exams. All graduates in the past six years have taught an upper-level course, which is greater than our 50% goal. Of the six students currently in the program who have taught beyond their first course, all have attained a score of 4.2 in at least one section. Five of the six do so consistently. Although these data show that we meet our goal this year, we are still pursuing our action plan for improving teaching effectiveness.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Of the five students who graduated in the past six years, 100% have placed at an AACSB accredited university.

**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
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning of the Fall 2010 semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** SOA Doctoral Program Committee

**Improve initial pass rate on comprehensive exams**
The initial pass rate is slightly lower than our target rate of 70%. However, our pass rate on the second attempt is above our target rate. The net effect is an overall pass rate consistent with our expectations given our desire to place students at research institutions. Therefore, we are not concerned about the overall pass rate. To improve the initial pass rate, we have restructured our assistantship funding effective in 2011-2012 such that students will not be required to teach during the summer session while studying for their comprehensive exam. This should allow them more time to prepare for the exam.

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

**Improve research collaborations**
Although we are meeting our target of 50% published/submitted papers by graduation, we are below our target in terms of stimulating collaborative research.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
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 did not place any graduates in this cycle. The major achievements related to goals from last cycle was to improve the teaching evaluations for existing students. We also worked on improving the research focus of the students by improving the rigor required for the 2nd year paper and, by providing funding for the second summer, providing more time for students to work on a quality research project.

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 more active in the research workshops. We have initiated a requirement for students to sit in the front row and instructed presenters to call on students first. This has put pressure on students (in a good way) to be more active in the workshops. As such, they are developing their critical analyses 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?

We still struggle with how to get joint research projects going with students. We need additional faculty resources in order to be able to work more with students. As it stands now, the students need to be proactive in generating research ideas. Whereas this works well for the more confident students, other students could benefit from more faculty 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?

The major changes have been to try to develop closer faculty/student relations. We have also worked on encouraging students to mentor each other. This has resulted in improved teaching evaluations and more active research workshops.

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 not changed our learning outcomes, measures or targets since the last report.

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 has highlighted two shortcomings in our program: 1. The need for students to have a larger research portfolio upon graduation. The process has stimulated us to institute a formal annual meeting with each student to review their work, a monitoring system to encourage workshop participation, a formal second year summer paper, and to restructure our teaching/research stipend system in order to allow the students more time to conduct research. 2. The need for some students to improve their teaching abilities. The process has stimulated us to monitor the students and to take steps (such as mentoring) to help them improve their teaching skills.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

Based on last year’s results, we moved the comprehensive exam date forward in order to allow students more time to work on their second year summer papers. That is, we continued to look for impediments to student research productivity and found that they were focused on the known task of comp preparation to the detriment of the more ill-defined task of research. We also began fully funding students via research stipends in year 2 and through the first semester of their 3rd year in order to free up research time.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

The findings reveal that we need more faculty depth to fully mentor the PhD students. There needs to be a decent sized student body for the students to be energized but the trade-off is the need for more faculty resources.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We are going to evaluate how many students to admit for 2013-2014. We are also trying to recruit more senior faculty members.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

Improving student comps pass rate; improving student teaching evaluations. Recruiting three students with GMAT scores above 700 - this should provide us with a nice incoming class.

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

Challenges for next year are related to faculty hiring. If we can hire more senior faculty to mentor the students, research productivity and student placements should improve.
Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

not applicable

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

n/a

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).

n/a
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2011-2012 Actuarial Science BBA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:40 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 formulas.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Selected and Identified Quiz Questions in AS 4340 | Outcome/Objective: Comprehension of theoretical & technical materials
  | Mastery of life contingencies | Structure and solve problems

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

---
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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
- **Enterprise Risk and Integration | Explanation of technical concepts**

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

**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
Georgia State University
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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 overgeneralizes 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.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Exceeded goal. 90% of the students were able to comprehend and effectively communicate the desired content in using the appropriate context, grammar, and syntax.
Target for O2: Communication
Target: 80% of the students will receive a score of 3 or higher.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Exceeded. 90% of the students were able to comprehend and effectively communicate the desired content in using the appropriate context, grammar, and syntax.

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)

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.

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 from the assessment suggest that students are demonstrating mastery of both analytic and communication skills in the core curriculum. As a result, no changes or improvements are deemed necessary.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 African American Studies BA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:40 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

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

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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

**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:

**Acquisition of Knowledge.**  
5. Paper articulates key concepts and theoretical stance that informs the research. 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 / or fails to organize interdisciplinary scholarship; and 1) Paper relies primarily on rhetoric and generalized arguments. Communications Skills.  
5. Paper is clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Paper is free of and uses appropriate (APA) writing style required for course. Citations are appropriately included to leave no room for charges of plagiarism. References are included appropriately according to required style;  
4) As 5 above with some minor (2 – 4) punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes  
3) As 4 above with no more than 6 punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes;  
2) Paper has some lack of clarity as well as several punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes and does not properly make citations or references;  
1) Paper is confusing or unclear in structure and includes several punctuation, grammar and syntax mistakes. Paper does not use appropriate writing style and / or does not include citations or references.  

**Analytical Skill:**  
5) Paper reflects skillful collection of data required for research. The paper reflects a careful reading and understanding of social 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 / or fails to organize interdisciplinary scholarship; and 1) Paper relies primarily on rhetoric and generalized arguments. Communications Skills.  
5. Paper is clearly written with appropriate punctuation, grammar and syntax. Paper is free of and uses appropriate (APA) writing style required for course. Citations are appropriately included to leave no room for charges of plagiarism. References are included appropriately according to required style;  
4) As 5 above with some minor (2 – 4) punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes  
3) As 4 above with no more than 6 punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes;  
2) Paper has some lack of clarity as well as several punctuation, grammatical or syntax mistakes and does not properly make citations or references;  
1) Paper is confusing or unclear in structure and includes several punctuation, grammar and syntax mistakes. Paper does not use appropriate writing style and / or does not include citations or references.  

**Acquisition of Knowledge.**  
5. Paper articulates key concepts and theoretical stance that informs the research. Paper includes a clearly stated hypothesis. Paper reflects use of multiple levels of data acquisition (primary, secondary, etc.). Paper demonstrates an understanding of relationship between the lived experiences of African Americans and the Global African community. Paper applies an application of data to understanding the impact of societal, economic and political factors on the life chances of people of African descent;  
4) As 5 above, but the paper does not include a clearly stated hypothesis;  
3). As 4 above but the paper does not reflect us of multiple levels of data acquisition;  
2) Paper is overly focused on personal opinion and generalizations. No data is included to support thesis and / or no application is made to the lived experiences of people of African descent;  
1) Paper has no clear hypothesis and no clear articulation of conceptual / theoretical stance informing research. Data is not applied appropriately to the lived experience of people of African descent.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate logical reasoning**  
80% of the students will receive a rating of 3 or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
AAS 3975: Met. 90% of the students demonstrated their ability to write a reflective critique of an economic, social, and or political issue affecting people of African descent. While the goal was met 50% of those students performed at the lower boundary of the goal. AAS 4980: Met. Of the students who selected the research proposal option, 100% of them scored 3 or better on their ability to analyze socio economic issues affecting the Africana community, communicate effectively, and acquire and apply new concepts. Action taken: Continue to triage students among academic and applied and research projects to allow students to engage in more relevant learning experiences.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate communication skills through writing**  
80% of the students will receive a score of 3 or higher on communication.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
AAS 3975: Met. 100% of the students demonstrated their ability to write clearly and use appropriate grammar and syntax. Again, while the goal was accomplished, 50% of those students performed at the lower most boundary for the goal. AAS 4980: Met. Of the students who selected the research proposal option, 100% of them scored 3 or better on their ability to analyze socio economic issues affecting the Africana community, communicate effectively, and acquire and apply new concepts. Action taken: Continue to triage students among academic and applied and research projects to allow students to engage in more relevant learning experiences.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate knowledge of field**  
80% of the students will receive a score of 3 or higher on acquisition of knowledge.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
AAS 3975: Met. 100% of the students demonstrated their ability to acquire and apply new concepts, however 62% of those
students performed at the lower most boundary for the goal. AAS 4980: Met. Of the students who selected the research option, 100% of them scored 3 or better on their ability to analyze socio economic issues affecting the Africana community, communicate effectively, and acquire and apply new concepts. Action taken: Continue to triage students among academic and applied and research projects to allow students to engage in more relevant learning experiences.

### 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)

---

**Re-write**
Students who score 3 or lower on the pre-midterm assignments will be given the option of re-writing the assignment under the supervision of the writing lab or a WA consultant if applicable.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Implementation Description: Faculty will work with the GRA or WAC to develop an early identification system for students who struggle with analysis and synthesis of course content.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Assigned faculty for the course
Additional Resources: Writing Across the Curriculum consultants
Budget Amount Requested: $2,600.00 (recurring)

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, or will be 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.

Based on the data from the assessment faculty teaching 3975 and 4980 will institute an earlier alert program. The early alert system will target students who score 3 or lower on the initial assignments for revision and resubmit. Students who score 3 or lower will be referred to the writing lab or the WAC consultant for corrective intervention.

Georgia State University
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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 two external reviewers conduct a blind review of student's research proposal on its ability to convey merit of the proposal, significance, innovation, application of theory, methodology, and human subjects concerns. The assignment is designed to give students preliminary feedback on their research proposal prior to submitting the final paper. The external review panel consists of AAS faculty and external researchers. The reviewer's scores are aggregated to compose the students' grade for the assignment. Each mock review lasts between 15 to 20 minutes. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, CO4 and SLO2, SLO3, SLO5. Impact Score Descriptor Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses High 1 Exceptional (A+/100)
Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses 2 Outstanding (A/ 95) Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses 3 Excellent (A-/ 90) Very strong with only some minor weaknesses Medium 4 Very Good (B+/ 89) Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses 5 Good (B/ 85) Strong but with at least one moderate weakness 6 Satisfactory (B- 80) Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses Low 7 Fair (C+/ 79) Some strengths but with at least one major weakness 8 Marginal (C/ 75) A few strengths and numerous weaknesses 9 Poor (C- 70) Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

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  2011-2012 - Target: Met

The Mock Research Proposal Presentation: This assignment is a mock review of the research proposal. It is designed to give students preliminary feedback on their proposal prior to submitting the final paper. Two external reviewers will be assigned to read each proposal and give feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. The external review panel consists of AAS faculty and external researchers. The reviewer's scores are aggregated to compose the students’ grade for the assignment. Each mock review lasts between 15 to 20 minutes. The goal of this assignment is to give students constructive feedback on the primary components of the proposal and its merit in advancing the body of knowledge in AAS. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, CO4 and SLO2, SLO3, SLO5. Impact Score Descriptor Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses High 1 Exceptional (A+/100) Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses 2 Outstanding (A/ 95) Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses 3 Excellent (A-/ 90) Very strong with only some minor weaknesses Medium 4 Very Good (B+/ 89) Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses 5 Good (B/ 85) Strong but with at least one moderate weakness 6 Satisfactory (B- 80) Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses Low 7 Fair (C+/ 79) Some strengths but with at least one major weakness 8 Marginal (C/ 75) A few strengths and numerous weaknesses 9 Poor (C- 70) Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses Communication: Goal: Met. Over 80% of the students scored 3 or better on the communication competencies (Introduction & Literature review). Analytic skills: Partially met: 77% of the students scored 3 or better on Analytic skills (Theory/Concepts); Knowledge acquisition: is composed of two elements (Significance & Methodology). 100% of the students scored 3 or better on explaining the benefits of the proposed research, however performed less well on explaining the data collection processes for their proposals (55%)

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  2011-2012 - Target: Met

The Mock Research Proposal Presentation: This assignment is a mock review of the research proposal. It is designed to give students preliminary feedback on their proposal prior to submitting the final paper. Two external reviewers will be assigned to read each proposal and give feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. The external review panel consists of AAS faculty and external researchers. The reviewer's scores are aggregated to compose the students’ grade for the assignment. Each mock review lasts between 15 to 20 minutes. The goal of this assignment is to give students constructive feedback on the primary components of the proposal and its merit in advancing the body of knowledge in AAS. This output is related to the following course objectives and student learning outcomes: CO1, CO2, CO4 and SLO2, SLO3, SLO5. Impact Score Descriptor Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses High 1 Exceptional (A+/100) Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses 2 Outstanding (A/ 95) Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses 3 Excellent (A-/ 90) Very strong with only some minor weaknesses Medium 4 Very Good (B+/ 89) Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses 5 Good (B/ 85) Strong but with at least one moderate weakness 6 Satisfactory (B- 80) Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses Low 7 Fair (C+/ 79) Some strengths but with at least one major weakness 8 Marginal (C/ 75) A few strengths and numerous weaknesses 9 Poor (C- 70) Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses Communication: Goal: Met. Over 80% of the students scored 3 or better on the communication competencies (Introduction & Literature review). Analytic skills: Partially met: 77% of the students scored 3 or better on Analytic skills (Theory/Concepts); Knowledge acquisition: is composed of two elements (Significance & Methodology). 100% of the students scored 3 or better on explaining the benefits of the proposed research, however performed less well on explaining the data collection processes for their proposals (55%)

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
Priority: High
Implementation Description: External reviewers will be enlisted to review and assess graduate research proposals. Results will be given in a Mock Review setting.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Revised Thesis Checklist

Review committee to establish relevant competencies for multidisciplinary program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Committee to review and report to AAS faculty
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Review committee
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)
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: Writing on Cultural Diversity and Anthropology (O: 1)
Students write short answers to the following question: QUESTION: One of the goals of ethnography is the description and
Students write short answers to the following question.

QUESTION: One of the goals of ethnography is the description and explanation of cultural diversity. A key way this is accomplished is the discovery of local beliefs, practices, perceptions, and meanings, and the comparison of these to other local contexts or to the observations and conclusions reached by the researcher. Answers were evaluated on the following scale: 1 = Unsatisfactory (erroneous or highly problematic and incomplete answer) 2= Satisfactory (demonstrates sufficient understanding but is incomplete OR does not make sufficient use of examples) 3 = Superior (demonstrates clear understanding with good use of examples)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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

- 80% of students should provide satisfactory answers, receiving a ranking of 2 or 3

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

- 61% of students received a score of 3 - 30 % of students received a score of 2 - 9% of students received a score of 1

**M 2: Identifying Major Elements of the Anthropological Critique of Race (O: 2)**

Students respond to standardized examination questions on the anthropological critique of race, focusing on the non-biology of the concept and the relationship between race and ethnicity.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O2: Critique of the race concept**

- 80% of the students are expected to correctly identify the non-biology of race, and demonstrate understanding of the race/ethnicity relationship

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

- 77% of students correctly identified the non-biology and culturally constructed nature of race - 90% of students correctly understood the problematic nature of the race/ethnicity relation

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

#### Streamlining Instruction, Evaluation and Mentorship

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

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

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

Measure: Identifying Major Elements of the Anthropological Critique of Race | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept

**Implementation Description:** We target the next assessment cycle  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010

#### Integrating Instructional and Testing Tools

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

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

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

Measure: Identifying Major Elements of the Anthropological Critique of Race | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept

**Streamlining 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

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

Measure: Writing on Cultural Diversity and Anthropology | Outcome/Objective: Culture and its significance for humanity

#### Instructional emphasis on cultural construction

While the target was barely missed on one question, the result indicates that both the critique of the race concept and the notion of cultural construction are both important and challenging, and should remain central foci of core instruction in anthropology. The faculty has discussed these results and jointly decided to emphasize this issue in the classroom.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

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

Measure: Identifying Major Elements of the Anthropological Critique of Race | Outcome/Objective: Critique of the race concept
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?

This year, both objective, standardized test questions as well as the more open-ended short-answer format were used in assessment. This was an experimental change to test different assessment techniques that allow students a greater degree of reflection and expression. The faculty is currently deliberating on the relative merits of each method. The faculty formally decided on the objectives for the coming cycle. We will maintain the focus on the anthropological critique of the race concept, and assess student learning on natural selection.

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.

These data demonstrated the continued importance of focusing on the anthropological critique on race. As a result, the faculty is formally collaborating on next year’s objectives and targets, streamlining instructional efforts on the chosen themes for each year.
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Mission / Purpose
The Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology focuses the comparative and holistic study of humanity across space and time. Undergraduate education in the Department of Anthropology is committed to: 1. A holistic and comparative understanding of human diversity derived from the anthropological 4-field approach. Students are exposed to biological, linguistic, cultural and archaeological anthropology, their intersections, and their application. 2. A solid grounding in anthropological theory and methodology, including both quantitative and qualitative components. 3. The combination of academic rigor with global social awareness, and community engagement and praxis. The Department fosters politically responsible and ethically sound applications of empirical knowledge that will serve undergraduate in professional fields, spanning medicine, education, environment, forensics, cultural resource management, business and economics.

Goals
G 1: Holistic and Comparative Curriculum
Upon graduation, students will be grounded in four-field, holistic and comparative anthropology. This means that they will demonstrate an understanding of the interconnections between biology and culture among humans in the past and present, and distinguish the social and historical processes involved in the intersections of biology, society and culture in human diversity.

G 2: Command and application of content: concepts, methods and theory
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: Competence in Fundamental Anthropological Methods (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students apply key concepts and methods relevant to each anthropological subfield by conducting specialized methodological exercises. 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/or critically evaluating current, peer-reviewed research in the field.

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 (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 3, 4)

Students identify, apply and critique anthropological theory, methods and knowledge, appropriate to the subfield.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Archaeological Methods - Garbology project (O: 1, 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.

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

**Target for O1: Competence in Fundamental Anthropological Methods**

Scores under 30 are Unsatisfactory, 30-34 is fair, 35-36 is good, 37-38 is very good and 38+ is excellent. Target: - 0 students will receive a score under 30, demonstrating satisfactory ability to apply fundamental archaeological methods and create typologies of material types - Average student scores will be Good or above, demonstrating superior application of methods.

**Target for O2: Content knowledge**

- Scores under 30 are Unsatisfactory, 30-34 is fair, 35-36 is good, 37-38 is very good and 38+ is excellent. Target: - 0 students will receive a score under 30, demonstrating satisfactory ability to apply fundamental archaeological concepts and methods - 75% of students will receive scores of Good or above, demonstrating superior critical analysis and interpretation of material remains, to reconstruct lived experience

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

- Fair: 1 student - Good: 4 students - Very good: 2 students - Excellent: 10 students

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

Students communicate in clear, organized, grammatically correct prose

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All students were rated satisfactory, communicating their findings in clear prose, appropriate for the discipline of archaeology. 12 students (71%) were rated "excellent" demonstrating superior communication quality.

**M 2: Cultural Anthropology - Ethnographic Fieldwork Project (O: 1, 3)**

Students in ANTH 2020 - Introduction to Cultural Anthropology formulate and conduct a short 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. The work is holistically evaluated in terms of the following criteria. These axes are unequally weighted and are listed in 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 correctly utilizes ethnographic methods. C. Approach and Development: The student includes evidence through ethnographic detail and effectively addresses 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.
### Target for O1: Competence in Fundamental Anthropological Methods

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 32 and 37.5 reflecting Satisfactory or Superior performance.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Out of 44 students: 26 students received 37+ points 1 student received 36.5 points 10 students received 36 points 4 students received 35 points 3 students received 34 points 1 student received 33 points 1 student received 31 points 1 student received 27 points. The two students that fell below the target turned in their papers late and thus incurred a penalty. The quality of the work was otherwise on target.

### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

- 41 students (93%) scored 35 and over, reflecting superior ability in constructing an ethnographic narrative - 2 students provided a competent narrative but received late submission penalties - 1 student provided a satisfactory but not superior narrative

### M 3: Biological Anthropology: Apprehending Evolution (O: 2)

Students demonstrate understanding of Darwinian evolution and its historical context, with attention to its role in shaping our understanding of biological process, by explaining the mechanism of natural selection, providing examples, and discussing its limitations. Evaluation is based on a rubric, which weighs explanatory accuracy, appropriate use of examples and competent prose.

#### Target for O2: Content knowledge

Out of 13 possible points: 0 students will receive below 8 (unsatisfactory) - Over 50% of students will receive a score above 11, demonstrating solid understanding of the biocultural relationship.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

- 79% of students scored over 11 - 5% of students scored below 8

### M 4: Capstone Seminar Paper (O: 2, 3)

The Senor Seminar is the capstone course for the department of anthropology and is a CTW course. Assessment, therefore, is based on writing. The measure chosen to assess student learning is a reflective research assignment in which students draw on literature, synthesize, critically analyze and reflect on the nature of anthropological knowledge. Papers are evaluated according to a rubric which measures outcomes on a scale from 1 to 5: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent, and 5=outstanding.

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

#### Target for O2: Content knowledge

All students should score 3 and above, and 75% should receive a 4 or better Normal 0

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

- All students in both sections of the seminar scored 3 and higher - The percentage of students scoring 4 or better were 80% in the first section and 83% in the second section

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

The department CTW rubric outlines specific writing quality targets for its ratings of 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (excellent), and 5 (outstanding). The target for writing quality is that all students will score 3 and above, and 75% of students will score 4 or better.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

- 0 students received below a 3 - 17% of students in section 1 and 20% of students in section 2 were rated as 3 (good) - 83% of students in section 1 and 80% of students in section 2 were rated as 4 (excellent) or 5 (outstanding), demonstrating superior communication.

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

**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

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

| Measure: Cultural Anthropology - Ethnographic Fieldwork Project | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge |
Implementation Description: I will explicitly draw students' attention to these issues and use examples to illustrate the proper use of evidence to support argumentation in an ethnographic context.

Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Additional Resources: n/a

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Seminar Paper | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication

Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Additional Resources: n/a

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Seminar Paper | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Additional Resources: n/a

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Cultural Anthropology - Ethnographic Fieldwork Project | Outcome/Objective: Competence in oral and written communication

Implementation Description: Students will be given access to the handout presenting the most common grammatical errors GSU students make. They will be encouraged to seek assistance over drafts of their work.

Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

Additional Resources: n/a

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Advisement
The instructor will monitor performance and individually advise students to address specific areas of concern

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Biological Anthropology: Apprehending Evolution | Outcome/Objective: Content 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?

In this cycle, all anthropological subdisciplines represented in the department (cultural, biological and archaeological) were included in the assessment. The faculty formally discussed the assessment process in a faculty meeting and: a) reaffirmed the outcomes/objectives focus on methodology, content and communication and b) discussed measures and findings. In the coming academic year, assessment will be further streamlined across mandatory 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 data indicate a solid programmatic structure but in the coming cycle the department will pursue including linguistic anthropology to the core curriculum, completing our mission to provide holistic training to students. An appropriate assessment measure will be devised accordingly.
**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

**Target for O1: Synthesizing knowledge**

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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In the 2011-2012 cycle, 13 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. 11 students passed at the first attempt. 2 students were required to improve on a
portion of the exam by rewriting, and successfully completed it on the second attempt.

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

In their theses and practicum papers, students have to demonstrate the ability to design and conduct original research, along with an in-depth understanding of the field of inquiry, theory and methods pertaining to the research, and proficiency in the writing conventions and formats of the discipline. Students' theses and practicum papers are evaluated by a committee consisting of three regular university faculty members, at least two of whom must be Department faculty members. Students must orally defend 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.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Producing Original Research**

At graduation, all students will produce a satisfactory thesis, conduct revisions and successfully defend their thesis or practicum demonstrating competence in their subfield.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In the 2011-2012 cycle, a total of 18 students reached their final semester in the program. All 18 successfully completed their research projects, and defended their thesis or practicum, completing the study program.

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

**Improving comprehensive examination outcomes**

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.

- **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)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Applied Linguistics BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 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, syntax, and semantics.

**SLO 2: Awareness of Bias (M: 2)**

Students demonstrate awareness that different theoretical and cultural perspectives, their own included, are value-laden and prejudicial.

**SLO 3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure (M: 3, 4)**

Students acquire the skills to analyze language and/or interlanguage structures (e.g., sound structure, word structure, sentence structure, and discourse structure).

**SLO 4: Reporting on Primary Research (M: 5)**

Students demonstrate competency in making credible claims about data they have collected and analyzed themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Written Communication and Editing Skills (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students develop effective written communication and editing skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Foundations of language acquisition (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of what is involved in the acquisition and development of language including its biological and social foundations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Key concepts in sociolinguistics (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Final examinations in foundational course, AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics (O: 1)

The final examination in AL 3021 is comprehensive and assesses student understanding of core areas of linguistics through analyzing language data and answering open-ended or selected response questions.

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

**Target for O1: Core Areas of Linguistics**

80% of students will exhibit mastery of the core areas of linguistic study by achieving a passing score of at least 70% on the final exam in AL 3021.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

During the fall and spring semesters of the 2011-2012 cycle, across 4 separate sections of AL 3021, 98 out of 118 students provided correct answers to over 70% of the questions on the final exam. Since 83.1% of students exhibited mastery of core areas of linguistic study on the final exam of this foundational course, this target has been met.

#### M 2: Final Papers in AL 3031 Language in Society and AL 4151 Communication across Cultures (O: 2)

The CTW papers in AL 3031 are graded on a 4 point rubric that includes the following categories: (A) identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives; (B) shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem. The AL 4151 rubric for CTW papers includes the following categories: (A) demonstrates an honest awareness of one's feelings/thoughts about cultural difference; (B) shows awareness of oneself as a cultural being. The percentage of students scoring at least "competent" on these areas on the final CTW papers in these course will be tabulated.

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

**Target for O2: Awareness of Bias**

On final CTW papers in AL 3031 and AL 4151, at least 80% of students will be judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all relevant criteria on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

During fall and spring semesters, 87.8% of students in AL 3031 scored at least competent on "Identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives" and 80.5% scored at least competent on "Shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem". In AL 4151, 92.3% of students scored at least competent on both "Demonstrates an honest awareness of one's feelings/thoughts about cultural difference" and "Shows awareness that oneself is a cultural being". The target was met across all criteria.

#### M 3: Performance on language analysis problems (O: 3)

The final examinations in AL 4011 Phonetics & Phonology and AL 4012 Morphology & Syntax consist primarily of language analysis problems. The number of students demonstrating competency in linguistic analysis on these examinations will be tabulated.

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

**Target for O3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure**

80% of students will demonstrate competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on the final examinations in AL 4011 and AL 4012.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

28 out of 32 students answered at least 70% of language analysis problems correctly on the final exam in AL 4011. 28 out of 33 students answered at least 70% of language analysis problems correctly on the final exam in AL 4012. Because the number of students demonstrating competence in linguistic analysis on these exams exceeded 80% (87.5% in AL 4011 and 84.8% in AL 4012), this target has been met.

#### M 4: Performance on language analysis papers (O: 3)

In AL 3041 Second Language Acquisition, students write papers critically examining the characteristics of written or oral language samples produced by non-native speakers (i.e., interlanguage). The number of students successfully completing competent interlanguage analysis papers will be tabulated.

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

**Target for O3: Analysis of Linguistic Structure**

80% of students will demonstrate competence in linguistic analysis by scoring at least 70% on interlanguage papers in AL 3041.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In AL 3041, 96.5% of students earned passing scores of 70% or more on assigned interlanguage analysis papers.

**M 5: Final Papers in CTW Courses (O: 4)**
The final papers in CTW courses (e.g., AL 3031 Language in Society, AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, and AL 4241 Senior Seminar in Applied Linguistics) are graded on a 4 point rubric that includes the following categories: (C) presents convincing arguments based on linguistic data and 85.4% scored at least competent on "Draws reasonable conclusions". In AL 4151, 80.7% of students scored at least competent on both criteria. Note that the number judged Not Yet Competent includes students who did not complete coursework, failing to submit a final paper.

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

**Target for O4: Reporting on Primary Research**
On final papers in CTW courses, at least 80% of students will be judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all relevant criteria on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Across fall and spring semesters in the 2011-2012 cycle, 82.9% of AL 3031 students scored at least competent on the final paper with regard to “Presents convincing arguments based on linguistic data” and 85.4% scored at least competent on "Draws reasonable conclusions". In AL 4151, 80.7% of students scored at least competent on both criteria. Note that the number judged Not Yet Competent includes students who did not complete coursework, failing to submit a final paper.

**M 6: Writing assignments in CTW courses (O: 5)**
The final papers in CTW courses (e.g., AL 3031 Language in Society, AL 4151 Communication across Cultures, and AL 4241 Senior Seminar in Applied Linguistics) are rated on a 4 point rubric in five areas, including (E) presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion. The number of students who score "competent" or "sophisticated" in this area on the final papers for these courses 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" on CTW final papers.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
87.8% of students in AL 3031 and 88.5% of students in AL 4151 earned ratings of competent or sophisticated on their final papers in these CTW courses, meeting the target.

**M 7: Exam results in SLA (O: 6)**
Performance on final examination in AL 3041: Second Language Acquisition will be documented.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O6: Foundations of language acquisition**
At least 80% of students will score at least 70% on the final project in AL 3041

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
86.2% of students scored at least a 70% on the final in AL 3041, meeting the target. This is the last time findings for this measure will be reported; the objective has been removed for future cycles since this is no longer a required course in the major.

**M 8: Language in Society paper (O: 7)**
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 O7: Key concepts in sociolinguistics**
At least 80% of students will be judged "competent" or "sophisticated" on all four relevant criteria on the rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
80.5% of students in AL 3031 achieved ratings of Competent or Sophisticated on the final paper across all four relevant criteria on the CTW rubric, meeting the target. This is the last time findings will be reported for this measure, since the related objective has been replaced for future cycles with an objective that better reflects the curriculum of AL 3031 Language in Society and AL 4151 Communication across Cultures.

**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*
Implementation Description: With primary research now required in all AL CTW courses, the second aspect of this action plan has been implemented. With regard to exposure to published research, syllabi for all required AL major courses will be solicited and examined for incorporation of foundational and current publications in course readings. Findings will be reported in the next cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair

reevaluate current measures

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

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

Responsible Person/Group: Lucy Pickering/Undergraduate Committee

Changes to student learning outcomes and associated measures

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

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Outcomes and Measures were modified in 2011 to better reflect the current curriculum. We now have 5 Outcomes and 6 Measures, all of which were met in 2012.

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Performance on language analysis problems | Outcome/Objective: Analysis of Linguistic Structure

Implementation Description: Completed by the faculty during the 2011-2012 cycle. See implementation notes for Revision of Learning Outcomes for further details.

Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair

new outcome

For the next cycle we will add a new outcome related to incultural competence and cultural discovery skills along with associated measures.

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

Implementation Description: Completed by the faculty during the 2011-2012 cycle. See implementation notes for Revision of Learning Outcomes for further details.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair

remove outcome

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Exam results in SLA | Outcome/Objective: Foundations of language acquisition

Implementation Description: Faculty revised outcomes and measured in the 2011-2012 cycle and discontinued this outcome.

Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair

revise assignments

In AL 4151, 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Writing assignments in CTW courses | Outcome/Objective: Written Communication and Editing Skills

Implementation Description: Revisions implemented during the last cycle seem to have made a positive impact, and the targets were met for AL 4151 during this cycle.

Responsible Person/Group: Kris Acheson-Clair
**revise measure**
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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Final examinations in foundational course, AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics | **Outcome/Objective:** Core Areas of Linguistics

**Implementation Description:** This action plan was carried out in the AL 2011-2012 cycle and the measure no longer uses elective course data. See implementation notes for Revision of Learning Outcomes for further details.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

**CTW course student retention**
The number of students who fail to complete CTW courses is lowering the percentage of students judged competent on final papers because the students who stop coming to class and do not turn in final writing assignments are automatically judged less than competent. CTW courses are reading and writing intensive, and as such it is not surprising that the withdrawal rate is higher than other courses. The problem lies with students who do not withdraw by mid-semester but still fail to complete the course. A plan will be made by CTW course instructors during this cycle to decrease the failure rate of CTW courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Kris Acheson-Clair

---
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**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
50% of graduating students (9 out of 18) had at least one presentation or published article.
**M 2: Oral presentation of Master’s paper (O: 4, 5)**
During their final semester, students make a formal oral presentation of their Master’s paper. Two faculty members rate the paper for clarity, organization, effective use of visual aids, and overall presentation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on use of technology for their presentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students scored &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on the overall scores for their presentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94% of students met or exceeded expectations by scoring good or excellent for their videotaped teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94% of students met or exceeded expectations for their videotaped teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students reported of 4 or 5 for the outcome &quot;knowledge of linguistic systems.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 for the outcome &quot;teaching methodology.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 for the outcome &quot;professional development.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 for the outcome &quot;technology.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

88% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students reported confidence levels of 4 or 5 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated “excellent” or “good” in writing and formatting/referencing for their MA papers.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated “excellent” or “good” in connecting theory to practice and scholarship on their MA papers.

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

Students are required to complete 90 hours of classroom-based experience (CBE) during their program. Advisors certify that their advisees have completed this requirement by submitting two documents each semester: a form signed by the student’s supervisor certifying that the CBE has been completed, and a reflective essay in which the student draws connections between the CBE and what has been learned in coursework.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Teaching methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students completed this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Connecting theory and practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students completed this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Professional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete the PD requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students completed this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

##### Theory and practice reflection component will be added to MA portfolio.

An explicit discussion of theory and practice connections will be added to the reflective overview in the MA portfolio.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Measure:** Survey of graduating students | **Outcome/Objective:** Connecting theory and practice

**Implementation Description:** MA advisors will oversee completion of the theory and practice connections reflection component in the reflective overview included in the MA portfolio.

**Responsible Person/Group:** MA advisors

---

**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 was not changed. For the coming year, regarding the microteaching video, the rating rubric will be revised and input from additional raters will be solicited, e.g., from cooperating teachers who allow MA students to do a microteaching lesson in their classrooms.

**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 view of findings over the past several years, we have increased the frequency of offerings of elective courses that connect technology and pedagogy, e.g., Technology and Language Teaching, AL 8620, and Corpus Linguistics, AL 8760. A new elective, Teaching English for Specific Purposes, AL 8630, is being offered for the first time this year. This entire course addresses how theory can inform language teaching in specific contexts. A component on connecting theory and practice will be added to the MA portfolio reflective overview to encourage students to explicitly consider and articulate in writing how they have connected theory and practice throughout their course work and classroom-based experience.

---
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---

**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: Theory and content knowledge (M: 1, 2, 4)**

Graduates of the program will have expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in the field of Applied Linguistics and their research specialty area.

**SLO 2: Research methodology competence (M: 2, 4)**

Graduates will understand and apply methods that are appropriate to different kinds of research in applied linguistics, including research design, data collection, data analysis, and interpretation.

**SLO 3: Communication skills (M: 2, 4)**

Graduates will communicate effectively in speech and writing.

**SLO 4: Career planning and development (M: 3, 4)**

Graduates will have relevant experience, documented success in disseminating their research, and plans for their career paths.

**SLO 5: Teaching expertise (M: 5)**

Graduates will be experienced teachers who demonstrate pedagogical and content knowledge for teaching a variety of courses.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Qualifying papers (O: 1)**

The purpose of the Qualifying Paper (QP) is for the PhD candidate to demonstrate strong writing abilities. When reading the completed QP, faculty should recognize the voice of a scholar-writer who is ready to progress to the next stages of the PhD program.

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

**Target for O1: Theory and content knowledge**
90% of students will pass the qualifying paper requirement.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students (4/4) passed the qualifying paper requirement.

### M 2: Comprehensive examinations (O: 1, 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 O1: Theory and content knowledge

Students' answers to each of the three questions of the comprehensive exam are evaluated using a rubric. Theory and content knowledge for each question is rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The paper suggests an incomplete understanding of the literature; it may have frequent lapses and/or substantial gaps in coverage), "Meets expectations" (The paper demonstrates a solid understanding of the relevant literature, but may have minor lapses or minor gaps in breadth or depth of coverage), or "Exceeds expectations" (The paper demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the relevant literature and addresses all parts of the question in depth). At least 90% of students will score "Meets expectations or "Exceed expectations" for theory and content knowledge on all questions of their comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved a score of at least "Meets expectations" for theory and content knowledge on all questions of their comprehensive exam.

#### Target for O2: Research methodology competence

Students' answers to each of the three questions of the comprehensive exam are evaluated using a rubric. Research methodology competence for each question is rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The paper demonstrates insufficient understanding of research methodology, suggesting that the student is not ready to conduct research without substantial guidance), "Meets expectations" (The paper demonstrates sufficient understanding of research methodology, suggesting readiness to conduct research with guidance), or "Exceeds expectations" (The paper demonstrates thorough understanding of research methodology as appropriate to the task, suggesting readiness for independent research). At least 90% of students will score "Meets expectations or "Exceed expectations" for research methodology competence on all questions of their comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved a score of at least "Meets expectations" for research methodology competence on all questions of their comprehensive exam.

#### Target for O3: Communication skills

Students' answers to each of the three questions of the comprehensive exam are evaluated using a rubric. Communication skills for each question is rated as "Does not meet expectations" (The paper demonstrates a level of writing that is not yet publishable), "Meets expectations" (The paper is well written and organized; in terms of writing it could be publishable with revisions), or "Exceeds expectations" (The paper demonstrates a level of writing that would be ready or nearly ready to send to a journal). At least 90% of students will score "Meets expectations or "Exceed expectations" for communication skills on all questions of their comprehensive exam.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students achieved a score of at least "Meets expectations" for communication skills on all questions of their comprehensive exam.

### M 3: Conference presentations (O: 4)

Graduate students are expected to begin presenting regularly at conferences.

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

#### Target for O4: Career planning and development

In the past year, at least 75% of graduate students beyond their second year will have presented at least one paper at a conference.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At least 82% of graduate students beyond their second year presented at least one paper at a conference, with over half of those presenting multiple papers.

### M 4: Publications (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Graduating students are expected to have published at least one scholarly paper.

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

#### Target for O1: Theory and content knowledge

By graduation, at least 80% of students will have a refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

60% of graduating students had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper.
Target for O2: Research methodology competence
By graduation, at least 80% of students will have a refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
60% of graduating students had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper.

Target for O3: Communication skills
By graduation, at least 80% of students will have a refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
60% of graduating students had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper.

Target for O4: Career planning and development
By graduation, at least 80% of students will have a refereed scholarly paper either published or accepted for publication.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
60% of graduating students had a published or in-press refereed scholarly paper.

**M 5: Teaching experience (O: 5)**
Students will graduate with substantial teaching experience in the Intensive English Program and in undergraduate courses in Applied Linguistics.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
100% of students who graduated had taught at least 4 semesters at GSU. 60% had taught at least two courses in the undergraduate program, while the other 40% each taught one course in the undergraduate program.

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

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

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

**add teaching expertise measure(s)**
We will explore the possibility of adding a more direct measure of teaching expertise, such as teaching evaluations.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**change teaching target**
Since some students have funding through fellowships or assistantships outside the department, it may not be practical for all (or nearly all) graduate students to teach two courses in our undergraduate program. Therefore we are changing the target to 100% of students will have taught 4 semesters and 90% will have taught at least one course in our undergraduate program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- Measure: Teaching experience | Outcome/Objective: Teaching expertise

**develop dissertation assessment rubric**
In order to have more assessment of students exiting the program, we will develop a rubric to assess the dissertation according to our desired outcomes and add the dissertation as an additional measure.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**monitor & increase student publication opportunities**
The new system for monitoring student progress includes information about publications, allowing the PhD committee chair and PhD advisors to see which students have not published any papers. This will be used to encourage faculty to mentor students in publishing and possibly to co-author with them.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
revise QP measure to reflect new program requirement
The Qualifying Paper is now a Qualifying Exam (which includes a Qualifying Paper). We will change the measure and add a rubric to assess the Qualifying Exam to more directly measure learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
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 added a new measure (publications) in order to track what percentage of students have published at least one scholarly refereed paper by graduation. We also added a rubric to more directly assess outcomes measured by student performance on comprehensive exams. The old measure simply calculated the percentage that passed, which was not as informative.

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 monitor student publications more closely so as to increase mentoring of students related to publishing, including the possibility of co-authoring scholarly papers.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Art Studio MFA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O1: Theoretical and critical thinking**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for theoretical and critical thinking. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 3 or 23% as 2 (developing), 4 or 31% as 3 (accomplished), and 6 or 48% as 4 (exemplary).

**Target for O2: Contemporary contextual knowledge**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for contemporary contextual knowledge. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 3 or 23% as 2 (developing), 5 or 39% as 3 (accomplished), and 5 or 38% as 4 (exemplary).

**Target for O3: Advanced research skills**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for advanced research skills. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 0 as 2 (developing), 6 or 46% as 3 (accomplished), and 7 or 54% as 4 (exemplary).

**Target for O4: Professional practice**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for advanced professional practice. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 1 or 8% as 2 (developing), 4 or 31% as 3 (accomplished), and 8 or 61% as 4 (exemplary).

**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 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for theoretical and critical thinking. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 3 or 23% as 2 (developing), 4 or 31% as 3 (accomplished), and 6 or 46% as 4 (exemplary).

**Target for O2: Contemporary contextual knowledge**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for contemporary contextual knowledge. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 3 or 23% as 2 (developing), 5 or 39% as 3 (accomplished), and 5 or 38% as 4 (exemplary).

**Target for O3: Advanced research skills**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for advanced research skills. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 0 as 2 (developing), 6 or 46% as 3 (accomplished), and 7 or 54% as 4 (exemplary).

**Target for O4: Professional practice**
With possible scores of 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, and 4 = exemplary, the achievement target is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
13 students were assessed for advanced professional practice. 0 were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 1 or 8% as 2 (developing), 4 or 31% as 3 (accomplished), and 8 or 61% as 4 (exemplary).

**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.

Graduate Program Review
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

Professional Practice in Higher Education
The graduate studio faculty is going to consider whether making Professional Practice in Higher Education (AE 6100) mandatory for all students (it is currently only required of graduate assistants who are teaching) will improve student achievement in the area of Professional Practice.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition with Statement and Resume | Outcome/Objective: Professional practice
Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional practice

Implementation Description: Spring 2013
Responsible Person/Group: Stan Anderson

Seminar Reorganization
In order to improve the performance of our students in regard to Theoretical and Critical Thinking and Contemporary Contextual Knowledge, we are planning to restructure the way MFA seminars are taught and rotated, including involving the art history faculty to a greater degree.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: MFA Solo Exhibition with Statement and Resume | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary contextual knowledge
| Theoretical and critical thinking
Measure: Thesis Paper | Outcome/Objective: Contemporary contextual knowledge
| Theoretical and critical thinking

Responsible Person/Group: Stan Anderson

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?
Having instituted four critical outcomes in Spring 2011, we are going to maintain this assessment process in order to gather data over multiple years.

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 most concerned with improving the scores in Theoretical and Critical Thinking and in Contemporary Contextual Knowledge. We are in the process of restructuring the way MFA seminars are taught and rotated, including involving the art history faculty to a greater degree, in order to improve student skills in these areas. In order to improve student achievement in the area of Professional Practice, we are considering making the standing pedagogy class mandatory.
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: 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 2: 2010 - 11 exam for AH 1700 (O: 1)
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
Responsible Person/Group: AH faculty
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 competencies and growth.

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
The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3. The aim is for an average score of 4.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
22 students in AE 4750/67/50 were evaluated for learning environment. 22 students achieved the minimum score of 3 for successful completion of the goal. The aim is an average score of 4. The average score achieved by the 22 students was 4.4.

Target for O2: Instruction
The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3. The aim is for an average score of 4.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
22 students in AE 4750/67/50 were evaluated for their instruction. 22 students achieved the minimum score of 3 for successful completion of the goal. The aim is an average score of 4. The average score achieved by the 22 students was 4.36.

Target for O3: Instructional Resources
The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3. The aim is for an average score of 4.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
22 students in AE 4750/67/50 were evaluated for instructional resources. 22 students achieved the minimum score of 3 for successful completion of the goal. The aim is an average score of 4. The average score achieved by the 22 students was
Target for O4: Professionalism

The minimum score for successful completion of this objective is 3. The aim is for an average score of 4.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

22 students in AE 4750/67/50 were evaluated for professionalism. 22 students achieved the minimum score of 3 for successful completion of the goal. The aim is an average score of 4. The average score achieved by the 22 students was 4.54.

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 Hsieh

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Instructional Resources
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Student Teaching Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Learning Environment
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Melody Milbrandt, Melanie Davenport, Kevin Hsieh

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.

**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 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.

**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.

Ratings for Learning Environment and Instruction were lower but still exceeded minimum expectations. Because Instruction was the weakest area, faculty recognizes the need to reinforce lesson planning skills in the methods coursework prior to student teaching and has already implemented more field experience hours to allow students greater opportunities to practice what they are learning. Increasing student field-experience hours prior to student teaching, not only allows more hands-on experience for students, but also gives faculty more insights into student “readiness.” We have already implemented another pre-student teaching field experience during the semester immediately prior to student teaching to better assess student readiness. 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. The art education faculty has implemented an additional pre-student teaching field experience under the supervision of Dr. Hsieh, in order to better assess student readiness. This process has helped faculty gain insights into student performance and identify students who may need remediation prior to student teaching, so that only candidates who are sufficiently prepared and have proven their readiness will be sent into the field. Two students were identified this semester to receive remediation during the summer, in order to be confident they are capable of success in student teaching next fall.
**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 2011-2012 - Target:** Met**

15 students were evaluated for the goal of research skills in gathering evidence. 15 students achieved the minimum goal of 3. In aiming for an average score of 4.0, the average score for this academic year is 4.8.

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

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Met**

15 students were evaluated for the goal of research skill in critically analyzing evidence gathered. 15 students achieved the minimum goal of 3. In aiming for an average score of 4.0, the average score for this academic year is 4.6.

**Target for O3: Written Communication Skills**

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Met**

15 students were evaluated for the goal of written and oral communication skills. 15 students achieved the minimum goal of 3. In aiming for an average score of 4.0, the average score for this academic year is 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

### 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 additional 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.
Although all of those evaluated above met our expectations for completion of the Master's degree, this evaluation includes some 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. There was one discrepancy in the numbers of graduating MAE students listed in available reports. One was listed as having graduated in Fall 2011, but she has not in fact completed her thesis. Faculty have asked for further information and are investigating this anomaly. There are five or six MAE students who have “fallen off the radar” and have slowed progress toward completion, primarily due to having accepted full-time employment, but we continue to communicate with them and encourage them toward completion. Reflecting upon feedback from the first two MAE cohorts, we have made adjustments to the curriculum in preparation for a new cohort for Fall, 2012.
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<th>Georgia State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Data by Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012 Art History BA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**Goals**

**G 1: Visual Arts Literacy**

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

**G 2: Visual Arts Advocacy**

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

**G 3: Technology**

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

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of content (M: 1)**

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

**SLO 2: Critical thinking skills (M: 1)**

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

**SLO 3: Research skills (M: 1)**

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

**SLO 4: Written communication skills (M: 1)**

Student is able to explain art-historical principles, and to use art-historical terms in their proper context to explain and/or describe works of art or art-historical problems. Student can effectively communicate the results of research and critical thought in a well-written essay.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Graduation portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

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

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

**Target for O1: Knowledge of content**

Evaluation is 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. The minimum score for successful completion of this goal is 3, while our
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 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.

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

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 were meeting most of our goals, the faculty and course content is more rigorous, requiring more 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: Knowledge of content

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

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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Research skills
3000-Level Courses
We want 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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking skills |
| Knowledge of content | Written communication skills |

Responsible Person/Group: Art History Faculty

Establishing BA in Art History
We are in the process of proposing a BA in Art History, as our current program is a BA in Art with a Concentration in Art History. A self-standing major should be more appealing to students interested in art history and will carry more weight when our art history students apply for jobs and graduate school.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Art History Faculty

Undergraduate Seminars
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 need, however, to consider how this will affect such things as RPG and credit-hour generation.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
| Measure: Graduation portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Critical thinking skills |
| Knowledge of content | Research skills | Written communication skills |

Responsible Person/Group: Art History Faculty

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?

Our review this year continues to be more thorough than in 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. Moving forward, we may reconsider what we ask for in terms of the capstone portfolio if we believe it will allow us to assess student learning even more effectively. The outcome score for Objective 1, Knowledge of Content, is higher than the previous year’s score (2010/11 was 3.76 and 2011/12 is 3.91). To some degree, this gain (.15 points, which is 3.8% of the total) may reflect 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) students 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 increase in performance in this objective is slight (3.8%) and 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. The outcome score for Objective 2, Critical Thinking Skills, is the same as the previous academic year (2010/11 was 3.65 and 2011/12 is 3.65). The stability of this number may be the result of the area’s emphasis on critical thinking in each of its 3000 and 4000-level courses. The methods course (AH 3000) may also be contributing to the consistency in performance. The methods class requires students to learn discipline-specific approaches to research and writing that help students perform at higher levels in 4000-level classes. The course’s focus on critical thinking (it is a CTW course) prepares our majors for the types of inquiry we demand of them in the rest of our upper-division classes. As with our other statistics, 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. The outcome score for Objective 3, Research Skills, is marginally lower than the previous year’s score (2010/11 was 3.76, 2011/12 is 3.74). The change is the smallest of all the objectives (.02 points, which is .5% of the total). The small downward shift we are reporting this year is not statistically significant and is likely attributable to normal yearly fluctuations. The lack of discernable 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 require an 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. Based on the stability of the outcomes for Goal 2, it appears that this class is having a positive effect and we are optimistic that it will also increase the outcome for Goal 3 going forward. 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. The outcome score for Objective 4, Written Communication Skills, climbed slightly from the previous academic year (2010/11 was 3.62, 2011/12 is 3.66). The change was relatively small (.04 points, which is 1.09% 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 exhibition review assignment, interdisciplinary approach to teaching Art History assignment, conference paper abstract assignment, graduate study application statement of purpose assignment, and a revised research paper. 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.

**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.

Moving forward, 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 will also 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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### 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)**


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

#### Standard Associations

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

#### Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
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.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
4.2 Highlight the arts and media.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**SLO 2: Research Skills (Critical Analysis of Evidence)**

Ability to read, process and critique high-level scholarly articles and books in multiple fields (eg, 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.

#### 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**
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**
2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
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.
3.6 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**SLO 3: Written Communication skills (M: 3)**

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

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

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

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 4 students evaluated for their research skills in gathering evidence, 4 of 4 achieved the minimum score of 3 for successful completion of the goal. The aim for an average score is 4.5, the average score for this goal for this academic year was 4.

**M 2: Review of thesis (O: 1)**

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

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Of the 4 students evaluated for their research skills in gathering evidence, 4 of 4 achieved the minimum score of 3 for successful completion of the goal. The aim for an average score is 4.5, the average score for this goal for this academic year was 4.
**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 learning outcomes were revised by reducing the number to three vital concerns. This smaller number allowed us to focus on the process of acquiring knowledge, critically analyzing that knowledge, and effectively presenting that knowledge and analysis in written form, as demonstrated by a written thesis. We are going to maintain this assessment process in order to assess achievement in these areas from year to 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 2011/12 outcomes for Art History graduate students reflect a mixed bag of various graduate-student abilities. Specifically, there was one extremely high-functioning graduate student, one weak but acceptable graduate student, and two mid-range graduate students. While we did not meet our desired metric of 4.5 for each of the goals, each segment was at or near 4. This is encouraging as this shows that our graduate students are achieving well above our stated minimum. Moving forward, we would like to offer Methodology and Historiography of Art (AH 8010) every fall so that all graduate students take this course, which introduces them to graduate-level methodology and provides 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.

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

**Instituted Graduate Methodology and Historiography (AH 8010)**

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 will also continue offering graduate-only seminars as we did this past academic year. 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.

**Graduate-Only Opportunities**

We are trying to increase enrollment and/or have the College's minimum enrollment requirement waived in order to offer Methodology and Historiography of Art (AH 8010) every fall. This course, which introduces graduate students to graduate-level methodology and provides them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research, should ideally be taken by graduate students in their first semester. Also, in keeping with our recent NASAD review, we plan to offer at least one graduate-only seminar every semester, but meeting the College's minimum enrollment requirement is proving problematic. 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.

**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 learning outcomes were revised by reducing the number to three vital concerns. This smaller number allowed us to focus on the process of acquiring knowledge, critically analyzing that knowledge, and effectively presenting that knowledge and analysis in written form, as demonstrated by a written thesis. We are going to maintain this assessment process in order to assess achievement in these areas from year to 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 2011/12 outcomes for Art History graduate students reflect a mixed bag of various graduate-student abilities. Specifically, there was one extremely high-functioning graduate student, one weak but acceptable graduate student, and two mid-range graduate students. While we did not meet our desired metric of 4.5 for each of the goals, each segment was at or near 4. This is encouraging as this shows that our graduate students are achieving well above our stated minimum. Moving forward, we would like to offer Methodology and Historiography of Art (AH 8010) every fall so that all graduate students take this course, which introduces them to graduate-level methodology and provides them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research, in their first semester (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 will also continue offering graduate-only seminars as we did this past academic year. Previously, our graduate students have almost exclusively taken mixed undergraduate/graduate classes, and this may have negatively impacted their performances.

**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 learning outcomes were revised by reducing the number to three vital concerns. This smaller number allowed us to focus on the process of acquiring knowledge, critically analyzing that knowledge, and effectively presenting that knowledge and analysis in written form, as demonstrated by a written thesis. We are going to maintain this assessment process in order to assess achievement in these areas from year to 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 2011/12 outcomes for Art History graduate students reflect a mixed bag of various graduate-student abilities. Specifically, there was one extremely high-functioning graduate student, one weak but acceptable graduate student, and two mid-range graduate students. While we did not meet our desired metric of 4.5 for each of the goals, each segment was at or near 4. This is encouraging as this shows that our graduate students are achieving well above our stated minimum. Moving forward, we would like to offer Methodology and Historiography of Art (AH 8010) every fall so that all graduate students take this course, which introduces them to graduate-level methodology and provides them with the tools needed to carry out high-level research, in their first semester (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 will also continue offering graduate-only seminars as we did this past academic year. Previously, our graduate students have almost exclusively taken mixed undergraduate/graduate classes, and this may have negatively impacted their performances.
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.

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 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Accomplished), 4 (Exemplary).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 113 students assessed for their technical skills in their applications to the studio major, 24 or 21% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 64 or 57% as 2 (developing), 25 or 22% as 3 (accomplished) and 0 as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 2 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 2.5.

Target for O2: Conceptual Skills
Minimum target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Accomplished), 4 (Exemplary).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 113 students assessed for conceptual skills, 40 or 35% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 51 or 45% as 2 (developing), 21 or 19% as 3 (accomplished) and 1 as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 1.8 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 2.5.

Target for O3: Historical and contemporary knowledge
Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Accomplished), 4 (Exemplary).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Of the 113 students assessed for historical and contemporary knowledge, 39 or 35% were evaluated as 1 (beginning), 60 or
54% as 2 (developing), 12 or 11% as 3 (accomplished) and 0 as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 1.7 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 2.5.

**Target for O4: Professional preparation**

Target is 2.5 on a scale of 1 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Accomplished), 4 (Exemplary).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the 113 students evaluated for professional presentation, 41 or 36% were assessed as 1 (beginning), 54 or 48% as 2 (developing), 17 or 15% as 3 (accomplished) and 1 or 1% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 1.8 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 2.5.

**M2: 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 one’s own artistic practice. Artist Statement and Resume further evidence students’ competence in writing and communication skills.

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

**Target for O1: 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: 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, 4 = exemplary. Target for technical skills is 3.6.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

60 students were evaluated for their technical skills. Of the 60, 2 or 3% were assessed as 1 (beginning), 8 or 13% as 2 (developing), 16 or 27% as 3 (accomplished) and 34 or 57% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.4 on a scale of 4, which is just below the target of 3.5.

**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: 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, 4 = exemplary. Target score for conceptual skills is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

60 students were evaluated for their conceptual skills. Of the 60, 0 were assessed as 1 (beginning), 11 or 18% as 2 (developing), 19 or 32% as 3 (accomplished) and 30 or 50% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.3 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 3.5.

**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: 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, 4 = exemplary. Target score for historical and contemporary knowledge is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

60 students were evaluated for their historical and contemporary knowledge. Of the 60, 3 or 5% were assessed as 1 (beginning), 7 or 12% as 2 (developing), 24 or 40% as 3 (accomplished) and 26 or 43% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.2 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 3.5.

**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: 1 = beginning, 2 = developing, 3 = accomplished, 4 = exemplary. Target score for professional preparation is 3.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

60 students were evaluated for their technical skills. Of the 60, 2 or 3% were assessed as 1 (beginning), 9 or 15% as 2 (developing), 16 or 27% as 3 (accomplished) and 33 or 55% as 4 (exemplary). This is an average of 3.3 on a scale of 4, which is below the target of 3.5.

**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**

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Fall semester 2009
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All Studio faculty in 7 discipline areas of Photography, Textiles, Interior Design, Graphic Design, Sculpture, Drawing/Painting/Printmaking, Ceramics

Additional Resources: As demand for our CTW gateway course ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemporary Art increases after 2010, additional faculty may be needed to cover this demand.

Course "Tracking"
We are exploring having "tracks" when more than one section of a 3000-level course is offered in any given semester. This would allow potential BFA majors in the course area in question to be "tracked" into one section, while potential BFA majors from other areas, as well as potential BA in Art with a Concentration in Art, Art Education, and all other majors would be "tracked" into the other section.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Gateway (Foundations) Portfolio and Statement
- Outcome/Objective: Conceptual Skills
  - Historical and contemporary knowledge
  - Professional preparation
  - Technical skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2013
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director and Area Coordinators in consultation with relevant faculty

Course Sequencing
The associate director and foundations coordinator will meet with relevant area coordinators and faculty to reconsider the sequencing of courses in some studio areas.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Final Portfolio, Artist's Statement, Resume and BFA Senior Exhibition
- Outcome/Objective: Conceptual Skills
  - Technical skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2013
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director and Foundations Coordinator

Staffing of Courses
We are investigating whether we need to have more regular faculty (rather than GTAs and PTIs) teaching Foundations-level courses and 3000-level courses that are "tracked" for potential majors in a given course area.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Gateway (Foundations) Portfolio and Statement
- Outcome/Objective: Conceptual Skills
  - Historical and contemporary knowledge
  - Professional preparation
  - Technical skills

Implementation Description: Spring 2013
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Associate Director and Foundations Coordinator in consultation with relevant 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?

Having instituted four identical outcomes for both the gateway course and the capstone course in Spring 2011, we are going to maintain this assessment process in order to gather more data on where and to what degree growth and learning occur 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.

We are most concerned about the 16-18% of students who possess only beginning or developing levels in the four outcome areas at the capstone stage, as well as the fact that the lowest (43%) exemplary levels at the capstone stage are in the area of Historical and Contemporary Knowledge. With the recent introduction of AH 2000, which not all recent graduating students have taken, we expect to see continuing improvement in terms of Historical and Contemporary Knowledge. With the recent introduction of two CTW courses, which, again, not all recent graduating students have taken, we expect to see continuing improvement in all areas. In addition, we are informing all faculty of areas warranting attention and expect to see course content adjusted accordingly. In terms of improving Technical and Conceptual Skills, we are studying whether the sequencing of courses in some studio areas needs to be reconsidered and addressed.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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

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)

Students communicate effectively orally and in writing in a context relevant to scientific research using appropriate formats and styles for scientific journals, meetings, conferences, or colloquia.

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

Astronomy Ph.D. students demonstrate knowledge of core principles, and an ability to apply that knowledge. Areas of required knowledge are: i. at least two of the core physics areas, classical mechanics, advanced electromagnetic theory, advanced quantum mechanics, and advanced statistical mechanics. ii. fundamental astrophysics and astronomical instrumentation and techniques. iii. stellar atmospheres, stellar structure and evolution, the interstellar medium, extragalactic astronomy, and relativistic astrophysics and cosmology. All Ph.D. students shall be able to demonstrate and apply appropriate mathematical skills in the context of their specialization, including matrix algebra, vector and tensor analysis, Fourier series and boundary value problems, and complex analysis.

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

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Qualifying Exam 2 (O: 5)

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Not reported in this 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Collaboration in Scientific Research</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four students were rated by their research adviser after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Collaboration in Scientific Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Scientific Communication</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four students were rated by their research adviser after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.5 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Scientific &amp; Research Technology</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four students were rated by their research advisor after successfully completing their dissertation and defense. The average rating for Scientific &amp; Research Technology was 4.9 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met |
|                                                        | Fifteen 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.6 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Scientific Communication</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Scientific Communication Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</th>
<th>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 for each learning outcome.</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertations. The average rating for Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills was 4.6 out of 5.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Motivations and Implications of Research was 4.7 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Critical Thinking was 4.8 out of 5.0.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Fifteen committee member evaluations were performed of student's dissertation defenses. The average rating for Scientific Communication 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Fifteen 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 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: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- Measure: Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- Measure: Qualifying Exam 2 | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
- Measure: Research Advisor Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
- Measure: 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

**Revise Assessment Data Collection**

In 2012-2013 we will revise the collection of assessment data to remedy the data gaps.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
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?
No changes were made in the assessment process in the PhD in Astronomy program this year. In the coming year we will address the missing data with a revised collection 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.

The assessments of the dissertations and defenses are quite good. No curriculum changes are planned.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Behavior and Learning Disabilities Certification**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

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

**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.

**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.

**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.

### 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):**
  - Measure: Lesson Plan | Outcome/Objective: Effectively plan and assess instruction.
  - 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):**
  - Measure: Teaching Sequence | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.
- **Implementation Description:** The current instructors using the teaching sequence rubric will meet with any new instructors in order to train new instructors on the use of the rubric. They will determine if further training is warranted.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2011
- **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.
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):
- Measure: Pupil change project.
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates understanding of how children learn.

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

Implementation Description: Students will be provided sample projects connected with scoring rubrics so they will better understand what is expected of them.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: BLD Coordinator and course instructor

---

**Georgia State University**
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*2011-2012 Behavior and Learning Disabilities MEd*

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 Behavior and Learning Disorders Program in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education is committed to preparing advanced 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. The M.Ed. program in Behavior and Learning Disabilities provides students who already hold certification in special education with the depth of knowledge and the breadth of skills in educating students with mild disabilities required of a "master teacher."

**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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

**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: Performance Evaluation (O: 1)
Final score in EXC 7941 (Practicum in Special Education) using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest.

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

**Target for O1: Student demonstrates understanding of learning.**
90% of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
For Fall 2011-Summer 2012 with an N of 19, 100% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the rubric with a range and mean of 4.

#### M 2: Assessment for Instruction (O: 2)
Final score in EXC 7130 (Assessment for Instructional Planning) using a rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest.

**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 3 out of 4.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
For Fall 2011-Summer 2012 with a N of 14, 93% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the rubric with a range of 1-4 and a mean of 3.43.

#### M 3: Comprehensive Exam (O: 3)
Written Comprehensive Exam scored by a Rubric of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest. We have created a new comprehensive exam using a 0-2 point rubric which will be faded in over the next several years. So students under the 'old' program plan will be scored using the 1-4 rubric and those under the 'new' program plan will be scored using the 0-2 rubric.

**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 3 out of 4 on the "old" comprehensive exams; 90% of students will score 1.5 or higher on the 'new' comprehensive exams.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
For Fall 2011-Summer 2012 with a N = 24 and all students completing the "old" comprehensive exam, 83% scored at or above 3 out of 4 on the rubric with a range of 1.03-4 and a mean of 3.11.

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

**Monitoring Student Progress**
Data for the Masters Program in BLD are being collected using new rubrics for two goals 9a) performance evaluation - student demonstrates understanding of learning (goal 90%; achieved 100%), and (b) assessment for instruction - effectively teaches diverse groups of learners (goal 90%; 93% achieved). Both targets were met and data will be monitored on these two goals to determine whether changes are needed. Per earlier data and action plans, the BLD faculty continue to address student data on the third goal - comprehensive exam - demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge. This year, the goal was partially met (goal 90%; 83% achieved). Based on previous student data, the BLD faculty have created a new comprehensive exam format, questions, and rubric which will be rolled out, as an option in Spring 2013 and permanently in Fall 2013 or Spring 2014 which is more reflective of the curricula changes and updates which have been made. The new exam format and questions will better assess the student’s pedagogical knowledge of the content in the program. In addition, a comprehensive literature list will be made available to all students taking comprehensive exams as a study tool.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** Medium
**Implementation Description:** new comprehensive exam format, question, rubric, and study tool
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2014
**Responsible Person/Group:** BLD faculty
**Additional Resources:** None

### Georgia State University
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Biology Assessment of Core**

*(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)*

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

### Goals

**G 1: To provide a foundation of Biological concepts.**
In the core, the Department of Biology seeks to introduce basic Biology content with an overview of components of the Scientific Method. Students will be exposed to conventional Biological themes and real-world applications of concepts.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 1: Content in Biology</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 2: Communication</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be expected to be able to express ideas about biological content both orally and in writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 3: Application of the Scientific Method</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability formulate a hypothesis, perform background research, design appropriate experiments to address biological questions, and analyze the results of the experiment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 4: Analysis</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to execute basic problem solving skills and data analysis in biology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SLO 5: Basic field/lab techniques</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to perform basic techniques used in biological research which are applied in a laboratory setting and, in some cases, in outdoor settings such as data collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Biology BS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mission / Purpose</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goals</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: To be able to describe and evaluate concepts in Biology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Content in Biology (G: 1) (M: 22)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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. |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/O 2: Communication (M: 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be expected to be able to express ideas about biological content both orally and in writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>O/O 3: Application of the Scientific Method</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply the scientific method to critically analyze problems in biology. Inherent in these skills are the ability formulate a hypothesis, perform background research, design appropriate experiments to address biological questions, and analyze the results of the experiment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Mini Lecture followed by 1 page summary (O: 2, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>84% of students scored 75% or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communicate effectively in oral and written forms. Biol 4930/6930 Summer 10. n=24. Each student will present a mini lecture and provide a 1-page summary. 84% of students scored 75% or higher. Target: 80% to score 75%

Target for O2: Communication

80% score 75% or above

**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 1:100 (Final Dilution) Outcome: Greater than 75% of the students were able to completely answer the question and demonstrate the mechanics of how they got there.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

**Action Plan Biology Fall 2009**

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

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

**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

**Plan to more efficiently collect data from faculty**

The Biology Dept. has formed an Assessment Committee to evaluate the structure, content and direction of our curricula. Collection of data from faculty has been difficult. The committee has decided that it appoint 5 faculty members to collect assessment data from various courses. These faculty members will then forward all of their data to Frank Cruz who will submit this data onto the Weave site. This Spring we will collect the data and submit that data onto Weave.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Collection of data from faculty has been difficult. The committee has decided that it appoint 5 faculty members to collect assessment data from various courses. These faculty members will then forward all of their data to Frank Cruz who will submit this data onto the Weave site. This Spring we will collect the data and submit that data onto Weave.

- **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Committee/ Frank Cruz

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

- **Measure:** Mini Lecture followed by 1 page summary
- **Outcome/Objective:** Communication
**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Biology is firmly committed to the twin goals of Excellence and Distinctiveness set forth in the University's Strategic Plan. The Mission of the Department is:

a. to provide students with a foundation of scientific literacy in biology that is essential for success in the society of tomorrow;  
b. to increase the understanding of biological processes through innovative research programs, thereby providing students with the opportunity to explore exciting new frontiers through biological research; and  
c. to promote collaboration with others in the University system and the state of Georgia in reaching out to the public and communicating the many ways in which new discoveries in biology impact our daily lives and affect the future of our community.

**Goals**

G 1: Scientific Professionals  
There are two tracks: non-thesis (emphasize course content) and thesis (emphasize scientific literacy and research). Successful students will be scientifically literate and possess the ability to synthesize information and formulate logical arguments. In addition to the aforementioned items, successful thesis students will design and perform experiments, analyze and interpret results. Successful students with communicate these results in oral and written formats.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Scientific Literacy (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)  
Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Student retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Student promotion and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Timely graduation</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>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Establish University-Level Research Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO 2: Conduct Research (G: 1) (M: 1)  
Students will be able to apply the scientific principles via performance of a laboratory or literary based paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education/Core Curriculum Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Priority Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Student retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Student promotion and progression</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>
<tr>
<td>4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Enhance a research culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Establish University-Level Research Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.</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: Thesis (O: 1, 2)
The thesis is the capstone assignment. These capstones provide a measure of the accomplishments of thesis students in scientific content, inquiry, and communication. Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend the current scientific literature; form hypotheses, design experiments, collect data, and evaluate results; place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and develop an understanding of the impact of these discoveries on science and society. Students will demonstrate a knowledge of scientific content as it pertains to their chosen area of concentration in biology. Students will be able to present their findings and the findings of others in written and/or oral formats.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O1: Scientific Literacy
90% of the thesis proposals are expected to be approved for continuation on the thesis track.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
70 students completed their MS degree between Su2011 and Sp2012. The average time between entrance into the program and receipt of degree was 23.9 months, while the median was 22 months. Of the 70 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.]

Target for O2: Conduct Research
100% of students conducting laboratory research should complete certification online course.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
finding for target 1

M 2: Non-thesis (O: 1)
For non-thesis track students must exhibit satisfactory completion of the non-thesis report. The non-thesis report is the capstone assignment. These capstones provide a measure of the accomplishments of M.S. students in scientific inquiry, scientific content and written communication. Students will demonstrate comprehension of current scientific literature; place reports of new discoveries into the context of previous scientific progress; and describe the impact of these discoveries on science and society.

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

Target for O1: Scientific Literacy
60% of students are expected to achieve a score of 4 or higher on a 5 point scale on rubric component assessing synthesizing and evaluating future research directions.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
A random sample of 12 non-thesis M.S. graduates were evaluated using the rubric and (10 of 12 (83%) scored 4 or 5).

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 a more detailed rubric for assessing the non-thesis reports. The analysis of this rubric will be used to create a database that allows for reexamination and tracking of student success. The Department will create a more detailed rubric for evaluating the non-thesis report. We will build a performance database in order to analyze the measures and findings of report 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.

If weaknesses emerge from the database analysis, the Department will re-examine and if necessary modify the curriculum.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Biology PhD
As of 12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Ph.D. program in the Department of Biology is firmly committed to the twin goals of Excellence and Distinctiveness set forth in the University’s Strategic Plan. The Mission of the Department is: a. To provide students with a basic core of scientific literacy in biology that is essential for success in the society of tomorrow; b. to increase the understanding of biological processes through cutting edge research programs, thereby providing students with the opportunity to explore exciting new frontiers through biological research; and c. to work with others in the University system and the state of Georgia in reaching out to the public and communicating the many ways in which new discoveries in biology impact our daily lives and affect the future of our community. To accomplish the mission the
Ph.D. program is divided into four concentrations: Applied and Environmental Microbiology, Cell and Molecular Biology and Physiology, Molecular Genetics and Biochemistry, and Neurobiology and Behavior.

### Goals

**G 1: Scientific Professionals**

Students in this program should be scientific professionals.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 3: Scientific Communication (G: 1)**

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

### 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.

### 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

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

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.

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

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Scientific Experimental Design (G: 1) (M: 1)**

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.

### 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.

### 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

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.2 Establish University-Level Research Centers.

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).

5.3 Establish a Georgia State University International Center.

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

**O/O 2: Scientific Inquiry (G: 1)**
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.

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 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.

5.0 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

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

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.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: PhD Qualifying Exam (O: 1)

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.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target for O1: Scientific Experimental Design

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 30 days.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Findings (2011-2012) - Achievement Target: Partially Met 10 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2011-2012 academic year. Of these 10 (70%) received a Pass on their first attempt, 1 passed on the 2nd attempt. Of those 2 students remaining who did not pass, 1 is retaking the examination during the Fa13 semester, and the third has left the program.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met 9 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2010-2011 academic year. Of these 9 (67%) received a Pass on their first attempt. Of those students who did not pass, 2 are retaking the examination during the Fa12 semester, and the third has left the program. Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met 9 students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2008-2009 academic year. Of these 15 (75%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 3 (16%) received either a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending and one student (5%) failed the exam for the second time. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Findings (2007-2008) - Achievement Target: Partially Met Seventeen students took the Ph.D. qualifying examination in the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 10 (59%) received a Pass on their first attempt, while 13 (76%) received either a Pass, Qualified Pass or Decision Pending. Those students receiving a Qualified Pass or Decision Pending subsequently satisfied the conditions required to pass the examination. Of those students who did not pass, three are 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 of their qualified status within six months.

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

Action Plan for Qualifying Exam

Related Action Plans: Evaluation of Revised Doctoral Examination Format During the 2011-2012 academic year our goal was partially met. In addition there was frustration among faculty regarding systematic areas of weakness and consistency of the evaluations. We
are instituting a grading rubric that will be completed by all of the examiners. (see appendix 2). During the 2010-2011 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 2009-2010 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.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: PhD Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Scientific Experimental Design

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Business Analysis MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Master of Science degree is designed for students who wish to work as Business Analysis practitioners. A typical student would have an undergraduate business degree, strong functional experience, or exceptional interest in Business Analysis. The program blends the elements of the Business Analysis (problem solving, information technology and analytical methods) so that every graduate will have a foundation in the Business Analysis discipline. The emphasis is on a deeper understanding of the concepts and techniques used. Graduates of the program will ideally enter a career path requiring analysis and decision support in any functional area of business, or across functional areas.

This Mission was formulated in 2005-2006. It was not moved to this cycle when WEAVE was updated.

Goals
G 1: Goal of the MS in Business Analysis
The goal of the MS in Business Analysis program is to provide students seeking a degree with a singular focus on business analyses tools, techniques and frameworks with the theory, method, and 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 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).
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 is 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 variables 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 qualitative 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The average score was 3.75. Students generally did very well on this measure. The target was easily met.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Model Building Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 Analytics 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 measuring error about the dependent variable. Does not understand the entire variable. Does not understand the complete 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 measuring error about the independent variables. Does not understand the connection between the dependent and the independent variables. iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning, transformations. Accurate and thorough preliminary analysis of the data. Most parts of preliminary analysis done well. Skipped or misunderstood some aspects of data preparation. Poor understanding of the need to examine data carefully before modeling. iv. Model Development and validation. Clear demonstration of a viable model and results from a validation. Possibly accurate model, not validated sufficiently. Some errors in model building. Model inappropriate or has too many errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The average score was 3.50 indicating that the target was met. For MS students, we believe that the standards can be raised a little. Since MBA and MS students tend to be in the same elective classes, it is difficult to have separate standards for MS students.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Understanding of Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 Analytics 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
With an average score of 3.75, the target was easily met. As with the previous measure, we believe the program for MS students can be made a little more intensive. They have the mathematical ability to go deeper into the techniques than we currently do in our courses.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Software Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Learning Outcome 4 Rubric Software Skills Excellent (4) Competent (3) Less than competent (2) Ineffective (1) i. Microsoft Excel. Expert use of software. Has ability to perform all required tasks. Well designed spreadsheets. Can perform most tasks well. Needs help with some tasks. Needs more than occasional help to accomplish tasks, or spreadsheet design is lacking in some aspects.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score was 3.50. The target was met. Software skills vary a bit among students, but overall they are learning what they need in order to effectively analyze what is needed.

### 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.

- **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

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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We are currently in the middle of the hiring process, conducting interviews.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** A hiring committee chaired by Dr. Subhashish Samaddar

#### Consider options for fast track MS in Business Analysis

Given the increasing need for students with Business Analytics skills in organizations, a fast track program can be developed to achieve the following: 1. Create a cohort of just MS students in courses, so that the courses may be tailored to have more mathematical depth than is possible in an MBA class. 2. Create a program that goes across departments within the college. Analytics skills are applied in all areas of an organization, and expertise from various departments will make it a stronger program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** A committee can be formed to assess the feasibility of such a program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All the faculty in this area should be involved in this process, along with the Dean’s office.
- **Additional Resources:** Not known at this point.

### 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.

#### 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.

While MS students continue to do well, we find that there is a growing need in industry for people with Business Analytics skills. We need to provide greater depth in the analytics courses to our MS students than we are currently doing. We can do this through a curriculum revision where we create a college-wide interdepartment MS program in analytics to either supplement or replace the program we currently have in the department. One possibility is a fast track MS in Analytics, with students taking classes from various departments within the college.

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Chemistry Assessment of Core**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
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 interpretet 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 medium 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 can not 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 6.2 out of 8.
**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 6.2 out of 8 questions correct. This is above the national mean.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 6.8/8 which is above target and national average.

**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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Students averaged 3.9 out of 8.

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

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

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

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

Goal was 4 out of 8.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students averaged 4.9/8

**M 5: Laboratory Reports in 1211 and 1212 (O: 2)**

Assessment of Critical thinking in laboratory report for 1211 and 1212 students via rubric.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

86% of students who completed course received an adequate or better.

---

**Mission / Purpose**

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

Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking

Critical thinking skills center on applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and methods. Students need thorough practical training in research techniques. These must include not only mastery of instrumentation and the calibration of same, but the design of the relevant control experiments. Overall, they need to gain mastery with the techniques that chemists use to measure data, and the conventions that chemists use to express data. Students must learn to evaluate their data, looking in detail for statistical significance. Students not only have to know facts, they should also be able to design experiments to ascertain if these facts are true. It is vital that the skills learned in one situation be transferable to related situations. One of the key aspects of teaching critical thinking is developing the higher order cognitive skills of decision making and problem solving. It is vital to create an atmosphere where students grow in their ability to reason. Upon Graduation students will be able to take and analyze real world data to develop a knowledge base and the ability to draw conclusions from this knowledge base. Thought processes should be rational, logical and consequential. Conclusions should grow directly from the data and accepted fundamental chemical principles. In addition, students should not only arrive at conclusions, but be aware that they are expected to defend these conclusions. It is also important to realize that data may be interpreted in more than one way, and that science moves forward as these different data interpretations 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 five 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 interpret 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
The average for the courses evaluated was 4.2 out of 8

**Target for O4: Quantitative skills**  
Out of 8 questions that relate to quantitative skills students should receive 4/8 (national average 3.8)

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
The average this cycle was 4.1/8 correct.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
78% of students scored adequate on the final paper in Chem 4000.

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**  
76% of students scored adequate or better on the rubric.

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
92% scored adequate or better on the rubric.

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
95% of students scored adequate or better.

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

**Action Plan**  
The Department of Chemistry serves not only students who have declared chemistry as their major but also students in biology, for which general chemistry is a prerequisite for the first course in the biology major (Principles of Biology), physics, for which chemistry is a required minor and pre-medical students. In addition any major can use chemistry 1151/1152 or 1211/1212 as the laboratory sequence required by the University for graduation. This report addresses the efforts to increase retention in the courses which are used by both chemistry and non-chemistry majors as part of the core curriculum (1151/1152, 1211/1212) and courses used by persons wishing to minor in chemistry (2400/3410). The second part of the report addresses the efforts to improve the retention, progression and graduation of persons who major in chemistry. Introductory Courses "Many introductory science courses are responsible for driving off many students either from a science major or from taking science courses." (Reform in Undergraduate Science Teaching in the 21st Century.) Because of the “turn off” factor of these 1000 and 2000 level courses one of the key factors
that will affect retention is the number of students who receive a D, F or withdraw from the course. These students either are turned off by science and change majors or are forces to retake the course causing the department to offer more sections both of which are unfavorable outcomes. Over the past four years the department has placed a priority in improving the retention of students in the 1211/1212 sequence believing those courses will affect the most people. These efforts have been supported by the University System of Georgia's RPG initiative and STEM initiative. A three year grant based on the RPG initiative allowed the department to address a problem in the retention of students. The implementation of peer tutorials, weekly communication by the Undergraduate Coordinator has not only given the department another person capable of advisement at the Freshman level but has also alleviated some of the concerns of the Honors program advisors that will hopefully be corrected during the upcoming registration for Fall 2009. The addition of an advisor who can focus on math and science courses based on departmental recommendations found on the web. We are still dealing with a few issues with misinformation that is given to students by university advisors. This group includes the student advisement center, the FLC advisors, parents, and biology majors and a large number of chemistry majors will be involved in learning and researching biologically related topics, we believe that linking the common concepts in biology and chemistry together will facilitate the understanding and relevance of the topics in General Chemistry and help students better integrate the two disciplines. To facilitate this process, we are analyzing the topics covered in General Chemistry I and II in order to determine which topics have biologically relevant examples that can be easily added to the curriculum without taking away from the chemistry department's mission as an American Chemical Society (ACS) certified program. The addition of biological examples and illustrations will help students make connections between the chemistry and biology. We hypothesize that adding biologically-related material will require the "weeding out" of some traditional topics which are no longer relevant, thus allowing a greater emphasis on the more relevant topics. This is the most recent addition to our action plan and is still in the infancy stages. Analysis of the Effect of Action Plan A ten year analysis of the 1151 course shows an increase from 239 students in 1998 to 361 students in 2008 (51% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 25.5 % to 18.6 %. The ACS scores are slightly higher. A ten year analysis of the 1152 course shows an increase from 208 students in 1998 to 333 students in 2008 (60% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 23.5 % to 20.1 % in 2007. In 2008 the department saw a spike in the DFW rate for 1152 up to 35.7 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same. Most of the gains in DFW rates have occurred over the past 5 years. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both courses over the past 10 years. Departmental goals are 50% percentilie or better. A ten year analysis of the 1211 course shows an increase from 497 students in 1998 to 779 students in 2008 (57% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 44.2 % to 10.5 %. The ACS scores are statistically the same (1211 was first given in 2001). A ten year analysis of the 1212 course shows an increase from 319 students in 1998 to 622 students in 2008 (95% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 34.2 % to 11.4 % in 2008. The department did see a decline in ACS scores when the initial RPG plan was implemented but the results over the past 2 years are statistically the same as in 1998. Below is a graph with the ACS scores for both classes over the past 10 years. Departmental goals are 50% percentilie or better. A ten year analysis of the 2400 course shows an increase from 391 students in 1998 to 645 students in 2008 (65% increase). During that time the class sizes have grown while DFW rates have decreased from 38.2 % to 31.9 %. A ten year analysis of the 3410 course shows an increase from 196 students in 1998 to 564 students in 2008 (180% increase). There has been a large increase in ACS scores of the 3410 over this 10 year period. Upper Division Courses for Majors An analysis of all 4000 level courses required of majors indicates that all courses have less that a 15% DFW rate. The number of students taught in the past ten years has increased with the number of students taking four of the seven courses (4000, 4120, 4190 and 4600) was over double what was taught ten years ago. The ACS scores for the physical chemistry sequence have remained statistically the same as ten years ago and the number of sections offered has not changed. Freshman Retention Statistics In 2002 40 incoming freshman indicated that they were chemistry majors, of these 40 students 35 were still enrolled in the university in fall of 2003 (88%). After 6 years of the initial 40 students 18 (45%) had graduated with a degree (not necessarily in chemistry) and 7 (18%) were still enrolled in a program at Georgia State University. Unfortunately the university defines retention by completing a program which means there is no way to track what the students' final major was. In fall 2007 a total of 65 students entered declaring as chemistry majors. As of Fall 2008 62 (95%) were still enrolled at Georgia State University. The 2007-2008 retention rate for Freshman was the highest of any program with 10% between the College of Arts and the College of Sciences. Again there is not a clear way to tell these statistics apart as some chemistry majors or if they have changed majors as the University tracks only students that are retained in the University. Much of the improved retention at the Freshman level can be attributed to three programs that have been implemented in the past three years; increased opportunities for advisement, direct dialogue between the university advisors and the department, and an increase in faculty and staff that advise. The most common complaint among students in 2006 was the difficulty to schedule advisement appointments. Since the implementation of sign-up sheets outside the Undergraduate Director's office students will not have to e-mail or call to make appointments. One of the major problems that the department has attempted to deal with with mixed success is the misinformation that is given to students by university advisors. This group includes the student advisement center, the FLC advisors and the Honors program advisors. Most of the problems have been solved by asking each of these groups to have students register for math and science courses based on departmental recommendations found on the web. We are still dealing with a few issues with the University program advisors that will hopefully be corrected during the upcoming registration for Fall 2009. The addition of an Undergraduate Coordinator has not only decreased the time that the Undergraduate Director can spend on advisement but has also increased the amount of time that the Undergraduate Director can spend on advisement and other issues by shifting some of the workload.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 11/2009
Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section  
2011-2012 Chemistry MS  
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

### Mission / Purpose

The Chemistry Department has long supported the University's mission. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program at the graduate level to prepare our students for productive careers in academia, industry and government.

### Goals

**G 1: MS Program Goals**
The M.S. program's goal is to produce well trained professionals who possess a high level of proficiency in modern chemical techniques and knowledge of modern chemical problems.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Communication (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Communicate effectively in written and oral forms. 2. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature for content. 3. Critically analyze claims made in the scientific literature. 4. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology. 5. Work effectively in group situations. 6. Students in the masters program must perform research and write a thesis or a non thesis paper detailing their work.

**O/O 2: Critical Thinking (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Construct reasonable hypotheses while asking scientific questions. 2. Design and conduct investigations about a variety of chemical problems. 3. Understand and analyze experimental results. 4. Formulate and defend explanations of theory in chemistry. 5. Solve unique problems based on learned factual matter. 6. Effectively perform laboratory operations to collect appropriate experimental evidence in conjunction with 2.1 - 2.5. 7. Students will be able to apply theory learned in lecture courses to original research performed under the supervision of a faculty member.

**O/O 3: Technology (M: 1)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Use computer graphics. 2. Access chemical databases. 3. Access chemical literature. 4. Conduct molecular modeling of chemical structures. 5. Use normal word processing skills. 6. Use the internet and online resources. 7. Use state of the art instrumentation in order to solve novel problems in chemistry.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Thesis / Project (O: 1, 2, 3)**
All thesis-based master's students will successfully defend a thesis, and all other master's students must write a non-thesis paper.

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

**Target for O1: Communication**
All Master's students are required to write and defend a thesis of original cutting edge research which they have performed under the direction of a faculty member or if they are in the non-thesis master's program, they are required to write a non-thesis paper under the direction of a faculty member.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% write and defend a thesis successfully or write a non-thesis paper successfully before receiving degree.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**
All Master's students are required to write and defend a thesis of original cutting edge research which they have performed under the direction of a faculty member or if they are in the non-thesis master's program, they are required to write a non-thesis paper under the direction of a faculty member.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% write and defend a thesis successfully or write a non-thesis paper successfully before receiving degree.

**Target for O3: Technology**
100% will successfully write thesis and upload using the internet to digital archive following specific college guidelines and will use overhead projectors, computers, and other equipment during presentation or write and submit a non-thesis paper.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of master's students defended thesis and uploaded thesis to digital archives or wrote a non-thesis paper.
### 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
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D. (Graduate Director) Donald Hamelberg, Ph.D.

### 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 continue to demonstrate critical thinking and writing skills through end of semester research reports that follow specific format guidelines that require an abstract, introduction, scientific question, methodology, results, conclusions, and references. Each semester shows improvement. Additionally, students are involved annually in poster presentations, group meetings, thesis and dissertation proposals and presentations, and conferences.

**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 plan to review and revise the assessment plan for the Department in 2013.

**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 revisions this year.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Chemistry PhD**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

### Mission / Purpose

The Chemistry Department has long supported the University's mission. Our goals are to deliver a high quality instructional program at the graduate level to prepare our students for productive careers in academia, industry and government.

### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge of Chemistry**
The goal of our program is to train research scientists. The core of the doctorate program in chemistry is to train students to employ the scientific method to solve real problems at the frontier of our understanding of matter, and to create new knowledge in their careers as leaders in academe, industry or government.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 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. This is demonstrated in a number of ways and includes oral presentations given during group meetings, poster presentations, and end of semester reports which summarizes research progress using the ACS style research paper guidelines. These guidelines are consistent with the following format: Title:Abstract:Introduction:Experimental Details or Theoretical Analysis:Results:Discussion:Conclusion:References. Our students are also encouraged to attend local, regional, national, and international conferences to present their research through poster and oral presentations.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**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 experiments. Additionally, students are required to submit an end of semester report on their research which requires the student to formally go through the critical thinking process by providing a detail analysis of their research (each semester) using the ACS research format. All Ph.D. students are required to submit a dissertation proposal where they provide background and significance of
their research, present preliminary data, and propose and develop future experiments to test several hypothesis they propose in their dissertation proposal.

**O/O 3: Technology (M: 2)**
Students will demonstrate the ability to 1. Plan and conduct experiments using top of the line research instrumentation. 2. Use computer and computer graphics for data analysis. 3. Use computers and online resources to access chemical databases 4. Access chemical literature. 5. Use computer-based software to conduct molecular modeling of chemical structures 6. Use word processing software applications. 7. Use the internet and online resources. 8. Use state of the art instrumentation in order to solve problems in chemistry.

**O/O 4: Quantitative Skills (M: 1, 2)**

1. Use complex and advanced mathematical models and equations to solve complex problems to understand theory in chemistry, such as, for example, fitting of pH profiles of kinetic isotope effects and quantum mechanical tunneling of hydride ions in enzymatic and chemical reactions. 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, for example, how the study of chemical structures and interactions create or solve disease states such as cancer and other diseases. 2. Understand chemical safety and waste control - and there 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 both a written and an oral qualifying exam within the first two years of enrollment in the program. The written exam is administered using the ACS national exam in the student’s concentration or an equivalent exam. The Department of Chemistry specializes in research in the following chemistry areas: analytical, biochemistry, chemical education, organic/medicinal and computational/physical chemistry. The exam is graded by the faculty on a pass fail basis. Once the written exam is complete a committee is formed to administer the oral portion of the exam. The oral committee consists of two faculty members from the student’s concentration and one from outside the concentration. The student must give a presentation of his/her research and the committee evaluates the student’s expertise and knowledge by asking questions which maybe general in nature or related to the student’s research.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Communication Skill**
The target would be 87% of all PhD students will achieve a score of 80% or better.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
15 students took the written qualifying exam in December 2011 and June 2012 and of this group 13 passed the exam with a score of 80% or above.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking**
The target would be 87% of all PhD students will achieve a score of 80% or better.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
15 students took the written qualifying exam in December 2011 and June 2012 and of this group 13 passed the exam with a score of 80% or above.

**Target for O4: Quantitative Skills**
The target would be 87% of all PhD students will achieve a score of 80% or better.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
15 students took the written qualifying exam in December 2011 and June 2012 and of this group 13 passed the exam with a score of 80% or above.

**Target for O5: Contemporary Issues**
The target would be 87% of all PhD students will achieve a score of 80% or better.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
15 students took the written qualifying exam in December 2011 and June 2012 and of this group 14 passed the exam with a score of 80% or above.

**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

**Target for O1: Communication Skill**
90% will write and defend a dissertation successfully.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
9 of 10 students successfully defended dissertation. The 10 student has made revisions and will graduate in the Fall, 2012.

Target for O2: Critical Thinking
90% will write and defend a dissertation successfully.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
9 of 10 students successfully defended dissertation. The 10 student has made revisions and will graduate in the Fall, 2012.

Target for O3: Technology
90% will successfully write their dissertation following specific college guidelines and will use overhead projectors, computers, and other equipment during presentation.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
9 out of 10 students successfully wrote dissertation and have graduated. One student has completed all written requirements and will graduate in Fall, 2012.

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

Continued Quality
Our goal is to continue excellence with our program’s growth.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 12
Responsible Person/Group: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

continued quality and growth
The department has met all its goals and will continue to grow while keeping the quality of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Giovanni Gadda, Ph.D.

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

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

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 continue to demonstrate critical thinking and writing skills through end of semester reports, poster presentations, conferences, group meetings, thesis and dissertation proposals, and thesis and dissertation defenses.

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 continue to be successful in presentations at poster sessions, thesis and dissertation defenses, group meetings, conferences, and end of semester reports.

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 plan to review and revise the assessment plan for the Department in 2013.

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 revisions this year.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Communication Assessment of Core
**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 purposes of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students' oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors; 108 major in Speech Communication.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000 (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate the ability to: 1. Choose and narrow a topic appropriately for the audience and occasion. 2. Communicate the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for audience and occasion. 3. Provide appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion. 4. Use an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion and purpose. 5. Use language that is appropriate to the audience, occasion and purpose. 6. Use vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest. 7. Use pronunciation, grammar, and articulation appropriate to the designated audience. 8. Use physical behaviors that support the verbal message.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

M 1: Competent Speaker Measure (O: 1)
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.

**Target for O1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000**
The Competent Speaker measure is used to grade the public speaking assignment in Speech 1000. Its criteria measure a wide range of oral communication skills, and students' scores have consistently ranged between 2 [satisfactory] and 3 [outstanding].

M 2: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (O: 1)
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 indicated in the four tables above, the overall mean score showed an slight decrease in students' communication apprehension: from 60.19389 to 58.56832 in fall 2010; and from 61.68956 to 59.60308 in spring 2011. More specifically, these sections demonstrated a slight decrease in apprehension for the public communication scale: dropping from 18.451 to 17.43366 in fall 2010; and from 18.56593 to 17.38536 in spring 2011. The PRCA-24 measurement also showed a statistically smaller, but notable decrease in student communication apprehension in group, meeting and dyad situations. The results from the assessment measurement indicate stronger support for the hypothesis that Speech 1000 strengthens students' oral competency by enhancing their confidence in a variety of communication situations.

**Target for O1: Course Objectives for Speech 1000**
For the PRCA measure, collected data over the past six years has fallen consistently between the following scores: Group = 12-14; Meeting = 12-15; Dyad = 12-14; Public = 15-20; Overall (total) = 55-62. 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.

M 3: Willingness to Communicate (O: 1)
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 52.25136 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 students' willingness to communicate, from 181.2584 in the pre-test to 197.2571 in the post-test, as well as slight increases in all other measures.

**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.
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Communication Disorders MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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

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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge (G: 1, 2) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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) (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Praxis II Exam (Total Score) (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students take the Praxis II Exam in speech-language pathology for national certification and state licensure prior to graduation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Apply Prerequisite Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will pass the Praxis II exam (score of 600 or higher) on their first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students scored above 600 on their first attempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Praxis II Exam Category I Score (Comm Process) (O: 2, 14)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for Category I Basic Human Communication Processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Describe Communication &amp; Swallowing Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> <strong>Not Met</strong></td>
<td>88% of the students scored within the national average or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. 14 students scored within the average, 1 above average, 2 below average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O14: Understand Linguistic &amp; Cultural Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>88% of the students scored within the national average or above on this section of the Praxis II exam. 14 students scored within the average, 1 above average, 2 below average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Praxis II Exam Category II Score (Phon/Lang Dis) (O: 3, 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for Category II Phonological and Language Disorders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students scored within or above the national average range on this section of the Praxis II exam. 13 students scored within the national average range, 4 students scored above average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong> <strong>Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students scored within or above the national average range on this section of the Praxis II exam. 13 students scored within the national average range, 4 students scored above average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4: Praxis II Exam Category III Score (Spch Disord) (O: 3, 4)</td>
<td>Score for Category III Speech Disorders. Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders</strong></td>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>94% of the students scored within or above the national average range on this section of the Praxis II exam. One student scored below average, 13 scored within the average range, 3 scored above the average range.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Praxis II Exam Category IV Score (Neuro Disord) (O: 3, 4)</th>
<th>Score for Category IV Neurogenic Disorders. Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders</strong></td>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>100% of students scored within or above the average range of scores. 11 scored within the average range; 6 scored above the average range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Praxis II Exam Category V Score (Aud/Hrg) (O: 3, 4, 13)</th>
<th>Score for Category V Audiology, Hearing. Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Discuss Communication &amp; Swallowing Disorders</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td>The average performance score for students was 78%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Praxis II Exam Category VI Score (Clin Managemt) (O: 4, 13)</th>
<th>Score for Category VI Clinical Management. Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Discuss Principles of Assessment and Intervention</strong></td>
<td>90% of students will score within the national average range or above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of students scored above or within the national average on this section of the Praxis II exam. 11 students scored within the average; 6 students scored above the national average.

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of students scored above or within the national average on this section of the Praxis II exam. 11 students scored within the average; 6 students scored above the national 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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of students scored above or within the national average on this section of the Praxis II exam. 11 students scored within the average; 6 students scored above the national average.

Target for O5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct
90% of students will score within the national average range or above.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
88% of students scored above or within the national average on this section of the Praxis II exam. 13 students scored within the average range; 2 scored above; 2 scored below.

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
88% of students scored above or within the national average on this section of the Praxis II exam. 13 students scored within the average range; 2 scored above; 2 scored below.

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

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Students achieved 3.24 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Students achieved a 3.94 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Students achieved a 3.94 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 4.0 on this section of the portfolio.

M 13: Portfolio Section 5 (Stds Ethical Conduct) (O: 5)
All master's degree students complete a portfolio to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills specified in the student learning outcomes for the CD Program. Each section aligns with one outcome and is rated on a scale of 1-4. For this section of the portfolio students must demonstrate that they can discuss and apply the standards of ethical conduct.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O5: Apply Standards of Ethical Conduct**
Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 3.82 on this section of the portfolio.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 3.88 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Student achieved a 3.82 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students achieved a 4.0 on this section of the portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 18: Portfolio Section 10 (Clin Skills Assess) (O: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O10: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achieved a 3.88 on this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 19: Portfolio Section 11 (Clin Skills - Interven) (O: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O11: Demonstrate Clinical Skills - Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved a 3.94 on this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 20: Portfolio Section 12 (Interpersonal Qual) (O: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O12: Demonstrate Appropriate Interpersonal Qualities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved a 3.94 on this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 21: Portfolio Section 13 (Apply Technology) (O: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O13: Apply Technology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved a 4.0 on this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 22: Portfolio Section 14 (Ling &amp; Cult Diversity) (O: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O14: Understand Linguistic &amp; Cultural Diversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating of 3.0 or higher (on a rating scale of 1-4) for this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students achieved a 3.82 on this section of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

Reduction of Outcomes & Measures
Assessment process will be streamlined in 2012-2013.

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 this 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.

Because our results were only 2% below our target, we will not be changing anything at this time.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Communication MA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The MA Program in Communication trains students to be innovative actors in the communications sectors--whether journalism, film and media making, public relations, international communication--while at the same time providing theoretical and methodological grounding for students wishing to pursue the doctorate.

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, 5, 6)
Students should demonstrate a command of the key texts in their area of specialization. These include theoretical and scholarly literature in the area; additionally, for the Film/Video specialization, it includes a breadth of knowledge of the important artistic works,
Strategic Plan Associations

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

**M 1: Assessment in Core Seminars: Literature and Theory (O: 1)**

Background: In the academic year 2010-11, we piloted an online system of end-of-course assessment for all graduate courses in the department. While some important information was gathered with this system, the data parsing and analysis proved to be an extreme burden on the limited number of faculty able to do it, and at the same time, we were getting lots of extraneous or irrelevant information. In light of this, last year's action plan included a complete rethinking of the graduate assessment in the department. In the Fall, the graduate director (Restivo) met with Marti Singer to discuss ways to implement a new assessment for a very complex graduate program with many areas of specialization. The grad director then mapped out some preliminary sets of rubrics and measures. Early in the Spring of 2012, the grad director met with each area of the doctoral and MA faculties, and worked with them to devise clear and relevant learning outcomes, rubrics, and measures for each of the tracks of the MA and PhD programs. We decided to designate key core courses in each area of the MA and PhD programs as those in which student performance would be measured. We developed learning outcomes which, while parallel throughout the various tracks, nevertheless are able to measure learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are expected across all the tracks. (See associated appended documents.) For the Mass Comm and Human Comm MA tracks, the core courses for assessment will be Issues and Perspectives in Communication, and Research Methods in Communication. New rubrics are being designed for both these courses, to more accurately pinpoint student performance across a variety of areas. For the Film-Media Studies area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media History. The rubrics have been developed for Advanced Film Theory and are in the process of being developed for Media History. For the Film Production area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media Expression. These rubrics have been developed.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

Because the new assessment forms for the MA are still in development, targets in some areas cannot be set yet. In the film MA, we would like to see students performing at level 3.0 in Advanced Film Theory. We have not yet devised the assessment form for Media History, the other core Film MA course. In the other MA tracks, we have not yet developed the assessment form for Issues and Perspectives in Communication, which measures competence in literature and theory.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

In the Film-Video track, assessment of this item was done in Advanced Film Theory. Findings: Knowledge of the aesthetic traditions of cinema/tv: 21% scored at 4; 29% scored at 3; 50% scored 2 or below. Thus half the students are scoring below expectations in this area. Knowledge of theoretical formations in the field: Again, we are seeing 50% to 64% scoring at 2 or below, ie, below our expected target. In the other MA tracks, this item could not be assessed last year because the relevant core course was not offered in the semester when the new system was adopted. No data yet.

**M 2: Assessment in Core Seminars: Research and Method (O: 3)**

For background narrative, see Description of Measure #1. For the Mass Comm and Human Comm MA tracks, the core courses for assessment will be Issues and Perspectives in Communication, and Research Methods in Communication. New rubrics are being designed for both these courses, to more accurately pinpoint student performance across a variety of areas. For the Film-Media Studies area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media History. The rubrics have been developed for Advanced Film Theory and are in the process of being developed for Media History. For the Film Production area, the core courses for assessment will be Advanced Film Theory and Media Expression. These rubrics have been developed.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

Because the new assessment forms for the MA are still in development, targets in some areas cannot be set yet. For two of the MA tracks, the assessment form has been developed (for the core course Research Methods in Communication). We still need to calibrate the rubrics so as to achieve meaningful assessments in this area. For the MA Film track, one question in the core
### M 6: Quality of creative or research thesis (O: 1, 2, 3)

Earlier versions of the thesis assessments were too vague, so we have developed new assessment forms which will measure competencies that correspond to those being measure in the core-seminar assessments. See appended documents.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions

All students should score a 3 or higher; 40% of the students should score 4 or higher.

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

All students should score at least a 3 at level 3 or level 4.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Here, the target should be 100% of theses at level 3 or level 4.

Not Reported This Cycle

### M 5: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense (O: 1, 2, 3)

Earlier versions of the thesis prospectus assessments were too vague, so we have developed new assessment forms which will measure competencies that correspond to those being measure in the core-seminar assessments. See appended documents.

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

Target for O1: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions

All students should score a 3 or higher; 40% of the students should score 4 or higher.

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

Ideally, all students should score a 3 (good) or higher score on this measure.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The discrepancy between the findings in the two areas needs to be addressed via alignment of rubrics across the department.

Not Met

### M 3: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing (O: 2)

For Background Narrative, see the description in Measure #1. Rubrics for writing are incorporated into both the core seminar assessments and the assessments of prospectus and thesis. The rubrics are as follows: 5 - the final paper would be an effective writing sample for admission to a distinguished doctoral program; 4 - the final paper is quite effective, and could be used as a writing sample for doctoral admission; 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; 2 - the paper is weak in more than one of the areas in (3) above; 1 - the paper is not of graduate-seminar quality.

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

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

For Background Narrative, see the description in Measure #1. Rubrics for writing are incorporated into both the core seminar assessments and the assessments of prospectus and thesis. The rubrics are as follows: 5 - the final paper would be an effective writing sample for admission to a distinguished doctoral program; 4 - the final paper is quite effective, and could be used as a writing sample for doctoral admission; 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; 2 - the paper is weak in more than one of the areas in (3) above; 1 - the paper is not of graduate-seminar quality.

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

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

Given that core seminars are generally taken in the first year of the MA program, we expect the outcomes to be lower than we would see for the thesis prospectus and thesis. The target is 80% of the students performing at 3 or higher, with 25% of the students performing at 4 or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Given that core seminars are generally taken in the first year of the MA program, we expect the outcomes to be lower than we would see for the thesis prospectus and thesis. The target is 80% of the students performing at 3 or higher, with 25% of the students performing at 4 or higher.

Not Met

---

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of theses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

---

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of prospectuses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

---

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of prospectuses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

---

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of theses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

---

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of theses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.
Because only a small number of theses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

**Target for O3: Understanding of research methods**
All students should score a 3 or higher; 40% of the students should score 4 or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Because only a small number of theses were defended in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next 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
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
  - Measure: Quality of creative or research thesis | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
  - Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Committee, Graduate Faculty

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

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

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Quality of creative or research thesis | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
  - Measure: Quality of thesis prospectus and defense | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty
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: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 03/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee.

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 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 thesis and prospectus. 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 several very different tracks in the Communications MA program, we have not decided yet whether we will develop separate rubrics for each track, or whether we can have common rubrics. (However, we definitely will need a separate set of rubrics for the creative work done in the film production area.) 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Literature and Theory | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Research and Method | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of research methods
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

Projected Completion Date: 03/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee; all graduate faculty

Review the content of the Advanced Film Theory course

Because the Film-Video program mixes students who are doing production with students who are doing critical studies, and because we accept students into the program with varied undergraduate majors and backgrounds, it is expected that there would be unevenness in knowledge of the canon. However, it would make sense to call an area meeting of production and film theory faculty to address how the course might more effectively get students up to speed.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Literature and Theory | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of scholarly and creative traditions
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Research and Method | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of research methods
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

Implementation Description: Series of area meetings of those faculty who teach film theory, and the production faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Angelo Restivo

Revise new rubrics for the Research Methods course

The findings for student performance in the Research Methods course were unusually high, and were not in sync with either previous years' findings or with the findings from this year's film-video track assessments. Thus, the area faculty who teach this course need to develop a set of measures and rubrics that will give more nuanced results of student performance here.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Research and Method | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of research methods
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Written, oral, and media-making competencies

Implementation Description: Meetings with relevant area faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Angelo Restivo; graduate committee.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of Literatures (G: 1) (M: 1, 6, 7, 8)**

Because all three of our doctoral tracks are highly interdisciplinary, the students in each track are expected to have solid mastery of the diverse literatures informing their particular area of study. Background: In the academic year 2010-11, we piloted an online system of end-of-course assessment for all graduate courses in the department. While some important information was gathered with this system, the data parsing and analysis proved to be an extreme burden on the limited number of faculty able to do it, and at the same time, we were getting lots of extraneous or irrelevant information. In light of this, last year’s action plan included a complete rethinking of the graduate assessment in the department. In the Fall, the graduate director (Restivo) met with Marti Singer to discuss ways to implement a new assessment for a very complex graduate program with many areas of specialization. The grad director then mapped out some preliminary sets of rubrics and measures. Early in the Spring of 2012, the grad director met with each area of the doctoral and MA faculties, and worked with them to devise clear and relevant learning outcomes, rubrics, and measures for each of the tracks of the MA and PhD programs. We decided to designate key core courses in each area of the MA and PhD programs as those in which student performance would be measured. We developed learning outcomes which, while parallel throughout the various tracks, nevertheless are able to measure learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are expected across all the tracks. (See uploaded documents.) For the doctoral programs, we developed new, and much more nuanced, rubrics for measuring performance on the comprehensive exams, specific to each area. Thus, measurements of outcomes on the comprehensive exams are now directly tied to measurements of learning outcomes of specific core seminars. (See uploaded documents.) In this way, we will be able to track over time how students are performing from coursework to comprehensive exams. If, for example, we identify an area of consistently weak performance in one of the area core courses, we can then add this area as a measure in the comprehensive exams, and thus be able to ascertain what kinds of curricular change would be warranted, given the particularities of the area.

**SLO 2: Research and Method (G: 1) (M: 3, 6, 7, 8)**

Research and Method: Students are expected to be able to formulate a research problem which poses a significant and original intervention in the field. They are able to select both the appropriate objects of study and the appropriate theoretical tools pertinent to addressing this problem. Background: In the academic year 2010-11, we piloted an online system of end-of-course assessment for all graduate courses in the department. While some important information was gathered with this system, the data parsing and analysis proved to be an extreme burden on the limited number of faculty able to do it, and at the same time, we were getting lots of extraneous or irrelevant information. In light of this, last year’s action plan included a complete rethinking of the graduate assessment in the department. In the Fall, the graduate director (Restivo) met with Marti Singer to discuss ways to implement a new assessment for a very complex graduate program with many areas of specialization. The grad director then mapped out some preliminary sets of rubrics and measures. Early in the Spring of 2012, the grad director met with each area of the doctoral and MA faculties, and worked with them to devise clear and relevant learning outcomes, rubrics, and measures for each of the tracks of the MA and PhD programs. We decided to designate key core courses in each area of the MA and PhD programs as those in which student performance would be measured. We developed learning outcomes which, while parallel throughout the various tracks, nevertheless are able to measure learning outcomes specific to the tracks, as well as learning outcomes which are expected across all the tracks. (See uploaded documents.) For the doctoral programs, we developed new, and much more nuanced, rubrics for measuring performance on the comprehensive exams, specific to each area. Thus, measurements of outcomes on the comprehensive exams are now directly tied to measurements of learning outcomes of specific core seminars. (See uploaded documents.) In this way, we will be able to track over time how students are performing from coursework to comprehensive exams. If, for example, we identify an area of consistently weak performance in one of the area core courses, we can then add this area as a measure in the comprehensive exams, and thus...
be able to ascertain what kinds of curricular change would be warranted, given the particularities of the area. At the doctoral level, after the comprehensive exam assessment, we will use common forms for assessing dissertation prospectuses and dissertations. These will lie in to the learning outcomes which are common throughout all the tracks of the PhD program. (Assessment forms uploaded in documents.)

Strategic Plan Associations

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

3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

SLO 3: Proficiency in communication theory (G: 1) (M: 2, 6, 7, 8)

Demonstrated ability to comprehend and engage the full range of communication theories in the student’s area (Rhetoric/Politics, Media/Society, or Moving Image Studies), including an understanding of the intellectual contexts in which these theories evolved, and the specific problems they attempt to address.

SLO 4: Proficiency in writing (G: 1) (M: 4, 7, 8, 9, 10)

Writing: the student is able to effectively present research in writing, mobilizing the skills assessed in items 1, 2, and 3 above: that is, once an appropriate research problem is identified, the student is able to cogently and effectively orchestrate his/her knowledge of the literature and theory to present a well-organized, clearly written, and effective argument.

Strategic Plan Associations

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

SLO 5: Strong oral presentation and advocacy skills (G: 3) (M: 5)

The doctoral student is expected to be able to present orally both analytical summaries of the work of others in the field, and their own research. They are also expected to be able to make pointed interventions in discussions and question/answer sessions, both in relation to their own work and the work of colleagues.

Strategic Plan Associations

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

SLO 6: Teaching excellence (G: 2)

Demonstrated excellence in teaching courses in both the introductory courses in the field and in the student’s areas of specialization.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 7: Professional development (G: 3) (M: 9, 10)

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 8: Increase student engagement with new media

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.]

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assessment in Core Seminars: knowledge of the literature (O: 1)

Several rubrics on our new assessment forms measure knowledge of the literature in core courses. The standards set forth are as follows: Course content: overall literature: 5 – 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. 4 – student demonstrates a clear mastery of the literature in the field, largely from the course 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. 2 – there are some significant gaps in the student’s knowledge of the literature of the area. 1 – there are wide gaps in the student’s knowledge of the literature of the area.

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

Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures

Target: 25% perform at level 4 or 5; 75% perform at level 3.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

Note: MIS = Moving Image Studies; MS = Media & Society; RP = Rhetoric & Politics In MIS, Historiography was the core seminar assessed. Findings: All students scored 3 in awareness of and engagement with historiographic theory. Our target is partially met, insofar as we expect 80% to measure at 3 or higher. We would like to see a percentage of students performing at level 4. But given the newness of the system, we should collect more data on this area before making curricular
adjustments. In RP, two students (or 22%) scored an average 3 in knowledge of the background literature, while the remainder of the class (88%) exhibited below average background knowledge. In MS, 50% of the core-class students scored 4, and 50% scored 5. (Given the disparity between the results in the Media & Society area vs the results in other areas, it is suspected that the rubrics in MS were not in alignment with those of other areas.)

M 2: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory (O: 3)
Several rubrics on our new assessment forms measure knowledge of the literature in core courses. The standards set forth are as follows: Course content: theory - 5 - 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. 4 - 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. 2 – the student has shown some difficulty in accurately summarizing theoretical arguments, in commanding theoretical vocabulary, and in making theoretical interventions. 1 – the student’s knowledge of theory is inadequate to do doctoral-level research.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Research and Method
Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher; 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Note: MIS = Moving Image Studies; MS = Media & Society; RP = Rhetoric & Politics MIS: 60% scored 4 or higher on soundness of project design (with only 1 student falling below the target 3). Similarly 70% scored 4 or higher on search for and use of historical data; with again only one student falling below the target. RP: Significantly, 100% of the students were able to perform textual analysis at above-average levels (all scoring 4). In the area of formulating a significant research question, 88% scored at level 3, while 22% scored below average at 2. Awareness of historical positioning of discourses; here we see 22% scoring at level 3, while 88% are scoring at level 2. Finally, in terms of ability to select objects of study and theoretical literature so as to produce productive conversation: 22% level 3; 77% level 2; 1 student at level 1. MS: Four questions covered methods (incl research design, data interp, evaluation); All students scored 4 or above. The wide variation in the results in the 3 tracks suggests that the results might be idiosyncratic to the instructors, and/or due to differences in interpretation of the rubrics of measurement. Thus, before doing more sweeping changes, we need to fine tune the measures and rubrics so that they yield relatively consistent results across the areas.

M 3: Assessment in Core Seminars: Research and Method (O: 2)
Two questions assess in this area: one question assesses ability to formulate a significant research question, and the second assesses the ability to select appropriate objects of study and theoretical discourses suitable to the research question.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Research and Method
Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher; 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Note: MIS = Moving Image Studies; MS = Media & Society; RP = Rhetoric & Politics MIS: 60% scored 4 or higher on soundness of project design (with only 1 student falling below the target 3). Similarly 70% scored 4 or higher on search for and use of historical data; with again only one student falling below the target. RP: Significantly, 100% of the students were able to perform textual analysis at above-average levels (all scoring 4). In the area of formulating a significant research question, 88% scored at level 3, while 22% scored below average at 2. Awareness of historical positioning of discourses; here we see 22% scoring at level 3, while 88% are scoring at level 2. Finally, in terms of ability to select objects of study and theoretical literature so as to produce productive conversation: 22% level 3; 77% level 2; 1 student at level 1. MS: Four questions covered methods (incl research design, data interp, evaluation); All students scored 4 or above. The wide variation in the results in the 3 tracks suggests that the results might be idiosyncratic to the instructors, and/or due to differences in interpretation of the rubrics of measurement. Thus, before doing more sweeping changes, we need to fine tune the measures and rubrics so that they yield relatively consistent results across the areas.

M 4: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing (O: 4)
Two questions in the assessment measure writing skills, with the rubrics as follows: Overall writing effectiveness: 5 - the final paper can with very minor revisions be submitted to a journal 4 - 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 2 - the paper is weak in more than one of the areas in (3) above 1 - the paper is not of graduate-seminar quality

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

Target for O4: Proficiency in writing
Target: 80% perform at level 3 or higher, 40% perform at levels 4 or 5.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Note: MIS = Moving Image Studies; MS = Media & Society; RP = Rhetoric & Politics MIS: 60% evaluated at 4 or higher on soundness of project design (with only 1 student falling below the target 3). Similarly 70% scored 4 or higher on search for and use of historical data; with again only one student falling below the target. RP: Significantly, 100% of the students were able to perform textual analysis at above-average levels (all scoring 4). In the area of formulating a significant research question, 88% scored at level 3, while 22% scored below average at 2. Awareness of historical positioning of discourses; here we see 22% scoring at level 3, while 88% are scoring at level 2. Finally, in terms of ability to select objects of study and theoretical literature so as to produce productive conversation: 22% level 3; 77% level 2; 1 student at level 1. MS: Four questions covered methods (incl research design, data interp, evaluation); All students scored 4 or above. The wide variation in the results in the 3 tracks suggests that the results might be idiosyncratic to the instructors, and/or due to differences in interpretation of the rubrics of measurement. Thus, before doing more sweeping changes, we need to fine tune the measures and rubrics so that they yield relatively consistent results across the areas.

M 5: Assessment in Core Seminars: Oral advocacy (O: 5)
Two questions in the core course assessment will assess student skills in presenting material orally. Because previous WEAVE reports have indicated to us that oral presentation and advocacy skills are strongly developed among our doctoral students, we will temporarily put this measure on hold, as we focus on other areas more in need of monitoring.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
### Target for O5: 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 be expected to fall between 2 and 3, with a small percentage falling below 3.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because, in the last several reporting cycles, our students have consistently met or exceeded targets in the oral advocacy area, we are not going to be measuring this in the next few cycles.

### M 6: Comprehensive doctoral examinations (O: 1, 2, 3)

The new Comprehensive Exam assessment form was designed specifically to integrate with the assessment forms developed for course work above. The assessment of comprehensive exams will be specific to each doctoral track, and will provide summarizing information which will connect back to assessment information gathered from the seminars. We have designed the comprehensive exam assessment to allow us to add specific rubrics for each doctoral track, depending upon what we discover as we assess performance in seminars. Thus, if we find that students in one of the tracks are consistently scoring low in one specific area of the field, we can then add that as an area of assessment in the comprehensive exams, with the intention that if the weakness has not been ameliorated by the time of comprehensive exams, then a revision of the curriculum in relation to that area would be advisable.

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

### Target for O1: Knowledge of Literatures

By the time of comprehensive exams, students should be performing at a higher aggregate level than in the seminars. 75% should perform at level 4 or 5, while all should perform at level 3 or higher, in all areas measured.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of comprehensive exams were taken in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

### Target for O2: Research and Method

By the time of comprehensive exams, students should be performing at a higher aggregate level than in the seminars. 75% should perform at level 4 or 5, while all should perform at level 3 or higher, in all areas measured.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of comprehensive exams were taken in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

### Target for O3: Proficiency in communication theory

By the time of comprehensive exams, students should be performing at a higher aggregate level than in the seminars. 75% should perform at level 4 or 5, while all should perform at level 3 or higher, in all areas measured.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Because only a small number of comprehensive exams were taken in the period after the adoption of the new assessment system, these findings will be aggregated with those of the current academic year and reported in the next cycle.

### M 7: Assessment of Dissertation Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

In the newly adopted assessment plan put in place in Spring of 2012, we decided to begin assessing doctoral dissertation prospectuses and dissertations, which in the past had not been assessed. Because only a very small number of prospectuses were defended in the period between the development of the measure and the end of the cycle, it is too early to develop targets or report findings here. Prospectuses will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported in next cycle.

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

### M 8: Assessment of Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

In the newly adopted assessment plan put in place in Spring of 2012, we decided to begin assessing doctoral dissertation prospectuses and dissertations, which in the past had not been assessed. Because only a very small number of dissertations were defended in the period between the development of the measure and the end of the cycle, it is too early to develop targets or report findings here. Dissertation assessments will be aggregated with those defended in the current academic year, and results will be reported in next cycle.

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

### M 9: Presentation at conferences (O: 4, 7)

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 O7: 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.
Conference Presentations: Overall our doctoral students perform well in getting work presented at conferences. This year, the total number of conferences presentations was 76. The breakdown: Local 10, Regional 18, National 44, International 4.

M 10: Publication in peer reviewed journals (O: 4, 7)
While this is an indirect measure, we feel that it is very important that we measure and report the number and types of publications and conference presentations of the doctoral students. Several years ago, we instituted the doctoral writing proseminar expressly to allow students to turn seminar papers into papers ready to send out for journal review. We want to track over time whether or not this results in increased publication among the doctoral students.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for O4: Proficiency in writing
The aggregate number of publications among the doctoral students should increase to reflect a 50% annual publication rate: ie, the number of publications accepted in any given year should rise to 50% of the doctoral cohort.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Publication: This year, 2 chapters and 1 journal article appeared in print, while 8 chapters and 10 journal articles were in press in April 2012. Eight articles were under review at journals, and we saw a total of 7 books reviews, encyclopedia entries, and conference proceedings. Comparing this to last year’s data: in 2010-11, 2 book chapters appeared in print, with 10 forthcoming; 3 journal articles appeared, with 3 forthcoming; and 3 book reviews were published. Thus, if we assume that of the 13 forthcoming 2011 articles, 3 appeared in print, this means that 10 of the 18 articles in press in 2012 were submitted in 2011. We can thus conclude that 8 of the articles in press in 2012 were accepted, revised, and in press during the year. This tells us that our students have increased their activity in successfully getting their work out to publication, which was what the Writing Proseminar was intended to achieve as its result. Again, while this is an indirect measure, we will continue to monitor this to see whether students maintain and increase this higher level of publication activity; the results can be used to decide how to structure the important Writing Proseminar for the highest effectiveness.

Target for O7: 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Research and Method
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in writing
- Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
- Measure: Publication in peer reviewed journals | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

Institute prospectus writing workshop
In Fall 2009, we began to offer a prospectus writing workshop for all students who had completed coursework (whether or not they had taken comps yet). We believe that this workshop will not only help doctoral students avoid the post-comprehensive-exams "doldrums," which often drains out the period during which the prospectus is written; but that it will also help the student in the publication process, as the completed prospectus can serve as a kind of template for planning which areas of the dissertation would be best suitable for sending out for publication during the writing process.

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

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

Integrate Center for Teaching/Learning feedback into grad teaching
Beginning this semester, our two undergraduate Film core courses (which are the entry-level courses for new graduate GTAs to teach) have incorporated Center for Teaching and Learning feedback sessions early in the semester. We should adopt this in all of our large undergraduate core courses (those which have course directors), so as to provide new GTAs with feedback early. We should also encourage more of our experienced GTAs teaching stand-alone courses to utilize this resource.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Publication: This year, 2 chapters and 1 journal article appeared in print, while 8 chapters and 10 journal articles were in press in April 2012. Eight articles were under review at journals, and we saw a total of 7 books reviews, encyclopedia entries, and conference proceedings. Comparing this to last year’s data: in 2010-11, 2 book chapters appeared in print, with 10 forthcoming; 3 journal articles appeared, with 3 forthcoming; and 3 book reviews were published. Thus, if we assume that of the 13 forthcoming 2011 articles, 3 appeared in print, this means that 10 of the 18 articles in press in 2012 were submitted in 2011. We can thus conclude that 8 of the articles in press in 2012 were accepted, revised, and in press during the year. This tells us that our students have increased their activity in successfully getting their work out to publication, which was what the Writing Proseminar was intended to achieve as its result. Again, while this is an indirect measure, we will continue to monitor this to see whether students maintain and increase this higher level of publication activity; the results can be used to decide how to structure the important Writing Proseminar for the highest effectiveness.

Target for O4: Proficiency in writing
The aggregate number of publications among the doctoral students should increase to reflect a 50% annual publication rate: ie, the number of publications accepted in any given year should rise to 50% of the doctoral cohort.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Publication: This year, 2 chapters and 1 journal article appeared in print, while 8 chapters and 10 journal articles were in press in April 2012. Eight articles were under review at journals, and we saw a total of 7 books reviews, encyclopedia entries, and conference proceedings. Comparing this to last year’s data: in 2010-11, 2 book chapters appeared in print, with 10 forthcoming; 3 journal articles appeared, with 3 forthcoming; and 3 book reviews were published. Thus, if we assume that of the 13 forthcoming 2011 articles, 3 appeared in print, this means that 10 of the 18 articles in press in 2012 were submitted in 2011. We can thus conclude that 8 of the articles in press in 2012 were accepted, revised, and in press during the year. This tells us that our students have increased their activity in successfully getting their work out to publication, which was what the Writing Proseminar was intended to achieve as its result. Again, while this is an indirect measure, we will continue to monitor this to see whether students maintain and increase this higher level of publication activity; the results can be used to decide how to structure the important Writing Proseminar for the highest effectiveness.

Target for O7: 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.

Increased opportunity to revise written work
Currently, slightly over 50% of our doctoral seminars incorporate paper revision into the seminar. We would like to encourage faculty to adopt this practice more widely. One of the systems we would advocate is to have the students present short versions of the final paper orally to the seminar as a conference presentation, and then use the resulting feedback to revise the paper for final submission. This is already done in some seminars; we would like to see it more widely adopted in doctoral syllabi.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Research and Method
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in writing
- Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
- Measure: Publication in peer reviewed journals | Outcome/Objective: Professional development

Institute prospectus writing workshop
In Fall 2009, we began to offer a prospectus writing workshop for all students who had completed coursework (whether or not they had taken comps yet). We believe that this workshop will not only help doctoral students avoid the post-comprehensive-exams "doldrums," which often drains out the period during which the prospectus is written; but that it will also help the student in the publication process, as the completed prospectus can serve as a kind of template for planning which areas of the dissertation would be best suitable for sending out for publication during the writing process.

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

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

Integrate Center for Teaching/Learning feedback into grad teaching
Beginning this semester, our two undergraduate Film core courses (which are the entry-level courses for new graduate GTAs to teach) have incorporated Center for Teaching and Learning feedback sessions early in the semester. We should adopt this in all of our large undergraduate core courses (those which have course directors), so as to provide new GTAs with feedback early. We should also encourage more of our experienced GTAs teaching stand-alone courses to utilize this resource.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
More faculty observation of student teaching
We are planning to have all GTAs be observed at least once per academic year by a faculty mentor.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: On-Hold
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 04/2010

Revised doctoral proseein curriculum
At the initiative of the Graduate Committee, and with the approval of the entire faculty, we have initiated a new proseminar format which is focused on faculty and student presentation of research in progress. Students will now be required to present work in prosemin at least twice during their doctoral residence, once before comprehensive exams, and once in the dissertation-writing period. We believe that this shift in focus in the 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: Presentation of work at conferences
  - Outcome/Objective: Professional development
- Implementation Description: We have already begun the new proseminar format; we will monitor its effectiveness during the year.
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2009

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
- Implementation Description: Has been in place now for the past 2 years.
- Responsible Person/Group: Cheshier, Graduate Committee, all area 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; departmental faculty

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: Restivo; MIS area faculty

Institute earlier application deadlines for graduate application
Because the Grad Committee discovered that we were losing our best applicants to other programs in part because our application deadlines were so late in the cycle, we moved the doctoral application deadlines to Dec 1 (Feb 1 for no GTA consideration); and the MA deadlines to Feb 1/ Mar 15. This is in keeping with other, competitive departments’ deadlines.

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

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

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Non-thesis option adopted 2011.
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Revamp end-of-semester online assessment of doctoral students
Given the described problems in the current set of data generated by the pilot assessment year, the following recommendations have been presented to the Graduate Committee: 1. Aggregate data by student for each semester; 2. Assign semester-in-program numbers to each student and generate data spreads under that variable. 3. Revise the evaluation questionnaire both to a/ eliminate redundancies; and b/ eliminate categories that will not lead to identification of actionable issues; and most important, c/ revise...
assess the 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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Research and Method

Implementation Description: Already implement in Prosem syllabus.
Responsible Person/Group: Cheshier

Annual reports submitted by all grad students
We already track doctoral student publications and conference presentations during the academic year in the course of our year-end meetings with each doctoral student. However, we want to institute a form for them to fill out (as opposed to the current CV), so that we can gather more information on other activities that we want to track, such as extent and types of engagement with New Media, creative work in film production (for the MA students), and other information.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee; graduate directors

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 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 duringcoursework 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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: knowledge of the literature | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
- Measure: Comprehensive doctoral examinations | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory

Projected Completion Date: 03/2012

Fine tune the new assessment system begun Spr2012
Because the new assessment of core courses in the PhD tracks is much more nuanced than previous assessment systems, it is going to take a while before all 3 doctoral tracks are being assessed consistently in relation to one another. Thus, when we see large discrepancies in performance from one doctoral track to another, we first need to determine whether the rubrics and measures are consistent across the areas, before taking further action.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: knowledge of the literature | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Literatures
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Theory | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in communication theory
- Measure: Assessment in Core Seminars: Writing | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in writing

Implementation Description: Ongoing meetings with area faculty.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Angelo Restivo; Mary Stuckey; graduate committee
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.

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. 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Only 4 MBA IS/CIS student took CIS 8010 during fall 2011-2012. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will review during 2012-2013.

### 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. Students were not able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. Students were able to accurately translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan; work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives. 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Only 1 MBA IS/CIS student took CIS 8000 during fall 2011-2012. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will review during 2012-2013.

### 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. Students were able to accurately articulate security and privacy circumstances and to propose appropriate control decisions.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Only 1 MBA IS/CIS student took CIS 8080 during fall 2011-2012. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will review during 2012-2013.

### 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. 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.
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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 2011 37 Fall 2011 57 Spring 2012 59 The number of students in this program major: Summer 2011 347 Fall 2011 659 Spring 2012 673 Previous academic year graduates: Summer 2010 21 Fall 2010 37 Spring 2011 48 The number of students in this program major during previous academic year: Summer 2010 297 Fall 2010 562 Spring 2011 586 General approach As part of the ongoing assessment of our CIS BBA program, the CIS department has leveraged the CIS 4980 "Capstone" course project. Students in this required course are assigned to real world organizations for the purpose of exercising the full range of topics from the CIS undergraduate core courses. Since these are real world environments, the needs of specific organizations may not cover all topics. See the CIS assessment plan at http://education.gsu.edu/cbi/oucomes/RCB/CIS_BBA_Assessment_Plan-8-04.htm. CIS has developed a survey to gain structured and free form feedback from individuals involved with CIS 4980 “Capstone” projects. Use of this survey began in Spring 2005 (although we have project materials from several earlier semesters as well as informal feedback and observations from students and faculty). The form used in this Capstone survey is attached. At the end of each semester, the CIS 4980 teams present their projects to fellow students, faculty, and clients. Each of these viewers (excluding students) is asked to complete a survey for each team's presentation. Students' are asked to complete the survey to comment on their own performance and on their level of preparation to perform within each of the areas on the survey. And, there are areas for "open" comments. Clients may complete the survey based on their observations of the team's work and their presentation at the client's site. The survey's areas cover the full range of primary objectives of the courses within the CIS undergraduate core (and also within most electives). In particular, we can map the areas back to the CIS courses and measure whether scores are increasing (hopefully reflecting continuing improvement in the conduct of the associated courses and the resulting student learning).

Goals
G 1: CIS BBA Program Goals
Students will become better problem-solvers; students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking; students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline; students will be well prepared for positions in the discipline.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 11)
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, 9)
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 read and analyze user requirements specifications within the context of a three-tier architecture will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to present the specification, presentation tier, business tier, and data tier abstractions. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to design current system architectures will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design current systems architectures will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop program specifications, procedures, test plans and implementation plans for real-world applications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Student will be able to model and develop a design for a web-based application. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to make effective and efficient use of Internet applications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to design and develop effective, graphically pleasing web sites will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

SLO 3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency (M: 7, 8, 10)

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Only 1 MBA IS/CIS student took CIS 8020 during fall 2011-2012. This is not sufficient for assessment measurement. Will review during 2012-2013.
Students will be able to read a program specification using unified modeling language. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to develop object-oriented software that conforms to specifications will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to develop object-oriented software that conforms to specifications will be evaluated by a faculty panel. Students will be able to design, code, test and document an object-oriented program in an object-oriented programming language. Within the context of a capstone course, the ability of students to write object-oriented programs will be evaluated by the client organizations. The ability of students to write object-oriented programs will be evaluated by a faculty panel.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Identified User Requirements (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Acquired and scoped the system and user requirements</td>
<td><strong>Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Specified System Requirements (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Specified, analyzed &amp; refined the system and user requirements</td>
<td><strong>Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Developed Program Specifications (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Developed appropriate program specifications given the identified user requirements</td>
<td><strong>Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Used Object-oriented concepts and notation (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Appropriately used object-oriented concepts and notation</td>
<td><strong>Students will be proficient in systems analysis</strong></td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: Developed Architecture (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Designed the specified system using an appropriate architecture</td>
<td><strong>Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 6: Designed programs (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Designed the programs according to specifications</td>
<td><strong>Students will be proficient in systems design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery.
### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

**M 7: Coded and Developed (O: 3)**
Coded/developed the specified & designed programs
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 7 Coded and Developed</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially 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 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 8 Appropriately used an object-oriented programming</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

**M 9: Designed user interface (O: 2)**
Designed and developed an effective, efficient, and graphically pleasing user interface
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O2: Students will be proficient in systems design**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 9 Designed user interface</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

**M 10: Appropriately used database concepts (O: 3)**
 Appropriately applied database concepts and techniques
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 10 Appropriately used database concepts</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

**M 11: Appropriately used business process modeling concepts (O: 1)**
 Appropriately used Business Process Modeling Concepts
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Students will be proficient in systems analysis**
4.0 on a scale of 1 though 5 with 5 being outstanding / strongly agree for an average end of the capstone project survey given to clients, observing faculty, and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 11 Appropriately used business process modeling concepts</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 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-Orientation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Used object-oriented concepts and notation | Outcome/Objective: Students will be proficient in systems analysis
Implementation Description: The CIS UPC will assess whether this miss is a result of programming not being required or the result of projects not requiring Object-Orientation. Student interpretation of questions seems to be an ongoing problem.
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
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Appropriately used database concepts | Outcome/Objective: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency
Implementation Description: Assess change in assessment rating of database concept use. Take appropriate action to correct or to clarify.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CIS UPC

Recommend self-paced programming course
Students are not able to program are now strongly advised to complete an e-training self-paced Java programming course. The survey will also emphasize that responses to this question should be N/A if no programming is required by the student’s project.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Appropriately used an object-oriented programming | Outcome/Objective: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency
Implementation Description: Students are not able to program are now strongly advised to complete an e-training self-paced Java programming course. The survey will also emphasize that responses to this question should be N/A if no programming is required by the student’s project.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2013
Responsible Person/Group: CIS 4980 instructor

Recommend self-paced programming course
Students who have not taken programming will be (and are now) strongly advised to complete an e-training self-paced Java programming course if they have not taken a CIS programming course.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Coded and Developed | Outcome/Objective: Object Oriented Programming Proficiency
Implementation Description: Strongly recommend self-paced programming course when programming not an existing knowledge
Projected Completion Date: 01/2013
Responsible Person/Group: CIS 4980 instructor

Require self-paced programming course
While students are not required to take a programming course, many projects include some programming. Even when the student does not have to program, they seem to feel inadequate. Students who have not taken programming are now strongly advised to complete an e-training self-paced Java programming course.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Used object-oriented concepts and notation | Outcome/Objective: Students will be proficient in systems analysis
Projected Completion Date: 01/2013
Responsible Person/Group: CIS 4980 capstone instructor

Mission / Purpose
The effective deployment of information technology is one of the keys to business success. New applications of information technology strike at the heart of what management does and how organizations are structured and compete in an increasingly interconnected global economy. In many respects these applications and technologies are redefining the nature of work and its organization. The CIS Graduate Program aims to develop specialists and managers with the combination of business and technology
skills needed to continue competitive advancement of American industry. The mission of the CIS major in the Master of Science program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business knowledge with the latest software engineering tools and techniques to create and manage information systems that allow organizations to compete in the global marketplace. Number of graduates in the MS CIS/IS degree program Summer 2008 Fall 2008 Spring 2009 3 5 5 Summer 2007 Fall 2007 Spring 2008 3 4 3 Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 8 8 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 5 13 7 Number of students in the MS CIS/IS degree Summer 2008 Fall 2008 Spring 2009 10 38 39 Summer 2007 Fall 2007 Spring 2008 10 27 22 Summer 2006 Fall 2006 Spring 2007 31 34 27 Summer 2005 Fall 2005 Spring 2006 38 57 46 The 2004-2005 assessment report for this program may be found at http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/CIS_MS_Assessment_Report_9_16_2005.htm. While this document primarily addresses specific course-level assessment of our departmental programs, it is but part of a larger assessment and curricular improvement activities engaging the energy of CIS faculty for two very compelling reasons. The first arises from the core nature of our discipline and the second arises from purely economic realities. 1) The disciplinary core. Our discipline is at the nexus of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Social Organizations. The modern business, governmental and Nonprofit organization is increasingly dependent upon these technologies to compete in a globally interconnected and interdependent world. Both these technologies and the organizational settings in which they are embedded are highly dynamic, and emergent settings. As such our discipline, and our curricula, must necessarily address those principles and skills that are stable over time, but also to anticipate where changing technical and social/political realties may lead. 2) Economic necessity. The triple-whammy of the dot com implosion, the economic downturn of post 9/11 economy and the accelerated global sourcing of digital work have conspired to reverse a 15 year trend of enrollment growth to a period of contraction and rebuilding. The net result of these continuous and dramatic underlying technological and social changes is that the content of virtually all CIS courses and the curriculum itself is in constant flux. Thus, by technical and economic necessity, the CIS faculty are confronted with compelling reasons for continuous improvement of our programs, course offerings and course content. We offer three examples as evidence of this attention to continuous curricular improvement. The first is that in the past 5 years the curriculum has undergone two major revisions at each the undergraduate and graduate programs and is in the stages of yet another substantial revamping. Secondly, three times in the past five years faculty have engaged Chief Information Officers and other leaders from major Atlanta Metropolitan business and service industry organizations in group discussion covering the nature and content of our programs and course offerings. A fourth such process is in the offering for early 2007. And thirdly, CIS faculty hold leadership positions in the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) special interest group on computer personnel research (SIG CPR) and make a specific study of the changing technical skill sets required of our graduates in the workforce. Our faculty are represented on Microsoft's academic advisory board and routinely engage with CIO and CTO level personnel in other industry and academic venues, which coupled with an active field research agenda provides a view of the changing skill-sets needed by our students. Thus, at both holistic and detailed levels of analysis, CIS faculty attempt to keep abreast of societal and technical changes requiring curricular adjustment. This document is, however, largely concerned with course-level assessment. It depends on direct measures of curricular competence, i.e., student exams, projects and presentations. Because it is an analysis of the artifacts of the curriculum and instructional activity, it is also an indirect assessment exercise. This assessment exercise addresses the fidelity by which the core course set in our CIS major meets a set of stated learning objectives. Those objectives and the mapping of those objectives to specific courses in our core are represented below, Figure 1 (Napier, Johnson, Stucke, 2006) Course-level Assessment method As is typical student performance was measured by sets of direct and indirect measures of exams, homework, projects and presentations, adjudicated by the principal instructor, and in many cases, with the participation of other faculty and industry representatives as outside adjudicators. The course level assessment provided herein was arrived at by indirect means; that is, via the evaluation of static artifacts. Those assessments were based on the learning objectives as stated in the course syllabus and according to the departments overall learning objectives. For each of the core courses the departmental evaluation committee developed a survey instrument (c.f., http://www2.cis.gsu.edu/cis/program/assessment/graduate/index.asp). The draft instrument was created from published course documents reviewed by instructors and then minimal staffed to provide a sampling representing 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.  

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Identify business needs and challenges that may be facilitated through information technology (M: 1)**

Students will be able to specify the requirements for an information system that meets user needs. This objective is not met in the core courses. In lieu of this, a surrogate objective will be used: Students will be able to select appropriate contemporary and leading-edge tools and techniques to correctly use these tools and techniques to specify the requirements for an information system. The student should be able to analyze an organization's performance by assessing its resources, capabilities, and competitive environment.

**SLO 2: Create environments for programs and systems (M: 2)**

Students will be proficient in design and implementation of information infrastructure.

**SLO 3: Manage an information technology project (M: 3, 4)**

Students will be able to translate a set of project requirements and resources into a workable plan. Students will be able to work with intellectual tools for selecting among competing projects and to choose appropriate solutions to meet project objectives.

**SLO 4: Build and renew business via technology & process (M: 5, 6, 7)**

Students will be able to identify business opportunities associated with an emerging technology. Students will be able to identify and diagnose problems in business process, to design improved configurations enabled by information technology, and to manage the organizational changes required to implement the new processes.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: L1: 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
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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Formatting slides | Outcome/Objective: Presentation Application Software

#### Additional examples and quizzes

With additional examples being provided during the lectures, students will see how to create charts and then import them into other software for presentations and documents. Additional quizzes will require students to work more closely with the material to gain better understanding.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Chart drawing | Outcome/Objective: Spreadsheet Application Software

### Coordinate 1010 sections

Establish a coordinator for the CSC 1010 course. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors teaching sections of the CSC 1010 course in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 1: Computer Systems Development (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 2: Programming Skills (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 3: Algorithm Design and Analysis (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Discrete Mathematics (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 5: Hardware Systems (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able: 1) to describe the principles and processes of hardware systems development 2) to apply modeling techniques and tools for implementing the phases of hardware development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

| M 1: Alumni Surveys |
An alumni survey will be mailed to alumni via the departmental newsletter on an annual basis. Survey will solicit input from alumni on job promotions, success in graduate schools, job satisfaction, etc. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee for review.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

M 2: Senior Level Course Surveys and Exit Interviews

A senior level course survey and exit interview will be conducted each term to solicit input from graduating seniors on a self-assessment of their education, on their concerns with the department, and their ideas for possible curricular improvements. The undergraduate coordinator will administer the survey in conjunction with the graduation audit check out.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

M 3: Senior Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 5)

Copies of selected presentations and oral reviews will be collected from individual faculty for future inspection by Assessment Committee. (each semester) Students are encouraged to participate in external design competitions where they are judged relative to their peers from other institutions. (ongoing)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O1: Computer Systems Development

The average samples should demonstrate mastery of the subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for them to be successful in the work force. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery and a thorough understanding of subject domain as well as excellent presentation skills. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Findings 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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.

M 4: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 2, 3, 4)

Each outcome can be mapped to a particular required course in our curriculum: 1-CSc 4520, 2-CSc 2510, 3-CSc 4530, 4-CSc 2310, and 5-CSc 4210. In each of the courses listed above, instructors include questions on assignments and projects targeting specific components of the corresponding outcome. Each outcome will be measured via the quality of the students’ answers to selected questions on the assignments and projects in the corresponding courses. Copies of selected written class assignments, lab reports, and research reports will be collected from individual faculty members for future inspection by the Assessment Committee. (each semester)

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

Target for O2: Programming Skills

Students should demonstrate the ability to work independently on relevant problems, assignments and projects. The average samples should demonstrate mastery of basic skills and the best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of the skills as well as presentation. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Findings 2011-2012 - 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

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 2011-2012 - 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 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
Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results

Findings 2011-2012 - 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.

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 2011-2012 - 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.

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.

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.

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

Coordinate lower level classes
Establish a coordinator for each of the lower level classes. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors of the course they are assigned to in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Examinations | Outcome/Objective: Programming Skills
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: none

Coordinate lower level classes
Establish a coordinator for each of the lower level classes. They will be responsible for meeting with all instructors of the course they are assigned to in order to ensure that there is consistency among each of the sections offered.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Written Assignments and Reports | Outcome/Objective: Programming Skills
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources: none
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.

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

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 (on going).
Source of Evidence: External report

Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking

Findings 2011-2012 - 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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Research publications should appear in highly selective journals and/or conferences, preferably supported by renowned professional societies (ACM, IEEE).
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%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Written Assignments and Reports (O: 1, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2011-2012 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 2011-2012 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Alumni Surveys (O: 1, 2, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

**Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)**

The surveys will reveal that the majority of the students found the coursework, projects, and thesis research useful and relevant to their careers.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At this current time we do not have enough data to provide reliable findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Graduate Oral and Written Presentations (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated mastery of presentation skills as well as subject domains. Students presented posters and talks at international refereed conferences.

M 6: Thesis/Project Reports and Defenses (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)

Copies of M.S. theses and project reports and defense presentation slides will be available for inspection by the Defense Committee and the Assessment Committee (ongoing).
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

### Target for O1: Computer Science Foundations

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

### Target for O2: Research and Critical Thinking

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for Ph.D. student candidates, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by course instructors and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

### Target for O4: Communication

The average samples should demonstrate basic research skills, mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains, and competent presentation skills sufficient for professional meetings. The best samples should demonstrate advanced research skills, excellent mastery of subject domain, excellent presentation skills suitable for M.S. students, and sufficient quality for acceptance at leading conferences. The assessment of mastery will be completed by Defense Committees and the Department’s Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee will evaluate the results.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

### Target for O5: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)

The average samples should demonstrate mastery and a thorough understanding of the advanced subject domains as well as competent presentation skills 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

M. S. students defended their master theses/projects during the reporting period. Several of the M.S. students have continued studies as Ph.D. students at Georgia State University and other institutions.

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

#### Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

#### Consider Course Only Master's Degree Option

Consider offering a third option for obtaining the Master's Degree. Specifically, a course only option instead of a thesis or project option.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Faculty

#### Consider foundation courses for graduate program

We plan to present the results to the computer science curriculum committee and show the areas (discrete mathematics and computer organization) that may need improvement. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
### Mission / Purpose

MISSION Within the Georgia State mission of research, education, and public service, the mission of the Department of Computer Science encompasses the following areas:  
- **Research:** To make leading contributions to basic and applied science by conducting broadly based research in both theoretical and applied areas of computer science and collaborating on interdisciplinary efforts with other departments in the institution.  
- **Educational Programs:** To provide the next generation of leaders, educators and capable lifelong learners in computer science.  
- **Service:** To support other programs at Georgia State by offering rigorous training in basic computer science to non-majors and to support collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines.  

The Department of Computer Science Ph.D. Program provides students with the underpinnings and advanced topics of computation and computer science for today's applications in industry, science, education, government, and business and prepares the foundation for tomorrow's applications in ubiquitous computing, medical cures for diseases, and instant access to information by every one.

### Goals

**G 1: Computer Science PhD Goals**  
Students will become better solvers of open computational problems; Students will improve abilities to develop novel computational models of real world problems; Students will gain advanced knowledge of computer science; Students will gain skills necessary for a successful career as computer scientists.

### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Computer Science Foundations (G: 1) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)**  
Students should be able to:  
1. Describe the principles and methods of (a) discrete mathematics, (b) best-practices programming paradigms, parallel and distributed computing, algorithm analysis, theory of computation, and complexity analysis, (d) computer & hardware systems development, (e) advanced network-oriented software engineering, and (d) deductive databases and logic programming.  
2. Develop models and corresponding optimization problem formulations, analyze computational complexity of problem formulations and applicable algorithmic approaches.  
3. Apply (a) discrete structures for solving problems in computer science, (b) algorithmic techniques to optimization problems, (c) high-level programming languages, parallel and distributed computing to implement the programming paradigms, and (d) advanced software engineering and modeling techniques for specification of computer systems and implementing the phases of hardware development.

**Strategic Plan Associations**  
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).

**O/O 2: Teaching (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students should be able to teach and/or assist in undergraduate/beginning graduate courses.

**O/O 3: Communication (G: 1) (M: 3, 4, 5)**  
Students communicate effectively using writing and oral conventions and formats appropriate to the research area in computer science.

**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.

**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 2011-2012 - 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.

**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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

A total of 9 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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

A total of 9 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

A total of 9 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

A total of 9 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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.

### 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Qualifying exam</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Bioinformatics (for students with concentration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science Foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dispatch Alumni Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Alumni Surveys</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Computer Science Foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong></td>
<td>07/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong></td>
<td>Graduate Director and Graduate Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Concentration in Accounting MBA**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

For students to develop and integrate: (1) skills for analyzing organizational performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions, (2) skills in developing financial reporting systems, (3) skills in interpreting and predicting choices in financial reporting systems, (4) assurance skills, (5) skills for collaborative work in teams, (6) and communication skills.

**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: Interpersonal skills**
Work effectively with team members to achieve common goals.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

| SLO 1: Financial reporting skills: Develop (G: 1) (M: 2) |
|---|---|
| That students apply professional standards, financial information tools, and professional judgment to develop financial reporting systems for decision making. |

| SLO 2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (G: 2) (M: 1) |
|---|---|
| That students apply economic, financial, and psychological theories to interpret and predict choices in financial reporting systems. |

| SLO 3: Assurance Skills (G: 2) (M: 6) |
|---|---|
| Assurance skills. That students provide assurance services in a variety of organizational contexts |

| SLO 4: Analytical Skills (G: 2) (M: 5) |
|---|---|
| That students present sound analyses of financial performance that incorporate global and ethical dimensions. |

| SLO 5: Collaboration Skills (G: 3) (M: 3) |
|---|---|
| That students contribute to collaborative efforts to achieve team goals. |

| SLO 6: Communication Skills (M: 4) |
|---|---|
| That students demonstrate the communication skills needed for thriving as a professional accountant |

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

| M 1: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (O: 2) |
|---|---|
| Performance on assignments in Acct 8130 |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict**

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met |
|---|---|
| NCI exam questions for the previous year had only 48% correct responses. For the current year, NCI exam questions reached 86.6% for correct responses. |

| M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop (O: 1) |
|---|---|
| Performance on exam questions in 8410. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

| M 3: Collaboration Skills (O: 5) |
|---|---|
| Evaluation by student peers of contributions to team projects in Acct 8030 and Acct 8410 |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O5: Collaboration Skills**

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle |
|---|---|
| Target was met in previous cycle. Not reported in this cycle. See action plan. |

| M 4: Communication Skills (O: 6) |
|---|---|
| At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

| M 5: Analytical Skills (O: 4) |
|---|---|
| Performance on assignments in Acct 8700 |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**
Mean of 75% on relevant quiz questions.

**Findings  2011-2012  - Target: Partially Met**

Target was met on 4 of the 6 relevant questions in spring 2012, except for: (1) Interpreting the valuation implications from asset impairment (73%), and (2) analyzing profit margins and asset turnover (73%)

**M 6: Assurance Skills (O: 3)**

Performance on assignments in Acct 8610

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

**Apply concepts to financial statements in class teams**

Use financial statements of Fortune 500 companies to illustrate, explain, and demonstrate the concepts of financial analysis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Analytical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills

**Implement team project in Acct. 8700**

Organize class into five teams to apply the concepts of financial statement analysis (acct 8700) to the 2011 financial statements of Fortune 100 companies in Georgia: Coca-Cola, UPS, Home Depot, Delta Airlines, Time Warner (CNN). Students analyze financial statements for buy/sell/hold investor decisions. Collaboration will be tested by team member evaluation of other team members.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Collaboration Skills | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration Skills

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Concentration in Business Analysis MBA**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

To enable students to identify the need for and effectively use analytical techniques - with an emphasis on quantitative techniques - for improved decision making in business.

**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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for this measure was 3.375, indicating good performance on this measure. The target was met.

**M 2: Model Building Ability (O: 2)**

In developing a model students will be measured on their ability to a) identify the dependent variable(s) and the appropriate metrics, b) identify key independent variables and their metrics, c) manage data collection, cleaning and transformation, and d) develop and validate a model.

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

**Target for O2: Model Building Ability**

80% of students will receive a score of 3.0 or higher on the 4.0 scale. Rubric 2 is to be used in scoring on assignments and projects from 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 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 uncertainty 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 uncertainty about the dependent and the independent variables. iii. Dealing with Data – collection, cleaning, transformations. Accurate and thorough preliminary analysis of the data. Most parts of preliminary analysis done well. Skipped or misunderstood some aspects of data preparation. Poor understanding of the need to examine data carefully before modeling. iv. Model Development and validation. Can clearly demonstrate 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for this measure was 3.625 out of 4.00, indicating continued strong performance in this area. The target was met.

**M 3: Understanding of Techniques (O: 3)**

Students will understand when and how to perform problem solving techniques for business problems and how to interpret the results.

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

**Target for O3: Understanding of Techniques**

Achievement Target: 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.
**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?

The assessment process remains the same as last 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...
The program as it stands for MBA students seems to meet their needs well in the marketplace. Our main weakness was our inability to offer courses as needed, due to insufficient faculty. We have hired one new faculty member who will start in Fall 2012, and a search will be on to hire another next year. This will enable us to offer electives that have not been offered at all for a few years, or have not been offered often enough for students.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Concentration in Entrepreneurship MBA**

*As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

#### Mission / Purpose

Students will be able to integrate the functional knowledge and skills gained in the core subjects that include finance, accounting, marketing, etc. along with entrepreneurship to understand and work effectively within the dynamics and challenges of the new venture arena and the management of entrepreneurial ventures. Upon successfully completing the concentration, students will 1) create business ideas, 2) evaluate whether an idea is a good business opportunity, 3) understand how to gather resources to move a business opportunity to the marketplace, 4) be made aware of various options to exit the business 5) prepare verbal presentations and 6) be prepared to participate with a team in an entrepreneurial context.

#### Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 1: Create Business Ideas**

Students will be able to use sound knowledge of business and economics in order to develop new business ideas that could be viable new ventures.

**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.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Concentration in Finance MBA**

*As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

#### Mission / Purpose

The MBA degree program with a concentration in Finance is designed for individuals seeking a professional business management degree with advanced knowledge oriented towards finance. Within the finance curriculum, students may gain expertise in various specialized areas including corporation finance, investments, financial institutions and markets, and international finance. The goal of the program is to provide students with the skills necessary to become strong general and functional managers and understand issues in the context of the rapidly evolving business environment particularly as relates to finance. The program provides graduates with the technical skills needed to support a thorough understanding of advanced issues in finance as well as with the analytical, conceptual and integrative skills needed to achieve a high degree of success in their careers in finance.

#### Goals

**G 1: Knowledge of finance and general management practices**

Students will develop specific knowledge of the discipline of finance as well as general knowledge of the core management areas of business practice.

**G 2: Conceptual and technical skill 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: Development of critical thinking skills**
Students will develop critical thinking skills for analyzing complex financial issues.

**G 5: Managerial leadership preparation**
Students will be prepared to join senior management levels in financial and non-financial organizations.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Development and application of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 2)**
MBA-Finance students will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macro-financial theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microfinancial theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and management practices outside of the area of finance.

**SLO 2: Development and application of technical skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**
Technical skills that MBA-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.

**SLO 3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual skills (M: 1, 2, 3)**
MBA-Finance students will: (i) Possess knowledge and capability in various subareas of finance such as corporate finance, investments, financial institutions and markets, and international finance. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)
To examine student performance in select courses from various subareas of finance (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310), the course instructors selectively chose five representative questions from various assessment instruments for their courses during the semester 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-2012: Direct Assessment of Course Performance-I (Fall 2011)" for findings from Fall 2011 and "Exhibit 1b-2012: Direct Assessment of Course Performance-II (Spring 2012)" for findings from Spring 2012. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2012: MBA-Finance 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: Administrative measure - other

#### Target for O1: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that our MBA-Finance students are continuing to learn at or above the expected level of performance and that their foundation knowledge meets our targets.

#### Target for O2: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that our MBA-Finance students are continuing to learn at or above the expected level of performance and that their technical skills meet our targets.

#### Target for O3: Development and application of analytical and conceptual 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that our MBA-Finance students are continuing to learn at or above the expected level of performance and that their analytical and
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?

The 2011-2012 academic year was the first year for the MBA-Finance assessment, thus there were no changes made in the assessment process from the prior year. As a result, these new faculty are trained to enable their participation in the assessment process. Finally, the Department recently completed is Academic Program Review and has begun implementation of the Action Plan that 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.

First, even though there was no assessment in the prior year (this was the first year of us conducting an assessment for the MBA-Finance program), in the spirit of continuous improvement we have introduced over the last couple of years two new courses 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 2012-2013 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.

FINANCE PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes did you make as a result of what you discovered in the assessment process? What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle?

Second, in response to earlier feedback from students, we will continue to seek participation from leading industry executives in our MBA courses to enhance student learning in the classroom. We will seek to continue this practice.
Since this is the first year of assessment in the MBA-Finance program, we will be in a better position to address these questions during the next assessment cycle.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

Overall targets were met indicating that the Department is a college leader in terms of the quality of the instruction and the knowledge base of students. We will continue to be diligent in ensuring a high quality program for students. Our findings provide us with valuable information for improving the curriculum. To facilitate continual improvement we are also actively involving our industry advisory board to provide input on program design and curriculum and to enhance student interaction with senior executives in industry.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 3:**
How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will continue to pursue strategies similar to those used in the MS-Finance program assessment that have been successful using for several years including the use of faculty review committees along with input from our industry 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) and the resulting action plan for improving the effectiveness of our program.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Concentration in Human Resource Management MBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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, 2) (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.

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

**SLO 2: Problem Solving (G: 1, 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: 2, 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.

**Standard Associations**
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
**SLO 4: HR Law (G: 1, 4) (M: 6, 7)**
The MBA-HRM graduate will be able to identify and address potential legal issues, relevant laws, and appropriate policies to address.

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

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 1.84/3.0. 74% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 1.96/3.00. 78% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 1.92/3.00. 76% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 2.11/3.0. 84% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Links with Business Strategy (O: 3)**
Students will show the ability to select appropriate business strategies and accompanying HR strategies and policies in case analyses in MGS 8300, MGS 8390, and MGS 8395.

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

**Target for O3: Links with Business Strategy**
80% of HR students will meet or exceed a 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 5 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rating of 1.86/3.0 77% of HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M 6: Law and Issue Identification (O: 4)
This measure will capture the students’ ability to identify and address legal issues and relevant laws and policies to address legal issues in compensation, selection, and other HR areas.

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

### M 7: Understanding and Interpreting case Law (O: 4)
This measure will capture the students’ ability to understand and translate into appropriate HR policies case law concerning HR issues.

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

**Target for O4: HR Law**

80% of students will be rated at or above 2.0. Measurement will be done by applying Measure 7 Rubric to randomly selected case analyses. Learning Outcome 4: Understand the role of legal constraints on HR activities and policies. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3 Measure 7: Understand and translate into appropriate HR policies case law concerning HR issues. Can discuss some implications of HR case law and can apply to some HR legal issues. Can discuss most implications of HR case law and can apply to most HR legal issues. Can discuss all implications of HR case law and can apply to all HR legal issues.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Faculty rating of 1.77/3.0. 66% of MBA HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

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

#### Graduation Requirement Change and Multi-Course Law Additions

Require MBA students to take MGS 8390. Add an additional 30-minute lecture in each class (MGS 8320, MGS 8360, MGS 8390). Reevaluate after next offering.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Law and Issue Identification | Outcome/Objective: HR Law

  **Implementation Description:** Action needed through Graduate Program Council

  **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg
  **Additional Resources:** None
  **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Understanding and Interpreting case Law | Outcome/Objective: HR Law

  **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucy McClurg
  **Additional Resources:** None
  **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### 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:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: General Understanding of HR in Organizations | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations
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

Reading Changes in MGS 8390
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: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Instructor will write and administer in-class activity and give feedback in class.

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: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Develop a concise lecture and handouts on corporate strategies and appropriate HR strategies for each.

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: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Instructors will write short hands-on cases to illustrate appropriate usage of job methods and performance measures.

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: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Add in-class activities to supplement additional lectures on topics.

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
Implementation Description: A short in-class activity using a case that will then be used to have students practice writing rules and regulations.
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: Planned
   Priority: High
   Implementation Description: Students will be coached to rewrite policy statements.
   Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
   Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Kay Bunch
   Additional Resources: None
   Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Assign readings to MGS 8360
Assign one additional set of readings to MGS 8360 concerning resource allocation in HR.
   Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
   Implementation Status: Planned
   Priority: High
   Implementation Description: Add readings to MGS 8360
   Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
   Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of MGS 8360
   Additional Resources: None
   Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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
   Implementation Description: Assign rewrites of 2 papers in MGS 8320
   Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Kay Bunch
   Additional Resources: None

Coordinate terminology and usage across all HR instructors
Continue to use extra class time to go into more detail on the differences among job analysis, job descriptions, and job specifications and how they are related. Coordinate among all HR instructors to be sure they are all using the terms consistently.
   Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
   Implementation Status: Planned
   Priority: Medium
   Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: General Understanding of HR in Organizations | Outcome/Objective: The Role of HR in Organizations
   Implementation Description: Coordinate with instructors over terminology and usage.
   Responsible Person/Group: All HR 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?

We began to include more PMBA/HR students in our analysis and data collection and to focus more on how those students are faring in our programs. We especially looked at how PMBA students differ from our MBA students and how we will need to adjust delivery of materials to enhance their learning and accommodate any special needs. We involved new faculty and PTIs more in assessment and in discussions of how we need to change courses and the relative weight of topics in class times.

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 shifted the amount of class time spent on straight delivery of facts and knowledge with the amount of time spent on application and advanced knowledge of material. Specifically, we decreased the class time spent on lower level learning and increased class time on case discussion, writing assignments and feedback, in-class activities, and group discussions. We added several cases and set up grading to make students more accountable to assignments that involve application and expression of opinions and policies.
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the MBA Concentration in Operations Management is to provide students pursuing a the 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
Our focus for 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. In the Fall 2011 and again Fall 2012, the faculty reworked the syllabus, course content and project for MGS 8710 Operations Planning making it more relevant regarding national and global supply chain planning. Curriculum for the 2012-2013 includes Operations Planning (focus on logistics & supply chain management; working capital deployment), Operations Strategy, Project Management, Quality Management, Service Operations Management, and Operations Management.

G 2: Attract Top Talent Students
The MBA Concentration in Operations Management program is meant to attract students from the upper half of the MBA program who appreciate and understand the importance of operations, logistics and supply chain managemnt for both manufacturing and service operations. In so doing, the operations management faculty is able to facilitate better learning through increased quality of classroom discussions and provide the best quality projects for the students.

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 they integrates with other perspectives in an organizational setting. Analysis conducted and recommendations made by a student completing this concentration will include Operations Management insights, frameworks, and tools, along with those from other functional disciplines, in order to formulate and implement effective strategic actions.

SLO 2: Develop Decision Making Abilities (M: 4)
The student should be able to identify critical success factors in 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. This objective is accomplished through the use of group projects and independent writings on various operations management topics.

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. Outside speakers are engaged to bring this perspective to life and create a desire to better understand the implications going forward.

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. Focus is placed on identifying a specific OM problem, defining the problem, setting criteria for measuring alternatives/solutions, selecting alternatives, measuring the alternatives against the selected criteria, implementation of the alternative, KPIs for measuring the success/failure of the alternative, and risk assessment of the selected alternative.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Reasoned Analysis (O: 1)
Evaluation of individual MS student's case and/or homework analyses will be completed. Individual readings and the students write-up on the reading will be reviewed and turned back to the student with comments on the relevancy of the write-up.

Target for M1: 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 Exceeds exceeds standards=3 Measure 1: Reasoned Analysis The student is not able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student can determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student exceeds at...
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### 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: 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 determines the effect that the OM dimensions have on a selected topic. The student easily integrates recommendations on a firm's OM applications both within the firm or industry.

#### 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: Strategic View of OM - Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3 Performance The student is not able to identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment.

#### 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 excels at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

#### 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.
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.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The actions have been implemented and initial good results have been shown. OM faculty members will continue to implement for more results
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Team Membership

With respect to the fourth learning outcome, to become a strong team member, three actions will be taken: ∙ Incorporate lessons on effective teams into teaching material. ∙ Require team members in the group project to create a team charter indicating an emphasis on the importance of cooperation and fairly distributed individual contributions. Evaluate after next offering. ∙ Ask each team to evaluate other teams’ performance to emphasize the importance of team work. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Implementation has taken in MBA 8155 and results show actions are effective.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Critical Thinking

The Operations Management faculty members will develop a measurement mechanism, including targeted assignments and exams, as well as a measuring rubric, for the assessment of the use of critical thinking skills in the solving of problems in operations management.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Develop Decision Making Abilities
Projected Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Operations Management Faculty Members
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (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.

- **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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**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.

  **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
  Average faculty rating 1.80 on a 3.0 scale. 80% of MBA students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

- **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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
Average faculty rating 1.50 on a 3.0 scale. 40% of MBA students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

**M3: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
Average faculty rating 1.40 on a 3.0 scale. 20% of MBA students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

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

#### Add case for recommendations
Add an in-class case discussion just before mid-term that requires students to analyze organizational situations and provide recommendations for action.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Recommend Responses Incorporating Four-Perspective Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Specify Courses of Action

  **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2013
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MBA 8165 instructors

#### Additional Case for Analysis of Causes
Add an in-class case discussion just before mid-term that requires students to provide analysis of organizational causes of events, issues and problems.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Find Four-Perspective Causes of Events /Problems | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Organizational Situations

  **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2013
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MBA 8165 instructors

#### Additional feedback on political aspects of decisions
Change the in-class activity to provide more feedback for students concerning their decision making regarding the political aspects of those decisions.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Identify Political Dimensions of Decisions | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze Political Realities

  **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2013
  **Responsible Person/Group:** MGS 8435 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?

The current outcomes, measures, and targets were written at the end of the 2010-2011 year. Therefore, we have been collecting data for the first cycle in 2011-2012. No changes have been made because we were waiting to see the results from this cycle. We are discussing the possibility of making adjustments in the way we state our targets 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.

This is the first year we have completed a cycle of the assessment process for this program. Therefore, our focus on changes has been on specific adjustments to individual courses. These are shown in the section, “Action Plan.” As we now move to a second year
of assessment in this program, we anticipate that curriculum-level changes next year. As always, incremental change to courses occurs in order to incorporate current events into classroom examples and to incorporate new cases when available and appropriate.

---
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### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 2.40. 76% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 2.5. 87% students met standard. Average on Criteria 2: 2.7. 93% students met standard.

**M 3: Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies (O: 2)**

Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies 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 (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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Average on Criteria 1: 0.7. 13% students met standard.

**M 4: Evaluate alternative locations and sites (O: 2)**

Evaluate alternative locations and sites Criterion: Identify key criteria and evaluate alternative locations and sites to support core business strategies. (RE8100)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O2: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm**
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Average on Criteria 1: 1.7. 40% 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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We are now reporting both averages and percentages and will monitor going forward.
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: Finished
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

Implementation Description: Reviewed and revised.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor

Review course materials and exercises
Review course materials and exercises on related topics to examine why target not met this year, but has been met in previous years.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluate alternative locations and sites | Outcome/Objective: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm
Measure: Evaluate corporate real estate strategies in relation to core business strategies | Outcome/Objective: Understand how real estate can contribute to achieving the overall goals of the firm

Responsible Person/Group: Instructor

The instructor changed the required readings, replacing some articles with chapters from a book. Students seemed to have difficulty incorporating theoretical materials from the new reading in situations designed to test their ability to apply theoretical concepts in specific situations.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: The instructor will re-evaluate the readings to ensure they are providing the content in a way that students can transfer theory to practice.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor
## 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)**  
Students are 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)**  
Students are 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)**  
Students are proficient 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)**  
Students 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)**  
Students can 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 quantitative 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 on evaluation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
100% of students met target.

**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 in the course.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
100% of students received grade of B or better.

**M 3: Evaluation by practicum supervisor (O: 2)**  
Evaluation by practicum supervisor. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must score a 3 or above on all quantitative 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 practicum evaluation items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
### M 4: Performance in ethics course (O: 2)
Performance in Advanced 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 the course.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target.

### 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 their application. 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 question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target.

### M 6: Performance in didactic courses (e.g., Assessment) (O: 3)
Performance in assessment didactic courses (e.g., PSY 8020, PSY 8030, CPS 9420)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**
90% of students receive grades of B or better in didactic courses related to key areas of the profession (e.g., Assessment).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grade of B or better.

### M 7: Written practicum evaluation from supervisors (O: 3)
Written practicum evaluation from supervisors. Supervisors complete formal written evaluations of students using quantitative and qualitative items. On a 5-point scale, students must receive a score of 3 or higher on all quantitative items to be satisfactory.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O3: Is proficient in key areas of the profession**
90% of students will receive a score of 3 or higher on related practicum evaluation items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met target goal of scores 3 or higher.

### M 8: Performance in theories courses (O: 4)
Performance in theories related courses (e.g., CPS 8450, CPS 8650, CPS 8370, PSYC 8660)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Understands relevant theories**
90% of students will receive grade of B or higher in theory related courses.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students received grades of B or higher.

### M 9: Comprehensive examination question on theory (O: 4)
Theory comprehensive examination question evaluation. Students write a 12-page answer to the question to demonstrate their knowledge of counseling theories and applications. Answers are evaluated by a two-person faculty committee who determine whether the students receives a grade of pass or fail.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target for O4: Understands relevant theories**
80% of students will receive passing grade on theory area comprehensive question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students received passing grades.

### M 10: Performance in research courses (O: 5)
Performance in courses about research methods and their application (e.g., EPRS 8530, EPRS 8540, EPRS 9820, CPS 9920)
Target for O5: Use and conduct research
90% of students will receive grade of B or better in research related courses.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of students received grades of B or better.

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

Comprehensive Examination Orientation
Present an orientation to 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Counselor Education PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 be able to provide formative and summative feedback to their students.
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively teach a course.
4. Students will articulate a personal philosophy of teaching.
Strategic Plan Associations

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

**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 demonstrate the ability to integrate social advocacy/social justice 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All students (N=6) engaged in teaching during the academic year 2011-2012 received at least a 2 out of 3 on the teaching section of their portfolio.

**M 2: Teaching (O: 1)**

On the question "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 the question "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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The range of scores on the question "the instructor was well prepared" on the teaching evaluation form was 4.5 to 5.0 with the mean of 4.84. 100% of the students (N=10) met this target.

**M 3: Teaching (O: 1)**

On the teaching effectiveness question of the teaching evaluation form (please note depending on the version this question is a different number), 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 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

On the question related to teaching effectiveness the range of scores was 4.5 to 5.0 with the mean of 4.84. Thus, 100% of the students (N=10) received either 4 or 5 on this question.

**M 4: Research (O: 2)**

Students will complete and submit their predissertation project.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Research**

Students will complete and submit their predissertation study.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

During the 2011-2012 academic year, two students successfully completed their predissertation study.
M 5: Research (O: 2)
Students will receive a passing on the research portion of their comprehensive examination.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O2: Research
Students will receive a pass on the research portion of their written comprehensive examination.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All students (N=6) who took the comprehensive examination received a pass on the research portion of the examination.

M 6: Clinical Skills (O: 3)
Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80% receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with clients from various cultural backgrounds. 3. understands the role of social advocacy in the treatment of clients. 4. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling profession.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O3: Clinical Skills
Students will receive at least 3 out of 5 on the relevant questions on the Supervisee Evaluation Form.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Applied Practice II (CPS 8660) and Applied Practice III (9660) were not offered during the 2011-2012 year. Therefore, no data was collected for these target areas.

M 7: Supervision (O: 4)
Students will receive at least a 3 (5 point scale; 1-needs considerable improvement; 5-demonstrates exceptional ability) with 80% receiving 4 or 5 on the following questions of the supervisee evaluation form: 1. demonstrates knowledge of supervision and counseling theory and concepts. 2. demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for working in diverse settings with supervisees from various cultural backgrounds. 3. demonstrates awareness of professional, legal, and ethical issues in the counseling/supervision profession and utilizes supervision to clarify ethical challenges faced with supervisees.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O4: Supervision
Students will receive at least a 3 on the relevant questions of Supervisor in Training Evaluation Forms, with 80% receiving at least a 4 or 5.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1. The range of scores for the theory question was 4 with a mean of 4.1; 100% (N=9) passing this criteria. 2. The range of scores for the diversity question was 4 to 5 with a mean of 4.6; 100% (N=9) passing on this criteria. 3. The range of scores for the ethics question was 4 to 5 with a mean of 4.7; 100% (N=9) passing on this criteria.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Teaching-Portfolios
Continue to monitor the portfolios in CPS 9963.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

Clinical practice
Continue to monitor the supervisee evaluation forms.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Clinical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Skills

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
Teaching-goals/objectives
Continue to monitor the teaching evaluations.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

Teaching-preparedness
Continue to monitor the teaching evaluations from our students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Teaching

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Criminal Justice and Criminology PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Ph.D. in Criminal Justice and Criminology is to prepare students for careers in research and teaching in Criminal Justice and Criminology, and related fields.

Goals
G 1: Researchers
Students will be capable of producing high quality research in Criminal Justice & Criminology.

G 2: Teachers
Students will be high quality instructors in undergraduate courses in Criminal Justice & Criminology.

G 3: Critical Thinkers
Students will be able to think critically about crime and justice issues.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 5: Critical Thinkers (G: 3) (M: 5)
Students will be able to critically analyze crime and justice issues and/or information utilizing theoretical, methodological, and statistical skill bases, in written form.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Presentations (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will present research at regional and national conferences in Criminal Justice and Criminology.

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

O/O 2: Publications (G: 1) (M: 2)
Students will publish research in peer-reviewed journals in Criminal Justice and Criminology.

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

O/O 3: Student Evals (G: 2) (M: 3)
Undergraduate evaluations of graduate student instructors will suggest excellence in teaching effectiveness.

Strategic Plan Associations
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Presentations (O: 1)

We will count the number of presentations given by Ph.D. students at regional and national conferences in Criminal Justice and Criminology, based on a review of the student's Curriculum Vita.

**Source of Evidence:** Activity volume

**Target for O1: Presentations**

100% of students will have presented at least once at a regional or national conference by the time they graduate. 60% of students will have presented at least twice at a regional or national conference by the time they graduate. 20% of students will have presented 3 or more times (at least 2 national presentations) by the time they graduate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Since the program is new, no students have completed the Ph.D. program and we do not have any data yet. We will begin reporting findings once students begin to complete the program.

#### M 2: Publications (O: 2)

We will count the number of peer-reviewed publications by Ph.D. students in Criminal Justice and Criminology based on a review of the student's curriculum vita.

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

**Target for O2: Publications**

100% of students will have submitted an article to a peer-reviewed journal by the time they graduate. 60% of students will have published a peer-reviewed journal article by the time they graduate. 20% of students will have published two or more peer-reviewed articles by the time they graduate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Since the program is new, no students have completed the Ph.D. program and we do not have any data yet. We will begin reporting findings once students begin to complete the program.

#### M 3: Student Evals (O: 3)

End of course evaluations will be used to measure undergraduate perceptions of teacher effectiveness based on the item “Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?”

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

**Target for O3: Student Evals**

100% of students will score a 3.5 or higher (out of 5) on this item. 60% of students will score 4.0 or higher (out of 5) on this item. 20% of students will score a 4.5 or higher (out of 5) on this item.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Since the program is new, no students have completed the Ph.D. program and we do not have any data yet. We will begin reporting findings once students begin to complete the program.

#### M 4: Faculty Evals

A summary score of the 12 items on the Classroom Observation Form, filled out by faculty will be used to measure the faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness by Ph.D. students in CJ&C.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

#### M 5: Comps Rubric (O: 5)

We will develop a rubric to assess critical thinking as displayed in written form on the Comprehensive Examinations that all students must take in order to advance to the dissertation stage of the program.

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

**Target for O5: Critical Thinkers**

Target to be developed after the rubric is developed.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Since the program is new, no students have completed the Ph.D. program and we do not have any data yet. We will begin reporting findings once students begin to complete the program.

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

**Develop Rubric**

We will develop a rubric to assess critical thinking on the written comprehensive examination.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

Since the Ph.D. program is new, we developed our goals, objectives, and measures. We plan to collect original data and report findings in the next assessment period, when students will have completed the Ph.D. program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Criminal Justice Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes issues of crime and justice occurring in urban environments from a multicultural, interdisciplinary perspective to inform science, policy, and practice. The mission of the Department is to produce students who are critical and ethical thinkers, knowledgeable about the issues of crime and justice, and prepared for criminal justice leadership positions in public and private agencies. This report provides an assessment of student learning for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Goals
G 1: Students will demonstrate critical thinking
Students will develop, enhance, and demonstrate critical thinking skills in the context of contemporary issues in crime and criminal justice.

G 2: Analysis of crime/criminal justice
Students will effectively analyze the complexity of crime and criminal justice systems considering historical trends, social and/or spatial relationships, and how these relationships develop, persist and/or change.

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).

SLO 2: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will effectively analyze a wide range of contemporary multicultural issues, including race, class, age, and gender, and their relationship to crime and justice in 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.

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=6) of CRJU 2200 were offered during both the Fall, 2011 (n=3) and Spring, 2012 (n=3) semesters. Of the six sections offered, two were taught by graduate assistants and one was taught at a branch campus with a very small class size. The examinations in the course sections included in this assessment covered approximately one-third (1/3) of the course, for a total of three exams in each of these sections. Objective multiple choice or true/false questions per objective were embedded on each of the three exams in each of the sections included in this assessment. 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. Reporting this period focuses on two of these 6 sections, both taught in the Fall, 2011 semester by full-time faculty.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues**
Each instructor included 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
A total of 76 students (N=9 for Instructor B; N=67 for Instructor C) were enrolled in the two CRJU 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions by instructor and section are reported below: Instructor B: Q1 Pass Rate: 78%; Q2 Pass Rate: 67%. (Overall: Did not meet target) Instructor C: Q1 Pass Rate: 79%; Q2 Pass Rate: 75%, Q3 Pass Rate: 98%, Q4 Pass Rate: 98%. (Overall: Partially met target). Overall: Partially met target.

**Target for O2: Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues**
Each instructor included 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_2011_2012.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
A total of 76 students (N=9 for Instructor B; N=67 for Instructor C) were enrolled in the two CRJU 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions by instructor and section are reported below: Instructor B: Q1 Pass Rate: 78%; Q2 Pass Rate: 78%. (Overall: Did not meet target) Instructor C: Q1 Pass Rate: 95%; Q2 Pass Rate: 92%; Q3 Pass Rate: 95%; Q4a Pass Rate: 60%; Q4b Pass Rate: 83%. (Overall: Partially met target).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
A total of 76 students (N=9 for Instructor B; N=67 for Instructor C) were enrolled in the two CRJU 2200 sections assessed during the evaluation period. The percentages of students correctly answering the embedded examination questions by instructor and section are reported below: Instructor B: Q1 Pass Rate: 56%; Q2 Pass Rate: 100%. (Overall: Partially met target) Instructor C: Q1 Pass Rate: 86%; Q2 Pass Rate: 82%; Q3 Pass Rate: 55. (Overall: Partially met target).

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Low
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2010
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty.
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Review of course content and assessment measures**
See plan for contemporary criminal justice issues.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Low
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 2200 teaching faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Review of course content and assessment measures
Consistent with last year’s action plan, the Undergraduate Committee (UC) will meet with teaching faculty at the beginning of Fall semester 2009 to discuss course content and evaluate the effectiveness of current assessment measures used in CrJu 2200. The UC will assist faculty to implement such changes as they deem necessary.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Fall 2010
Projected Completion Date: 08/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Criminal Justice Undergraduate Committee and CrJu 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
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: Finished
Priority: High
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
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues
  Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues | Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues
Implementation Description: On-going
Responsible Person/Group: Brenda Blackwell

Assessment of course materials
Instructors will be queried regarding their teaching of materials related to questions to determine links between material coverage, how material is covered, and reinforcement strategies related to outcomes not or partially met.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues
  Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues | Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee

Evaluation of assessment items considering goal
Continued evaluation of assessment items utilized to ensure applicability of goal will occur.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Embedded examination questions | Outcome/Objective: Analyze Contemporary Crime/Criminal Justice Issues
  Analyze Contemporary Global & International Issues | Analyze Contemporary Multicultural Issues
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate 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?

With implementation of the PhD program, new instructors have been cycled in to teaching this course. The PhD teaching seminar includes discussion of assessment methods and the need to link assessments to learning outcomes. Students are assisted in making these links for real world assessment purposes when teaching in this program, ensuring better instruction for our students. In addition, we reviewed the old assessment strategies and measures in consideration of the new Core goals implemented by the Regents and GSU to ensure that we are in compliance with requirements. This review ensured that our assessment process is evolving and continues to consider the needs of students and improves 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.

We continue to evaluate our program to ensure that the materials are timely and relevant to the world today and to students in our classrooms. This year’s assessment results indicate a need to ask faculty to review their course materials in conjunction with outcomes for learning assessments. Faculty will be informed of assessment outcomes and will discuss strategies to improve outcomes at the course level. The undergraduate committee will review outcomes and goals to determine if goals are reasonable give the student body linked to this course. Adjustments will be made if warranted.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Criminal Justice BS**
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Criminal Justice emphasizes 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 or 3 in their ability to comprehend and synthesize information by the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 on this rubric dimension. Finally, we expect 50% of students to achieve increased scores, as possible, between first and final draft submissions. The provided assessment rubric identifies dimensions represented by scores.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of three (3) sections of CRJU 4930/35: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The fall semester yielded one section (N(A)=41), while two sections provided data in the spring (N(B)=34; N(C)=13); thus, data were provided for a total of 88 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average of 2.7 on the 1-4 scale. Separate sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.5; Section B average = 3.1; and Section C average = 2.3. Overall, 89% of the students enrolled in this academic year (N=78) earned either a 3 or 4 on the rubric scale for ID/Summarize, and 47% of these students eared a score of 4. All reports above reference the final paper draft. Finally, recall students submitted multiple drafts of the paper; rubric scores over time indicate that 73% (N=64) improved in their performance or remained at the highest score across the two submissions. Only 1% decreased over the two drafts, and 26% demonstrated no improvement where improvement 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 or 3 in their ability to comprehend and synthesize information by the
end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 on this rubric dimension. Finally, we expect 50% of students to achieve increased scores, as possible, between first and final draft submissions. The provided assessment rubric identifies dimensions represented by scores.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of three (3) sections of CRJU 4930/35: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The fall semester yielded one section (N(A)=41), while two sections provided data in the spring (N(B)=34; N(C)=13); thus, data were provided for a total of 88 students.Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 2.8 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 3.1, and Section C average = 3.0. Overall, 78% (N=68) were rated as a 4 or 4, and 45% of these (N=40) were rated as a 4 on the rubric for Comprehend and Synthesis of Information. The scores reported above reference the final paper draft. Recall that students submitted multiple drafts of the paper. Rubric scores over time indicated that 38% of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 49% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and 3% decreased. Overall, the scores consistently show significant improvement over the first draft. 59% (N=52) maintained the best possible score or improved scores across the two submissions. Only 1% decreased their outcomes while 37% showed no improvement (when improvement was possible). Collectively while these enrollees did not meet our goals, they did approach goal achievement; 78% scored 3-4 and 59% demonstrated improved over time. Our goal that 50% would meet a rating of 4 on the rubric was approached (45%) but not met.

**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 apply knowledge and tools and analyze criminal justice subject matter 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. Finally, we desire that 50% of students will achieve increased scores (where possible) on the application and analysis dimension of the rubric between first and final draft submissions.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

A total of three (3) sections of CRJU 4930/35: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The fall semester yielded one section (N(A)=41), while two sections provided data in the spring (N(B)=34; N(C)=13); thus, data were provided for a total of 88 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 2.9 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.9, Section B average = 3.1 and Section C average = 2.8. Overall, 84% (N=74) were rated as a 3 or 4, and 50% of these (N=44) were rated as a 4 on the assessment rubric for the application and analysis dimension. The scores reported above reference the final paper draft. Recall that students submitted multiple drafts of the paper. Rubric scores over time indicated that 70% (N=58) of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score across the two submissions. Meanwhile, 27% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and only 2% decreased on the application and analysis rubric dimension. Collectively these enrollees met our goals; 84% scored 3-4, 50% scored 4, and 70% demonstrated improved performance or maintained the highest score between draft submissions.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of three (3) sections of CRJU 4930/35: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The fall semester yielded one section (N(A)=41), while two sections provided data in the spring (N(B)=34; N(C)=13); thus, data were provided for a total of 88 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 2.7 on the 1-4 scale for the generation of conclusions dimension. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 2.4; Section B average = 3.1 and Section C average = 3.0. Overall, 81% (N=69) were rated as a 4 or 4, and 45% of these (N=32) were rated as a 4 as a 3 on the generation of conclusions dimension of the rubric between first and final draft submissions. Recall that students submitted multiple drafts of the paper. Rubric scores over time indicated that 64% (N=58) of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 31% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and only 5% decreased. Collectively these enrollees partially met our goals; 83% scored 3-4, and 64% demonstrated improved scores across draft submissions, yet only 41% scored a 4.

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4, 3, or 2 in their ability to apply knowledge and tools and analyze criminal justice subject matter 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. Finally, we desire that 50% of students will achieve increased scores (where possible) on the generation of conclusions dimension of the rubric between first and final draft submissions.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of three (3) sections of CRJU 4930/35: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The fall semester yielded one section (N(A)=41), while two sections provided data in the spring (N(B)=34; N(C)=13); thus, data were provided for a total of 88 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 3.3 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 3.1, and Section C average = 3.0. Overall, 83% (N=73) were rated as a 4 or 4 on the written communication dimension of the rubric, while 41% of these (N=36) were rated as a 4 on this dimension. The scores reported above reference the final paper draft. Recall that students submitted multiple drafts of the paper. Rubric scores over time indicated that 64% (N=58) of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 31% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and only 5% decreased. Collectively these enrollees partially met our goals; 83% scored 3-4, and 64% demonstrated improved scores across draft submissions, yet only 41% scored a 4.

**Target for O5: Written communication skills**

Our goal is that 80% of student papers will be rated as a 4 or 3 in their ability to use excellent written communication skills to convey ideas about criminal justice subject matter by the end of the senior seminar. In addition, we aim for 50% of students to be rated as a 4 in this rubric dimension. Finally, we desire that 50% of students will achieve increased scores (where possible) on the written communication dimension of the rubric between first and final draft submissions.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

A total of three (3) sections of CRJU 4930/35: Capstone Seminar were offered during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The fall semester yielded one section (N(A)=41), while two sections provided data in the spring (N(B)=34; N(C)=13); thus, data were provided for a total of 88 students. Rubric scores on the final draft of the essay yielded an overall average score of 3.3 on the 1-4 scale. Specific sections yielded the following outcomes: Section A average = 3.3, and Section C average = 3.3. Overall, 83% (N=73) were rated as a 3 or 4 on the written communication dimension of the rubric, while 41% of these (N=36) were rated as a 4 on this dimension. The scores reported above reference the final paper draft. Recall that students submitted multiple drafts of the paper. Rubric scores over time indicated that 64% (N=58) of the students improved in their performance on this outcome or remained at the highest score. Meanwhile, 31% demonstrated no improvement where improvement was possible and only 5% decreased. Collectively these enrollees partially met our goals; 83% scored 3-4, and 64% demonstrated improved scores across draft submissions, yet only 41% scored a 4.
CRJU 4930: Seminar in Criminal Justice is a key assessment course for the department. In this course, students are required to provide an oral presentation, utilizing PowerPoint based on their Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay, which evaluates an issue in criminology or criminal justice. The assignment, included in the syllabus, requires students to identify a single issue from the internship experience, identify a relevant theory (criminological, sociological, psychological, organizational, or legal) that can be utilized to enhance understanding of the issue, and prepare a presentation based on their position paper that addresses policy implications and recommendations.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Application and analysis**

80% of student presentations will be rated as a 4 or 5 on a five point assessment scale utilized on a rubric (with 1 representing a poorly identified topic, lack of linkage between course/program content and internship experiences and 5 representing an achievement of excellence, with a timely and important topic relevant to internship agency functioning identified and analyzed using appropriate course and program materials and information.

**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: Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice 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. 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. This writing assignment occurs in two parts, and students are expected to identify an ethical issue that occurs in the criminal justice system, then to locate extant literature and evaluate research findings concerning the issue. The same assignment was used across all sections of Ethics taught int eh fall 2011, spring 2012 and summer 2012 semesters. Assignment 1 occurs at the beginning of the term. This assignment requires students to identify and select an ethical issue for study. Second, they must identify three scholarly resources that examine the issue. Students must then create and justify criteria that they will apply to assess the quality of their sources. They then apply these criteria. At the end of the term, after exposure to ethical frameworks and assessments critically steeped in different ethical approaches, students revisit this assignment, thinking critically about the criteria they applied and their success and application of these criteria to the issue. This set of assignments measures not only students’ ability to assess and apply ethical frameworks, but also their written communication skills.

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 topical 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.

**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 topical 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.

**Target for O7: Identification of ethical frameworks**

Our goal is that 50% of student papers will yield increased overall scores, as possible, in for the total rubric score across the initial assignment (Assignment 1) and the revision of this assignment after content coverage in the course (Assignment 4).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

A total of five (5) sections of the Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice class were offered during the course of the 2011-2012 academic year. Two sections were offered in the fall and three sections were offered in the spring. An adjunct faculty member taught on section of the course (N=10 students) in the spring and, for a variety of reasons, usable assessment data were not available for this section. Moreover, a GTA new to teaching was the instructor for two sections of the course, one in the fall (N=24) and one in the spring (N=36); assessment data were not requested from this instructor during this time frame. Hence, assessment data for this period are derived from two sections of the course taught by a full time faculty member; Section A was taught in the fall (N=32) and Section B was taught in the spring (N=35). Data for assessment purposes are provided on these 67 students in the attached Ethics Rubric Data file. Overall, the average total rubric score for Assignment four, the final submission, was 9.6 of 15 total points; this is compared to an average total rubric score of 12 on the first, or draft, submission of the assignment (e.g., assignment 1). It is concluded that the overall student body did not meet the instructor’s expectations. Moreover, when examining improvement data, it is reported that only 7 of the 59 students who submitted both assignments (12%) yielded improved scores between the draft submissions. Overall, 8% of student papers yielded no change, and the majority (80%) actually produced lower scoring papers at the second stage compared to the first stage of paper submission.

**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

Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Committee and CTW teaching faculty

**Improve data collection efforts**
The Department will make a concerted to improve data collection efforts.

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

Implementation Description: The department has reviewed all syllabi in the undergraduate curriculum with a focus on determining alignment of course learning outcomes with departmental learning outcomes. The next step will be to review the assessment approaches within courses to determine usefulness for departmental assessment across sections.

Projected Completion Date: 07/2014
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

Implementation Description: Continued data collection
Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: UG committee and program faculty.

**Expanded gathering of data**
We will work to expand collection of data across sections of the capstone seminar next semester to collect a wider range of data relevant to assessment of oral presentation requirements and outcomes in the coming two years.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: 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
**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 a new CTW Ambassador was put into place and this individual worked to improve, in particular, communication across section instructors. This, in conjunction with this year's CTW findings, yielded the creation of an ad hoc committee, working in conjunction with the undergraduate committee to address the student learning outcomes currently in place, the outcomes for students, and obstacles and needs to be addressed to ensure that students can master the material that is put before them, particularly in the ethical issues course. Momentum continues to increase in addressing student learning outcomes under the guidance of this ambassador. Moreover, it should be noted that a new undergraduate coordinator took over in August; this will promote further evaluation of assessment strategies and focuses on student learning outcomes. Conversations between outgoing and incoming coordinators highlight the need to address learning outcomes that have not been evaluated in the last two cycles (namely oral communication), and the consideration of adding and evaluating new student learning outcomes not currently addressed.

**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 assessment practices for the undergraduate program are inherently tied to assessment conducted within the CTW courses, largely because the capstone course allows the department to capture all students at and endpoint and is structured in such a way that the department can determine the impact of the overall curriculum in generating overall student learning outcomes that are derived from the cumulative effects of courses' contents. Discussions regarding assessment practices within the undergraduate committee in the prior year, and between the outgoing and incoming undergraduate coordinators have pointed to the possibility of extending examination of student learning outcomes into additional required courses. While not all targets were met, specifically in terms of the ethical issues course, strategies are in place through CTW to address shortcomings and these outcomes will remain under scrutiny. The new committee and coordinator will at this point re-assess the student learning outcomes that have been in place over the past three years to determine the necessity of broadening or refocusing attention on different outcomes to further extend student learning. Decisions concerning approach will be made in the coming year.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the M.S. in Criminal Justice is to engage students in generating and applying 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 with M.S. students; (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 be knowledgeable 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: 1, 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 theory (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the theoretical knowledge base in criminology and criminal justice.

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.

SLO 6: Apply theory and terminology (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to apply learned terminology and theory to real-world situations that both relate to and expand outside the fields of criminology and criminal justice.

SLO 7: Communicate effectively (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to effectively communicate, in oral and written form, their understanding and analyses of crime and justice issues as they apply their knowledge to real-world problems and questions.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Assessment Survey of Non-thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)
This is a 16 item faculty-rated assessment instrument used to evaluate non-thesis students. 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 100% of students with an average score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the three items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the three items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the three items.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Of the four students completing the capstone course in the spring of 2012, all 4 (100%) averaged a 3 or better on the three items that measure this outcome. Two of the students (50%) averaged a 4 out of 4 on these three items.
**Target for O2: Apply research and statistical skills**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with an average score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the two items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the two items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Of the four students who completed the capstone, 4 (100%) averaged a 2 or better. Three (75%) averaged a 3 or better and 1 (25%) averaged 4 out of 4 on the two items.

**Target for O3: Understand theory**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) on the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better on the items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) on the items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the four students who completed the capstone, all four averaged a 2 or better. Three of the four (75%) averaged a 3 or better on the two items measuring this outcome. None of the students (0%) averaged a 4 on the two items.

**Target for O5: Understand how systems & processes interact**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the two items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the two items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the two items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Of the four students who completed the capstone, all four (100%) averaged a three or better on the two items. Two of the students (50%) averaged a 4 on the two items.

**Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the three items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the three items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the three items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the four students who completed the capstone, all (100%) of the students averaged a 2 or better on the three items measuring this outcome. Three of the students (75%) averaged a 3 or better on the three items that measure this outcome. None of the students averaged a four.

**Target for O7: Communicate effectively**

The desired performance is to have 100% of students with a score of 2 or better (on a 4 point scale) across the four items that measure this objective on the Assessment Survey of Non-thesis Students. 60% of students will score a 3 or better across the four items. 20% of students will score a 4 (out of 4) across the four items.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Of the four students who completed the capstone, all four (100%) averaged a 3 or better on the four items on our rubric assessing these outcomes. None of the students averaged a 4 across the four items on the rubric assessing these outcomes.

**M 2: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7)**

The Thesis 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 4 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 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Four students completed a Master's thesis during the 2011-2012 academic year. All four students (100%) averaged a 3 or higher on the items measuring this outcome. One student averaged a 4.0 (25%). All three targets were met.

**Target for O2: Apply research and statistical skills**

The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Four students completed theses during the 2011-2012 academic year. All four students (100%) averaged a 2 or better on the items measuring this outcome. Two students (50%) averaged a 3 or better on the items measuring this outcome. No students (0%) averaged a 4 on the items measuring this outcome. One of the three targets for this outcome were met.
Target for O3: Understand theory
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Four students completed theses during the 2011-2012 academic year. Of those three students had theses relevant to this outcome. Of the three students, all (100%) scored a 3 or better on the item measuring this objective. Two (66.6%) scored 4 on the item measuring this objective. All targets were met.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Four students completed theses during the 2011-2012 academic year. Two students had theses relevant to this objective. Both (100%) scored 4 out of 4 on the item measuring this objective.

Target for O6: Apply theory and terminology
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Four students completed theses during the 2011-2012 academic year. Two students had theses relevant to this objective. Both (100%) scored 4 on the item measuring this objective.

Target for O7: Communicate effectively
The desired performance is to have at least 100% of students with an average rating score of 2 or higher, 60% of students with an average rating of 3 or higher and 20% of students with an average score of 4 (on a 4 point scale) across the items measuring this outcome.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Four students completed the thesis during the 2011-2012 academic year. All four (100%) scored a 2 or better on the item that measures this objective. 50% scored a 3 or better. 50% scored a 4 on the item measuring this objective. Two of the three targets were 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: Finished
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 (resulting in missing data for some items), and consequently low reliabilities for outcome measures. Further, the low numbers of students that we have completing theses and the low number of items that are being answered by faculty (missing data) make it difficult to reach our very high performance targets. As suggested by the GAC we have set up a tiered target and our targets are being partially met, but some of the higher targets are not being met. This may be the result of small sample sizes (low reliability and missing data). We plan to revise the thesis instrument this year, with those limitations in mind.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Knowledge assessment survey of thesis students | Outcome/Objective: Apply research and statistical skills
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.

Course changes
Both CRJU 7010 and CRJU 8980 will have increased focus on problem identification, problem solving, identifying stakeholders, and mapping and planning CJ processes. This will help students be better prepared for the capstone experience.

Edit Capstone Rubric
Add a not applicable option, since not all of the items are assessed for each student’s project. Add an assessment of problem solving, identifying stakeholders, and planning to assess leadership.

Annual Report Section Responses
Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.
We created a rubric to assess capstone experiences for students in our non-thesis track. We applied that rubric for the first time this year to assess non-thesis students.

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.
We will be implementing enhanced recruiting, possibly yielding a greater number of students, with no change in faculty. This will produce an increased burden on existing faculty. In addition, we need to complete our revisions to the rubric for assessing thesis students and engage in assessment of the PhD program for the very first time— all of which will require faculty resources.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
None

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
We created a new rubric for assessing capstone students. This replaced our previous assessment instrument for students in the non-thesis track.

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
Mary Finn - University Senate Volkan Topalli - University Senate

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences...
**Goals**

**Mission / Purpose**

**G 1: Auditing issues**

The School of Accountancy would like graduates in accounting to demonstrate mastery in critical thinking through writing. Our Critical Thinking through Writing in Accounting is the ability to identify and solve unstructured problems in unfamiliar accounting domains and effectively communicate the thinking, solution process and conclusions. Students demonstrating critical thinking skills must be able to locate, organize, and analyze. Feedback responses will be given based on completion 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. 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.

**International Activities**

Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate their knowledge of auditing directly to their peers.

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Accounting**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

**Goal**

**G 1: Auditing issues**

The School of Accountancy would like graduates in accounting to demonstrate mastery in critical thinking through writing. 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 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 which detail actual audit failures. They will use auditing standards and knowledge of auditing procedures to identify effective audit planning, risk analysis and error detection. They will 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. They will receive feedback responses at least twice before the submission of the final product. They will learn how to address critical comments to improve their writing.

**Books**


**International Activities**

Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

Dr. Lisa Mulfic was awarded a J. William Fulbright to teach and research in Bosnia. Professor Cynthia Johnson has arranged a Travel Abroad program for spring in Trinidad and Tobago. Dr. Dean Dabney edits the International Criminal Justice Review, published by the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology.
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 16% 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" under Section 404 of the Sarbanes Oxley Act of 2002. They identify and analyze fraud risks, identify and analyze internal control weaknesses and then prepare a memo documenting the critical 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.
2.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view where appropriate.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view where 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 of 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 are 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 me 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

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

Add Action Plan
Your action plan should relate to the measure/outcome. Or, you can add a a general action plan for all of your measures/outcomes under "action plans" above in the "assessment" link.

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

Future plans
Improve communication with students emphasizing the importance of CT in an accounting career. Obtain baseline writing samples from each student to make an early assessment of which students should be referred to GSU's Writing Lab. to improve their written communication. Invite CTW faculty to attend seminars and workshops offered by the CTW Program. Supplement or replace one-on-one training of faculty with at least one group training session.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: During course introduction faculty will emphasize the importance of CT to the students enrolled in the course. All students will be asked to submit a writing sample to the professor. The professor and the CTW consultants will identify students who are likely to benefit from the help of the Writing Lab. CTW Program indicated that workshops for non-ambassadors will
**Mission / Purpose**

AAS CTW courses will require students to engage, through writing, a "wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions
needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to
formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to
believe and what to do.” (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, page 1.)
While critical thinking will be valued throughout the course of the semester, specific assignments will most directly fulfill the CTW
designation. CTW-designated assignments will be assessed using the rubric included in the appendix (50%) and the grading rubric
included in the syllabus (50%).

**Goals**

**G 1: AAS CTW Goal 1 (Annotations)**
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 a. 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.

**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
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**
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.

**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.

**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)

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Anthro**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

In anthropology, critical thinking entails examining and contextualizing the multiple perspectives that inform complex social, cultural, and biological realities pertaining to the human condition in its past and present dimensions.

**Goals**

**G 1: Goals for Anthropology majors CTW**

Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities; they will demonstrate an ability to draw
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Critical thinking in Anthropology (M: 1)

In Anth 3033, students were asked to submit 3 versions of 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 ANTH 4970, students had 6 assignments, 3 of which required multiple revisions. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. For the Monday section, 76% of the students scored a 4 or 5, 12% scored a 3, 8% scored a 2. For the Wednesday section, 68.4% scored a 4 or a 5, 31.5% scored a 3. Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities. b. Draw Conclusions: students will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions that engage current perspectives in the discipline. c. Contextualize: students will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand. d. Critique: students will demonstrate an ability to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

SLO 2: Critical thinking

In Anth 3033, students were asked to submit 3 versions of papers—one on each course module. The third version of the fourth paper was selected for CTW score measuring. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. All of the students received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4. In our two sections of ANTH 4970, students had 6 assignments, 3 of which required multiple revisions. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. For the Monday section, 76% of the students scored a 4 or 5, 12% scored a 3, 8% scored a 2. For the Wednesday section, 68.4% scored a 4 or a 5, 31.5% scored a 3. Analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze complex social, cultural, and biological realities. b. Draw Conclusions: students will demonstrate an ability to draw conclusions that engage current perspectives in the discipline. c. Contextualize: students will demonstrate an ability to contextualize relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand. d. Critique: students will demonstrate an ability to critique relevant anthropological theories on the issues at hand.

SLO 3: 2010/2011 outcomes

In Anth 3033, 95.5% of students received 3 or higher, and 27.3 of students received 4 or higher. One student received a 2. In ANTH 4970, 20% of students received between 3 and 4, 80% of students received 4 or higher.

Relevant Associations: n/a

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Course projects (O: 1)

In Anth 3033, students were asked to write papers where they reflected critically on course readings and discussions. The measure chosen for this assessment was paper # 4, in which they reflected on a variety of topics drawing on discussions conducted during the whole semester. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In Dr. Catey's ANTH 4970, the measure was a critical and self-reflexive paper about students' experiences as anthropology majors, for which students were required to critically draw on relevant literature in the discipline. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In Dr. White's ANTH 4970, the measure was a critical and self-reflexive paper about students' experiences as anthropology majors, for which students were required to draw on relevant literature in the discipline. Papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In ANTH 4980 (Special Topics: Methods in Sociocultural Anthropology) students were assessed based on a semester-long assignment, which required them to conceive, design, develop, implement and present an original small-scale ethnographic research project. Assignments were evaluated according to a rubric which measured outcomes on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. The target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Critical thinking in Anthropology
In Anth 3033, papers were evaluated on a rubric which measured the outcome on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 was poor, 2 was fair, 3 was good, 4 was excellent, and 5 was outstanding. Our target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In ANTH 4970 (Dr. White's Senior Seminar), 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 4980 (Special Topics: Methods in Sociocultural Anthropology) all students were expected to score "Satisfactory" or above all an rubric items. 75% of students were expected to score "Excellent" or above in their individual work. In ANTH 4970 (Dr. Catey's Senior Seminar), papers were evaluated according to a rubric which measured outcomes on a scale from 1 to 5: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent, and 5 = outstanding. The target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive a 4 or better. In ANTH 4980 (Race and Racism), papers were evaluated according to a rubric which measured outcomes on a scale from 1 to 5: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent, and 5 = outstanding. The target was for all students to receive at least a 3, and for 75% to receive at least a 4. In ANTH 4980 (Anthropology of Self and Emotion), 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.

**M 2: 2011-2012 measure**

In all ANTH classes, assignments 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.

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

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

#### Improvement plans

In ANTH 3033, requiring students to write a critical paragraph in response to the instructor's feedback turned out to be extremely productive. This requirement will continue to be implemented in the 2012-2013 cycle. The course has been fine-tuned over the last several years and no further changes are required at this time. ANTH 4980 Anthropology of Self and Emotion: Existing structure of the course seems to be effective for most students. Over the course of the semester, all students revised initial drafts based on instructor and peer feedback and received improved scores on their second drafts, suggesting that the writing workshops implemented were successful. While it is difficult, based on the small sample size, to determine whether student performance slightly below the target for paper #3 can be related to specific aspects of instruction, in the future students who score in the “3” range or below on the final draft of paper #1 will be required to meet with the professor outside of class to discuss specific challenges each faces in his/her writing, with a follow-up meeting to be scheduled if improvement is not seen on paper #2.

In ANTH 4980 Methods in Sociocultural Anthropology, the class will focus on data collection and analysis even further and emphasize connecting and contextualizing research in grounded processes. ANTH 4970 Dr. White's Senior Seminar This semester, a “no late grade deductions” policy for assignments was implemented that did not require revision. Students were responsible for setting their own schedule to complete most writing assignments. The idea was that if students were less pressured to complete some assignments and could set their own time and work management schedules, they might focus more on the writing and less on the deadlines. This policy did work well for most students, however, many students postponed turning in assignments until the last two weeks of class. Some commented that they appreciated this as a lesson in responsibility and time management, but in the fall, a different policy of positive incentives will be attempted for assignments turned in by a given deadline. ANTH 4980 Race and Racism, ANTH 4980 Anthropology and Public Health and Dr. Catey’s ANTH 4970 will no longer be offered, in that Dr. Catey is leaving our department.

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

#### planned course improvements

In ANTH 3033, requiring students to write a critical paragraph in response to the instructor's feedback turned out to be extremely productive. This requirement will continue to be implemented in the 2012-2013 cycle. The course has been fine-tuned over the last several years and no further changes are required at this time. ANTH 4980 Anthropology of Self and Emotion: Existing structure of the course seems to be effective for most students. Over the course of the semester, all students revised initial drafts based on instructor and peer feedback and received improved scores on their second drafts, suggesting that the writing workshops implemented were successful. While it is difficult, based on the small sample size, to determine whether student performance slightly below the target for paper #3 can be related to specific aspects of instruction, in the future students who score in the “3” range or below on the final draft of paper #1 will be required to meet with the professor outside of class to discuss specific challenges each faces in his/her writing, with a follow-up meeting to be scheduled if improvement is not seen on paper #2.

ANTH 4980 Methods in Sociocultural Anthropology, the class will focus on data collection and analysis even further and emphasize connecting and contextualizing research in grounded processes. ANTH 4970 Dr. White’s Senior Seminar This semester, a “no late grade deductions” policy for assignments was implemented that did not require revision. Students were responsible for setting their own schedule to complete most writing assignments. The idea was that if students were less pressured to complete some assignments and could set their own time and work management schedules, they might focus more on the writing and less on the deadlines. This policy did work well for most students, however, many students postponed turning in assignments until the last two weeks of class. Some commented that they appreciated this as a lesson in responsibility and time management, but in the fall, a different policy of positive incentives will be attempted for assignments turned in by a given deadline. ANTH 4980 Race and Racism, ANTH 4980 Anthropology and Public Health and Dr. Catey’s ANTH 4970 will no longer be offered, in that Dr. Catey is leaving our department.

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

#### 2011-2012

In ANTH 3033, requiring students to write a critical paragraph in response to the instructor's feedback turned out to be extremely productive. This requirement will continue to be implemented in the 2012-2013 cycle. The course has been fine-tuned over the last several years and no further changes are required at this time. ANTH 4980 Anthropology of Self and Emotion: Existing structure of the course seems to be effective for most students. Over the course of the semester, all students revised initial drafts based on instructor and peer feedback and received improved scores on their second drafts, suggesting that the writing workshops implemented were successful. While it is difficult, based on the small sample size, to determine whether student performance slightly below the target for paper #3 can be related to specific aspects of instruction, in the future students who score in the “3” range or below on the final draft of paper #1 will be required to meet with the professor outside of class to discuss specific challenges each faces in his/her writing, with a follow-up meeting to be scheduled if improvement is not seen on paper #2.

**ANTH 4980 Methods in Sociocultural Anthropology** In the future, the class will focus on data collection and analysis even further and emphasize connecting and contextualizing research in grounded processes. ANTH 4980 Race and Racism, ANTH 4980 Anthropology and Public Health and Dr. Catey’s ANTH 4970 will no longer be offered, in that Dr. Catey is leaving our department.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
and contextualizing research in grounded processes. ANTH 4970 Dr. White’s Senior Seminar This semester, a “no late grade deductions” policy for assignments was implemented that did not require revision. Students were responsible for setting their own schedule to complete most writing assignments. The idea was that if students were less pressured to complete some assignments and could set their own time and work management schedules, they might focus more on the writing and less on the deadlines. This policy did not work well for most students, however; many students postponed turning in assignments until the last two weeks of class. Some commented that they appreciated this as a lesson in responsibility and time management, but in the fall, a different policy of positive incentives will be attempted for assignments turned in by a given deadline. ANTH 4980 Race and Racism, ANTH 4980 Anthropology and Public Health and Dr. Catey’s ANTH 4970 will no longer be offered, in that Dr. Catey is leaving our department.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
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?

The ANTH program added small CTW sections to several regular courses. This experimental approach was effective in moderately increasing our CTW offerings. Also, hiring a Visiting Lecturer made a positive contribution to our CTW program. The drawback in having a VL teach CTW courses, however, is the lack of continuity 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?

The consensus in the anthropology department is that the quality of our majors has considerably improved, both in terms of their writing and for their critical thinking skills. Ideally all students should take ANTH 3033 early in their career, and then register for ANTH 4970 before graduating. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. However, offering several small sections of CTW courses increases students’ exposure to critical thinking through writing throughout their careers as anthropology majors.

**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 these areas?

The anthropology department is still strapped for resources. Increasing CTW course offerings inevitably takes a toll on graduate course offerings. Furthermore, adding on a CTW section to a 4000/6000 course further complicates the instructor’s position vis-a-vis a composite student population with different requirements.

**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, several small CTW sections were added to regular 4000 courses for the sake of expanding our CTW course offerings. The ANTH program added small CTW sections to several regular courses. This experimental approach was effective in moderately increasing our CTW offerings. Also, hiring a Visiting Lecturer made a positive contribution to our CTW program. The drawback in having a VL teach CTW courses, however, is the lack of continuity in the 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?

Since the assessment process is satisfactory, 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.

This year’s assessment will determine whether we continue to offer small CTW sections along with a number of regular 4000/6000 level courses.

**Administrative Dept Question 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

Given the increased need for CTW courses in anthropology and given that we cannot offer more than 2 to 3 dedicated CTW courses a year, we decided to offer several small CTW sections along with 4000 level courses.

**Administrative Dept Question 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

Assessments for this year reveal the importance of thinking existentially in order to cover our CTW needs; however, having small CTW sections added to 4000/6000 level courses is less than ideal. An additional Permanent Lecturer position would go a long way in helping us support the CTW course offerings that our major requires.

**Administrative Department Question 3:** How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Findings from this year will determine whether we are going to continue offering small CTW sections along with 4000 level courses. The department will also make every effort to secure additional resources to expand our CTW offerings. If we hire a Lecturer, we will be able to create a continuity within several of our CTW offerings.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure
In 2011-2012, we added small CTW "special topic" sections to several courses at the 4000/6000 level. This allowed us to expand our CTW offerings. Three more anthropology faculty (Dr. Jennifer Patico, Dr. Faidra Papavasiliou, and Visiting Lecturer Dr. Scott Catey) received CTW training. Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.

Adding small CTW sections to 4000/6000 courses is effective in increasing CTW offerings, but it further complicates the task of teaching a 4000/6000 level course. Having visiting faculty teach CTW is also problematic, in that no action plan can be implemented for their course offerings. Our goal for next year is to hire a lecturer to increase our course offerings while guaranteeing pedagogical and methodological continuity.
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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 demonstrates 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.

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 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 97% of students received at least a 3 and 78% received a 4.

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

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 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 89% of students received at least a 3 and 59% 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 "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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 100% of students received at least a 3 and 74% received a 4.

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

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 "Arguments are not based on linguistic principles", 2 is "Arguments are loosely based on linguistic principles", 3 is "Arguments are mostly based on linguistic principles" and 4 is "Arguments are clearly and consistently based on linguistic principles". Our target is for 85% of students to receive at least a 3 and for at least 40% to receive a 4.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 92% of students received at least a 3 and 76% 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 "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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 87% of students received at least a 3 and 70% received a 4.

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
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: Finished
Priority: High

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/ setting 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: demonstrates self-awareness about cultural difference | Outcome/Objective: communication across cultures final paper

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 92% of students received at least a 3 and 76% 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 "Conclusions are based on misconceptions of linguistic principles, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented", 2 is "Conclusions are somewhat or vaguely based on misconceptions of data, personal opinion, or are unrelated to arguments presented or on bias", 3 is "Conclusions are largely supported by data and not personal opinion or bias" and 4 is "Conclusions are clearly supported by data-informed arguments and not personal opinion 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In terms of this outcome, 97% of students received at least a 3 and 57% received a 4.
**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?**

Last year's Action Plan proposed 1) changing a requirement for the CTW paper in Communication across Cultures in order to improve student outcomes, 2) advising students so that they take the courses in the correct order, and 3) collecting CTW data more promptly to ensure full data availability. All of these plans were accomplished this year. 1) Students in the Communication across Cultures class were required to do their ethnography on a microculture with which they were completely unfamiliar. This helped them to identify cultural difference (and thus become aware of their feelings and thoughts regarding such differences) and recognize themselves as cultural beings. This year, we met (and surpassed) our targets for these measures, whereas last year we did not. 2) Advising of students has been improved, including providing clear information online and in the new program brochure about the ordering of the two CTW courses. We are also planning to add a note as to the preferred ordering of these courses in the catalogue in the next curriculum change cycle. While a few students have still taken the senior-level course before the junior-level course or taken the courses simultaneously, most students are now taking them in the correct order, so they are better able to build on what they learned in the junior-level course when taking the senior-level course. Because the junior-level course is limited to majors & minors and the senior-level course is usually taken by a few students in other departments, we have decided not to make the junior-level course a prerequisite for the senior-level course at this time. 3) We collected full data on all CTW courses this year, which has allowed for analysis of how our students are doing.

**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, we see improvement over the course of the junior-level course, which has parallel assignments that allow for comparison. Data within the senior-level course and between the two courses are more difficult to compare because of the differences in what students are asked to do. However, we see students performing at a high level from the end of the junior-level course onwards, even when they are asked to do different types of tasks. Two sections of each course were offered this year; data provided are averages from both sections of a course. In the junior-level course, students had three assignments that all required them to compare and contrast public opinion with a sociolinguistic perspective, and in Table 1 we can see improvement in their rubric scores from the first assignment to the third for four of the five measures. The measure on which students did not show improvement, “draws reasonable conclusions,” was one on which they were already performing on a high level. The final paper departed from this structure and was a much more open-ended literature review assignment. In spite of the difference in assignment type, similar percentages of students scored at least "competent" on all measures as on the third assignment. The percentage of students with a “sophisticated” score increased from the third assignment on “identifies values and assumptions that underlie different perspectives” and “presents convincing arguments based on linguistic principles,” but stayed steady on “draws reasonable conclusions” and fell on “shows awareness of prejudicial aspects of the problem” and “presents ideas clearly and in a well-organized fashion.” The lower number of students scoring “sophisticated” on these two measures is not very surprising, given that the paper was much longer without instructor questions that might have been helpful in suggesting a structure and focusing on prejudicial aspects. However, the strong scores on this final paper overall do suggest that students were able to apply what they had learned on the previous assignments to a different and more complex task at the end. There are also a series of CTW assignments in the senior-level class, but as they each have very different foci (justification of proposed project, literature review, and analysis), it is not very meaningful to compare scores
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 our recent hire of a lecturer who teaches CTW courses has been an enormous help, in the absence of additional changes we are likely to continue to have problems offering enough sections of our CTW courses while still keeping manageable course loads. Since we recently changed our senior-level course, and the new one was not previously a required course, not all students have needed the new course. This has allowed all those who need the senior-level course to be able to get in. However, the junior-level course was offered both terms this year and filled each time with additional students wanting in. Once all students need the new senior-level course, both courses will be filled to capacity, possibly creating bottlenecks for graduation. This is especially likely to be an issue if our major continues to grow, in which case we will need to offer multiple sections of each course per semester. We are interested in offering another senior-level “capstone” course which might be taught by a wider range of faculty, which could help lessen the stress on the current senior-level course, but the junior-level course will likely need to be offered more often in any case.

A related issue is that this year all CTW courses (two per semester) were taught by a single lecturer, who also had an additional course in addition to teaching CTW, which made up her fourth unit (the additional work involved in a CTW course should be taken into account when assigning workloads, as the courses involve intensive working with students on their writing, including grading of multiple drafts. Although discussion among CTW faculty in the department has suggested that we can partially address this problem internally, by giving feedback without always grading drafts, it would be helpful to have more faculty involved in teaching the CTW courses. To this end, and to help with the issue of sufficient course offerings noted above, we are likely to need an additional hire to teach CTW courses in the near future. A final issue that has been particularly apparent this past spring was the relatively high number of students who missed a large number (7 or more) class sessions. Many of these students do not finish the courses at all, including students who were doing well until they stopped showing up for class. While in some cases this behavior can be due to individual student issues and problems, there is often a situation in which a student is taking more classes than they can reasonably expect to finish, usually for financial reasons (they are working, sometimes full time, and/or they cannot afford to attend classes for more than a few more semesters and so try to take a too-heavy load each semester). This suggests a need for more student support, probably both in terms of finances and advisement. While I am unsure what we can do about students’ financial situation in this forum, I thought it nevertheless important to mention. Perhaps better advising of the students would at least help them to make decisions based on more accurate information about the courses they hope to take.

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 large amount of work with student writing is clearly helping students throughout both classes, as we can see in the improved rubric scores, and as has been noted by both instructor and students. Students frequently comment that they are being better communicators, better researchers, and more critical thinkers. Clearly, while students may complain about the workload, they do appreciate its effects! In addition, we now have two CTW courses required for the major that fit particularly well with Georgia State’s global education initiative, allowing students to learn about and develop skills, knowledge, and awareness of bias in both courses. The additional work involved in a CTW course should be taken into account when assigning workloads, as the courses involve intensive working with students on their writing, including grading of multiple drafts. Although discussion among CTW faculty in the department has suggested that we can partially address this problem internally, by giving feedback without always grading drafts, it would be helpful to have more faculty involved in teaching the CTW courses. To this end, and to help with the issue of sufficient course offerings noted above, we are likely to need an additional hire to teach CTW courses in the near future. A final issue that has been particularly apparent this past spring was the relatively high number of students who missed a large number (7 or more) class sessions. Many of these students do not finish the courses at all, including students who were doing well until they stopped showing up for class. While in some cases this behavior can be due to individual student issues and problems, there is often a situation in which a student is taking more classes than they can reasonably expect to finish, usually for financial reasons (they are working, sometimes full time, and/or they cannot afford to attend classes for more than a few more semesters and so try to take a too-heavy load each semester). This suggests a need for more student support, probably both in terms of finances and advisement. While I am unsure what we can do about students’ financial situation in this forum, I thought it nevertheless important to mention. Perhaps better advising of the students would at least help them to make decisions based on more accurate information about the courses they hope to take.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Art Education
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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 discussing works from various eras and genres. They also explore strategies for engaging young learners in these disciplines. The CTW assignment in this course focuses 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: Critical Reflection
Art Education majors are expected to become reflexive practitioners, demonstrated through personal evaluative and critical responses to course readings and activities and the ability to defend their responses.

G 2: 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.

G 3: Application of Coursework
Art Education majors are expected to apply concepts and practices from course readings and activities to real-life classroom situations and demonstrate the ability to develop and defend their own ideas about appropriate strategies and content for teaching art.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Classroom Management (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Art Education majors should demonstrate critical awareness of classroom management strategies, including effective communication as well as management of materials, behavior, and time. They should be able to analyze, compare, and critique strategies seen in field experiences, and develop and defend their own ideas about classroom management.

SLO 2: Art Criticism (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)
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. Art Education majors are expected to develop and defend interpretations of art works informed by analytical processes such as the Feldman method, and to incorporate art criticism and analysis of artworks into their lesson plans.

SLO 3: Resource Analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 3)
Art Education majors are expected to demonstrate awareness of different sources of information about content and strategies for teaching art, and to demonstrate the ability to analyze and critique these sources (such as websites, journals, books) on the basis of how complete, appropriate, engaging, and relevant they are, to inform their decision-making in designing lesson plans based on available resources.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubric for Field Experience Reflection (O: 1)
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. The lowest aggregated scores on the rubric were 77% for evaluation, and 84% for interpretation, indicating that these aspects need to be addressed more fully in our CTW assignments. See Action Plan for further details.

Target for O1: Classroom Management
For the Final field Experience review, we would like all students to earn 80% or better on all criteria in the rubric. The scores ranged from 84% to 98% on all items but one: the “Evaluation” criteria seemed to stymie students in this course as well, because they scored an average of 77% on this item. This will be addressed in our action plan.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Low score on the Evaluation criteria (77%) indicates additional emphasis is needed in this area.

M 2: Art Criticism assignment (O: 2)
On the various measures in the Art Criticism Rubric, students scored between 73% and 97% of expectations. The lowest areas of student competence were Analysis and Evaluation, which are addressed in our Action plan.

Target for O2: Art Criticism
Students must earn a B- or better for the course, and this assignment is an essential component. We would like for all students to achieve at least an 80% on all criteria listed for this assignment, but the average score on the “evaluation” criteria was only a 73.9%, which we will address in our action plan for next year.
### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Target was mostly met, but the average score on the "evaluation" criteria was only a 73.9 %, which we will address in our action plan for next year.

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Resource Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of each objective stated in the rubric for this assignment, students scored between 80 - 98 %, meeting the goals earning a B- or better in all coursework. Evaluation proved once again to be the weakest criteria, with average score of 80%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target was met, but again, Evaluation proved to be most challenging aspect of critical thinking through writing assignment, so we will give this extra emphasis across the board.

### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

#### Address weaknesses illustrated by scores

Data collection from all three CTW assignments in the Art Education undergraduate programs indicated that the weakest skill set among our students was in the ability to critically evaluate a resource, an artwork, or a field experience in terms of posing critical questions, suggesting improvements or opinions, and particularly, providing rationale or support for their ideas. We recognize the need to spend more time in class modeling this critical thinking skill, giving students more practice, and setting higher standards on assignments prior to the CTW assignment in order to have opportunities to give students more feedback about this skill and their efforts to achieve it.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Art Criticism assignment | Outcome/Objective: Art Criticism
  - Measure: Resource Review | Outcome/Objective: Resource Analysis
  - Measure: Rubric for Field Experience Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Classroom Management

- **Implementation Description:** In both CTW courses in Art Education, the instructors will spend more time going over the expectations of the assignments, explaining each criteria more fully, modelling how to meet the criteria of "Evaluation" and offering examples of successful student work as models.

- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Melanie Davenport ( AE 4200 ) Dr. Melody Milbrandt ( AE 4900 )

- **Additional Resources:** examples of more successful assignments that address criteria of Evaluation well, to share with students.

#### Expand and enrich CTW assignments in Art Education

After piloting the Resource Review as a potential second CTW assignment for AE 4200, in Fall of 2010, I made the rubric more sophisticated and added it into the syllabus as a full-fledged CTW assignment prior to their Final Field Experience review, and I believe it helped raise the outcomes of the second assignment by giving students the opportunity to get feedback on their writing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Melanie Davenport

### 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?

During the past academic year, a second CTW assignment was added to AE 4200 syllabus, as planned, and the effect was positive. Students performed better on the existing CTW assignment from having another CTW experience prior, receiving feedback and the opportunity to revise. Collecting data about specific criteria on each CTW rubric was also very helpful in allowing us to identify areas of weakness to address in future.

#### 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 AE 4200, the entry level course, having two CTW assignments has given student the opportunity to further develop their critical thinking skills and as the instructor, I definitely feel that the quality of student writing has improved. In the advanced course, AE 4900, there is currently only one CTW assignment, but we are discussing adding a second one to foster those skills further. Lesson planning continues to be uneven among advanced students, so we hope to develop a CTW assignment related to lesson planning for AE 4900 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?

Communication among instructors remains problematic, just because of time and other obligations, but otherwise, the CTW initiative is working well. I think having a course release or a GA to assist with implementation and evaluation of CTW would be beneficial.

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 last year, we have added an extra assignment in the entry level course, and are discussing ways to revise other existing assignments to focus more on CTW objectives. Student writing has improved overall, but lesson planning is still an area in need of improvement, and we feel that perhaps adding a CTW component to these assignments might be beneficial.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Art History

(Mission / Purpose)

It is the department's mission to provide Art History majors with the skills to be able to critically analyze and interpret artworks based on formal and historical knowledge, and to be able to convey that knowledge effectively through oral and written communication. Written assignments that require critical thinking in Art History may ask students 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." In AH 3000, students are introduced to the historiography and methodologies commonly employed in the study of art and art history. They have an opportunity to apply this knowledge in a semester-long research paper on a topic of their choice. AH 4990 is designed as a summative course for students to reflect on their college careers and on the practices required of art historians in different job capacities. It students to submit a great deal of written documentation for assessment including an exhibition review assignment, interdisciplinary approach to teaching Art History assignment, conference paper abstract assignment, graduate study application statement of purpose assignment, and a revised research paper.

Goals

G 1: Inquiry
Students will be able to formulate pertinent questions about works of art or art historical problems.

G 2: Synthesis
Students will be able to synthesize interpretations of art and art historical claims made by others.

G 3: Evaluation
Students will be able to evaluate the creative and cultural significance of art and/or evaluate claims made by others about art.

G 4: Interpretation
Students will be able to compose valid interpretations of works of art or art historical problems.

G 5: Reflection
Students will be able to reflect on the validity of their own assumptions.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: AH4990 interdisciplinary assignment (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 1)
Students were asked to prepare a short lecture (with a written write-up) in which they presented on an art historical topic using material from another discipline to broaden comprehension of the social and historical context of the art. Examples could include a novel, a piece of music, a film, or a scientific discovery. Evidence of critical thinking was restricted to the written portion of this assignment.

SLO 2: AH3000 research paper (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 2)
The primary document for assessing CTW in AH 3000 is a 10-page research paper on an art historical topic. In general, this project is designed to develop student's skills in conducting art historical research and in analyzing and applying different methodologies used by art historians in the study of art or art historical problems. However, the paper requires many elements of critical thinking to occur simultaneously in order for the assignment to be a success. Therefore, we have switched to a holistic rubric to measure overall evidence of critical thinking (G1 through G5) in the paper.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: AH 4990 interdisciplinary assignment (O: 1)

As with AH 3000, we have implemented a holistic rubric for use in this AH 4990 assignment.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: AH4990 interdisciplinary assignment**
80% of students will score a 4 or better (out of 6) on the critical thinking component of the assignment. We feel that the percentage here should be higher than the 70% identified for AH 3000, as AH 4990 is a more advanced CTW class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83% of students (or 15 out 18 students) achieved a score of 4 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: AH 3000 research paper (O: 2)**

We developed a new holistic rubric, using a scale from 0 to 6 (insufficient to excellent) to measure the five goals for critical thinking in this assignment: · Provides a clear thesis (G1-5) · Identifies the salient issues/questions/debates (G1 inquiry) · Make effective use of supporting evidence (G2 synthesis) · Thoughtfully analyzes evidence (G3 evaluation)Posits valid interpretations and justifies assumptions (G 4& 5 interpretation and reflection)

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

**Target for O2: AH3000 research paper**

Ideally we would like all students to meet or exceed the "acceptable" range (a score of 4 or better out of 6 on the rubric); however, a goal of 70% seems more realistic, and in line with other year-end assessment goals and outcomes for the major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year saw an improvement, with almost 80% of the students in AH 3000 scoring a 4 or better on the research paper rubric, compared to 68% from last year. This is great news for us; we felt that this was a strong class overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Course sequence**

One issue we continue to run up against is that many of our students end up taking the CTW courses simultaneously.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** We have decided to offer the courses in different semesters next year to address this problem. This is a short term solution, however. We need to determine how we can catch our majors earlier on in their academic career. Most do not seek proper advisement, nor do they read through the college catalogue.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** AH faculty

**AH 3000 assignment**

We plan to change the research paper assignment to allow students to choose from a broader range of paper topics. The focus on a canonical work of art proved too difficult for many of them, as they were a) unable to track down a sufficient amount of research that was accessible to them as undergraduates and/or b) make the subtler distinctions between different author's arguments about the same work of art.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** AH 3000 research paper
  - **Outcome/Objective:** AH3000 research paper
- **Implementation Description:** Consult with AH faculty to rewrite research paper assignment for AH 3000.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador (Susan Richmond) in consultation with AH faculty

**AH 4990 assignment**

AH faculty decided in spring to change the AH 4990 assignment used in the reporting of CTW. The original assignment (a personal reflection paper) didn't seem to meet as many of the CTW goals we have established for our majors. The new assignment (an interdisciplinary project) has several components to it, all of which add up to a more efficient demonstration of evidence of CTW in the major.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** AH 4990 interdisciplinary assignment
  - **Outcome/Objective:** AH4990 interdisciplinary assignment
- **Implementation Description:** We implemented a new assignment this past spring, and will continue to use it next year. I've listed this as in-progress because we would like to gauge its usefulness/success over several cycles. We would also like several faculty to have the opportunity to teach this particular assignment so that we can gather more feedback at that level. Right now, only 1 professor has assigned the new project.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Susan Richmond and AH faculty

**Rubrics**

Although this was not a part of our action plan from last year, we gone ahead and revised the rubrics for both courses in response to the committee report that our rubrics measurements were unclear and/or insufficient. We believe that the holistic rubrics that we are now using provide the best measurement of CTW in our assignments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **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?
We met our targets this year. It's difficult to say if this achievement is related to the implementation of our action plans (streamlining the course sequence and changing the AH 3000 research assignment), so the reasons for the success can only be anecdotal. However, we feel that the plans that we've implemented and have in progress will allow us to continue to meet our targets.

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 feel that the students who completed the two courses did demonstrate better CTW skills overall, and will leave GSU with a good skill set. Again it's unclear if this is a result of a greater emphasis on CTW in the major, or whether this year's group of students entered with a higher level of critical thinking skills. Anecdotally, the presence of more students with higher skills seems to raise the overall level of CTW in the classes as a whole. This can be seen in the quality of student work and in the perception among the students that CTW is important and worthy of their time.

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 encounter problems with students failing to take the CTW courses in a timely fashion. This is especially true with transfer students. One problem lies in the designation of our major. Art history is currently designated as a concentration (a B.A. in art with a concentration in art history). It appears on Gosolar only as a "B.A. art" and does not distinguish the art history concentration from the studio art concentration. We are working to change this designation and establish a actual major. Though this is a non-CTW issue, we hope that it will help us identify and advise our students earlier on in their coursework, and allow us to get them into CTW courses before their senior year. This is the only problem area for us at this time. However, we will continue to discuss the success of the designated assignments and rubrics, especially as more faculty come on board to teach the CTW courses.

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 implemented changes to assignments that we feel will better reflect CTW in AH 4990. We've also improved our rubrics to measure more effectively the CTW components of both course assignments. Last year's committee report recommended measuring separate CTW outcomes, however we feel that a holistic approach is more appropriate for the assignments on which we are reporting.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Art Studio
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design defines critical thinking through writing as: "wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do." (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005, page 1.)

Goals
G 1: Technical Skills
Students will demonstrate competent technical and formal skills.

G 3: Professional Portfolio
Graduating BFA students will have professional quality portfolio that includes digital documentation of artwork, video documentation of artwork (if appropriate), current resume/cv, and artist statement.

G 2: Unified Body of Artwork
Students will complete the BFA program with a mature studio practice that includes a unified body of artwork.

G 4: Critical Writing Skills
Students completing the BFA program will have the critical writing skills necessary for a career in the fine arts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Portfolio II: Textiles Assignment (G: 1) (M: 2)
Paste Assignment Description here.

SLO 3: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art (M: 8)
SLO 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 beliefnet.com and do theBelief-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

SLO 5: DP Portfolio II
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? 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.

SLO 6: 3DS 4945 & 4955, Ceramics Portfolio I & II (M: 6)
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.

SLO 7: GRD 3910 History of Graphic Design
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 although it has justifies paragraph and capital letters. – Bruce Rogers’ page from The Centaur of 1913 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: + 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 defenses are 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 peer 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
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: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Pam Longobardi/ Critical Thinking Through Writing

ART 3910 Fall 2010

Craig Drennen Student # Criteria#1 Criteria#2 Criteria#3 Criteria#4 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

Source of Evidence: Beliefnet.com Quiz Know your beliefs

http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Quizzes/BeliefOMatic.aspx

DUE Tues Sept 28

Belief Systems: 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, 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.

M 4: ART 3910 Critical Issues in Contemp Art

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Pam Longobardi/ Critical Thinking Through Writing

ART 3910 Fall 2010

Craig Drennen Student # Criteria#1 Criteria#2 Criteria#3 Criteria#4 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

Source of Evidence: Beliefnet.com Quiz Know your beliefs

http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Quizzes/BeliefOMatic.aspx

DUE Tues Sept 28

Belief Systems: 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, 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.

M 5: DP Portfolio II (O: 1)


Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

M 6: 3DS 4945 & 4955, Ceramics Port. I & II (West) (O: 6)

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
2011-2012 CTW Biology
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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. To enable students to communicate their analysis of original data in written form. Writing about scientific analysis forces students to organize their thoughts into a logical argument.

Goals

G 1: Improve writing skills
Students will become better writers by organizing complex biological concepts into written form

G 2: Improve reading skills
Students will become better critical readers as a result of improving their writing skills

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Lab Report (M: 1, 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 protocol introduction
   e. _____Moves from a broad to specific
   f. _____Includes a hypothesis
   g. _____Does not read like a protocol intro

II. Methods (2 points)
   a. _____Passive past tense
   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 conclusions

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
   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. ____Contains number, title and caption
   f. ____Shows only relevant data that is discussed in discussion

VI. General
   a. _____Grammatical issues

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.

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

Target for O1: Lab Report

85% of the class improved by 15% points over the course of the semester

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

90% of the class improved by 10% 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Scientific Report | Outcome/Objective: Lab Report

Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Frank Cruz

Mandated CTW faculty help
To help nurture a communicative relationship between CTW faculty and students, 2% of the course grade will be dependent upon meeting with the CTW instructor to help with improvements on reports.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Scientific Report | Outcome/Objective: Lab Report

Mandatory student meetings
Students are going to be required to see their CTW faculty instructor at least once during the semester to receive counsel on their report.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Implementation Description: To prevent students from slipping through CTW courses without establishing a working relationship with their CTW instructor, 2% of their grade will be contingent upon their attendance during office hours to receive help on their report.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: 3810 CTW 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?

Requiring all sections to follow a rubric that was constructed by CTW faculty helped to standardize the various sections. This ensured that all students were assessed similarly and were demanded the same learning objectives.

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 not systematically compared the exit classes to the entry 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?

Having different faculty members with different philosophies has made standardizing the quality of the CTW component of the labs challenging. Since I am only a peer faculty member confronting individuals about this has been difficult and awkward.

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 big changes have been made besides adding sections of CTW courses. The impact on the students seems obvious from the improvements made during the semester. Not only are they better at analyzing data, they are better at organizing thoughts and ideas in general.

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?

Assessing the students is something that we are still trying to perfect. Our department has just formed an assessment committee this summer to address issues like this.

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 mentioned above, assessment of our curricula is under construction and we have formed a committee to help direct assessment in our department.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:  Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

My department has not changed the curricula in response to the data, although we are brainstorming ways to use the data to improve our curricula.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:  What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

The assessment this year let me know that most sections assess reports comparably and that students from different sections are still learning the same skills about writing and scientific analysis.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:  How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

I anticipate that the assessment committee will find ways to make obtaining data easier. In addition to obtaining more data, we will discuss how to use the data to inform us about the status of the curricula as it relates to our program objectives. This year we used our findings to restructure the rubric once it was used last fall. The Spring rubric seemed to work better and no changes to the rubric are anticipated.
You must make reference to the outside text (video or article) and explain its point.

**Goals**

**G 3: Analysis**

Students in BIS courses will analyze theories, concepts, facts or other information from the perspective of multiple disciplines. Students completing the CTW courses in theatre will be able to: Analyze and evaluate literary, historical and theoretical source materials in terms of the reliability of evidence and assumptions of the authors. Synthesize materials from a variety of disciplines to determine their relevance to theatrical theory, history and practice. Formulate research questions related to the production, history and theory. Develop a personal aesthetic with which to approach their work as theatre artists. Apply critical thinking skills in reporting research findings in oral and written form.

**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 (M: 1, 11)**

Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper based on their research into a specific literary or historical topic. The paper will be organized around a clear thesis statement or question, support this statement or address this question in a logical manner and with an appropriate level of detail and draw logical conclusions based on the synthesis of materials from a variety of sources and disciplines. Students will demonstrate organizational skills of presentation without distracting grammatical errors or lapses in academic language or citation mechanics.

**SLO 7: THEA 3100 Research Paper (G: 3) (M: 7, 12)**

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.

**SLO 8: Entry Paper for BIS Program (G: 3, 4) (M: 9)**

Students applying for acceptance to the BIS program are required to submit a writing sample in the form of a piece of expository writing submitted for a class previously taken at the college level. Papers will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. We will begin collecting papers in Fall 2012, with the first evaluations to be completed in Summer 2013.

**SLO 9: Exit Paper for BIS Program (G: 3, 4) (M: 10)**

Students applying to graduate with the BIS degree are required to submit a writing sample in the form of a piece of expository writing submitted for one of their CTW classes. Papers will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. We will begin collecting papers in Fall 2012, with the first evaluations to be completed in Summer 2013.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**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 assignments: 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 is it 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, will go beyond simple summary to demonstrate learning, and express a real ownership of the ideas.

O/O 6: Oral Presentation
In Political Science 3800, students demonstrated application in a paper and oral presentations. Assignment description: Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper and oral presentation of conclusions of research by providing clearly stated conclusions with examination of implications or consequences of conclusions. Students will also integrate other perspectives thoughtfully and respectfully.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: THEA 4070 Research Paper (O: 1)
Students complete a research paper of 10-12 pages, proving a thesis focused down from a 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 works cited page. 4) The final draft of the paper.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

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 claims/conclusions effectively 1 2 3 4 5
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O5: Analytical Reaction Essay
The expected achievement target for BIS students is that at least 80% of the students in a CTW class will obtain a grade in the two highest evaluation levels used in the course’s last CTW written (and/or oral, in some cases) project. Given the way many CTW rubrics are designed, this means, quite often, scoring a 4 or 5 on the evaluation rubric used for a particular project or assignment. The rubric used in Speech 3250's analytical reaction essay is shown here:

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: ___________________________ Faculty Name: ___________________________
COURSE # ___________________________

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 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 & PolS 3800
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

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 reviewed, 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 9: BIS Entry Paper (O: 8)**

Students applying for acceptance to the BIS program are required to submit a writing sample in the form of a piece of expository writing submitted for a class previously taken at the college level. Papers will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. We will begin collecting papers in Fall 2012, with the first evaluations to be completed in Summer 2013.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**M 10: Exit Paper for BIS (O: 9)**

Students applying to graduate with the BIS degree are required to submit a writing sample in the form of a piece of expository writing submitted for one of their CTW classes. Papers will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the BIS Council using rubrics developed by the Council in consultation with Jennifer Lawrence. We will begin collecting papers in Fall 2012, with the first evaluations to be completed in Summer 2013.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**M 11: Findings for THEA 4070 2012 (O: 1)**

We would consider four of the eight rubrics the most relevant to critical thinking through writing: Argumentation/Critical Thinking, Development, Knowledge and Structure. Of those Knowledge was consistently the strong point in the research papers, with an average of 4.18 for the draft and 4.73 for the final draft. Development and Argumentation/Critical Thinking did almost equally well, with students averaging 4.12 on the draft of the former, 3.94 on the draft of the latter and 4.27 for both on the final paper. Structure came in the lowest, with a 4.18 average on the draft and 3.86 on the final version (this reflects five students who did not submit drafts and one whose draft was much shorter than the required submission of 2/3 of the paper). On the positive side, nine students scored a perfect 5 on this rubric, as compared to only 1 in 2010-2011. In the four key areas, the overall average for this assignment is 4.25 for the draft and 4.28 for the final submission, with 9 students scoring an average of 5, 6 scoring 4 to 4.75, 6 in the 3-3.75 range and 1 scoring less than 3. The target set after last years report was an average of 4.1 in the four key rubrics, 4 in Argumentation/Critical Thinking, 4.2 in Development, 4.75 in Knowledge and 3.5 in Structure. The only area in which this was not exceeded was Knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: THEA 4070 Research Paper**

The target set after last years report was an average of 4.1 in the four key rubrics, 4 in Argumentation/Critical Thinking, 4.2 in Development, 4.75 in Knowledge and 3.5 in Structure.

**M 12: Findings for THEA 3100 2012 (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 for both the draft and the final paper. Development came in second with 4.5 on the draft and 4.68 on the final. Argumentation/Critical Thinking came in third, with students averaging 4.19 on the draft of the former, 3.94 on the draft and 4.46 on the final paper. Structure came in the lowest, with a 4.38 average on the draft and 4.27 on the final version (this reflects six students who did not submit drafts and four whose revisions of the draft resulted in a weaker paper). On the positive side, 15 students scored a perfect 5 on this rubric, in the four key areas, the overall average for this assignment is 4.52 for the draft and 4.6 for the final submission, with 9 students scoring an average of 5, 12 scoring 4 to 4.75, 1 in the 3-3.75 range and none scoring less than 3.5. The target set after last years report was 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. The only area in which this was met was knowledge, suggesting a need to work more exercises in critical thinking into the classroom work.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O7: THEA 3100 Research Paper**

The target set after last years report was 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.

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

**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

**Action Plan for BIS Major**

Since the BIS consists of a wide variety of programs, including 10 university-planned BIS programs in addition to numerous student-planned programs, and only one of these programs, theatre, offers its own CTW classes, we have had to develop a CTW tracking plan that meets the unique nature of the degree program. The first stage of this was the creation of rubrics specific to the BIS program but general enough to accommodate everything from environmental science to classics. To measure student work against these rubrics, starting in Fall 2012 we will require all students applying for entry into the BIS program to submit a sample of expository writing at the college level. At the same time, students applying to graduate will be required to submit a paper from one of their CTW classes. This will be assessed, using the BIS rubrics, by a subcommittee of the BIS Council, with the first findings available in Fall 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
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 the theatre program in 2011-12 was the training of a second full-time faculty member to teach CTW courses. This lecturer will take over THEA 4070 in Fall 2012, offering a new perspective on critical thinking in that part of the field. This is a partial fulfillment of Acting Plan Item 2, calling for the training of all full-time faculty in theatre to teach CTW courses. For the BIS program as a whole, we have set up an action plan for CTW assessment. We have created rubrics for BIS students, with two rubrics specifically addressing the interdisciplinarity of student writing. We have also created a mechanism for assessing student work in the 10 university created and various student created programs falling under the BIS umbrella.

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 THEA 3100, the average for the four key CTW rubrics, Argumentation/Critical Thinking, Development, Knowledge and Structure, rose from 4.52 on draft of the final paper to 4.6 on the final submission. This represents a growth of .08 on all papers and .15 on those for which drafts were submitted. Given the high average on the drafts, this is acceptable growth. In THEA 4070, the CTW average on the draft was 4.25, which rose to 4.28 on the final paper. This represents an improvement of .03 on all papers and .23 on papers for which drafts were submitted. This could be improved, although it should be noted that this is a much more complex paper than the one assigned in THEA 3100.

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 the theatre program, the greatest need remains for training of all faculty in CTW procedures. We have helped this to a significant extent by training another full-time faculty member to do CTW courses, but we have not been able to schedule training for the entire faculty. His taking over one of our CTW courses will provide much needed back up (should the current CTW ambassador leave for any reason, we would have nobody capable of overseeing the program in theatre or filing reports) and new perspectives on how to incorporate CTW within THEA 4070 without losing course content. The BIS program as a whole simply needs time and student cooperation. Assembling the papers we require for assessment will be the biggest challenge in the upcoming year, given the need to balance the requirement for receiving papers from students applying to enter the program and to graduate and the need to maintain numbers in enrollment and graduation.

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 theatre has been the creation of grades for drafts in the final assignments for both THEA 3100 and THEA 4070, thereby encouraging more students to hand in drafts so they can learn more about critical thinking in writing through the direct experience of revising papers to meet the demands of critical thinking. The BIS program as a whole has had the biggest change with the adoption of CTW rubrics focusing on interdisciplinarity and a mechanism for assessing student work between entering the program and graduation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Business Analysis
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the CTW component of Business Analysis is to help students develop the "wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome ill-founded presuppositions["personal prejudices" in the original]; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do." (Bassham, Irwin, Nardone & Wallace, Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction (McGraw-Hill, 2005) page 1.) "Personal prejudices" in the original document has been changed to "ill-founded presuppositions" since I doubt many of the students have "personal prejudices" in the usual sense of the phrase about the subject matter of this course, but there will be times that initial guesses about things may need to be discarded as students delve deeper.

Goals
G 1: Critical Thinking Skills and Processes
Students graduating with a major in Managerial Sciences in the Business Analysis concentration will be able to apply critical thing skills and processes with addressing problems in the field.

G 2: Effective Writing Skills
Students graduating with a major in Managerial Sciences and a concentration in Business Analysis will be able to apply critical thinking skills and processes with addressing problems in the field.

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 an 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Target for O6: Written 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.

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

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"
  - Measure: Written Communication of Conclusions
- Implementation Description: Re-wording of the CTW assignments
- 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 the goals set out for BA student.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Review meetings will be held in the early fall to discuss the effectiveness of the overall program in helping students on the two dimensions of CTW. These will be different than a review of the specific learning outcomes set out in the assessment plan.
- Responsible Person/Group: William Bogner, Jim Shi, members of the BA faculty.
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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)
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. N/A is not an option all papers must have titles.

**O/O 2: Appropriate Introduction (M: 1, 2)**
The introduction should be judged adequate based on the rubric section below. Introduction: Excellent: Includes a full statement of the problem, any background theory that will be used to answer the problem and the basic experimental design that will be used to answer the problem. Adequate: Minor errors in either experimental design, theory or unclear statement of the problem. Not yet adequate: A major error in one of the above categories or several minor errors. Poor: Major errors the experimental design, or a lack of understanding of the theory or misstatement of the problem. N/A is not an option.

**O/O 3: Appropriate Materials and methods (M: 1, 2)**
The paper contains a materials and methods section which would allow a competent chemist to repeat the experiment. Based on the rubric section below. Experimental: Excellent: Includes the details of the experimental procedure (section titled Materials and Methods). A competent chemist should be able to reproduce the experiment using this section of the paper. Adequate: Minor details
omitted that would hamper reproduction of the experiment. Not yet adequate: A competent chemist would have difficulty reproducing the experiment. Major components of experiment not described or omitted. Poor: Lack of experimental detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 4: Appropriate Results section (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The paper contains a results section which is logical and incorporates all data in a readable format. Based on Rubric section below. Results: To think critically about data, it must be presented accurately, clearly and in a logical order. Excellent: Data presented fully including appropriate significant figures. Data are presented in logical order. Data format is readily available (in appropriate Tables, Figures and text) for facile assessment by the authors and readers. Adequate: One of significant figures, logical order, and efforts to make data readily accessible missing. Not yet adequate: Two of the above missing. Poor: Confusing organization of the data and/or major errors in presenting significant figures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O/O 6: Figures and Tables (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 53 students which were enrolled in chemistry 4000 in the academic year 2010-2011. 52 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 = 3.25/4.0). All 52 completers were judged as adequate or higher by the final submission of the final paper. (3.9/4.0) Introduction: Most students had difficulty with the introduction on the first submission of paper 1. (1.2/4.0). All 52 completers were judged as adequate or higher along with 1 by the final submission of paper 3. (3.5/4.0) Results: Many students had difficulty with the results section of the first paper. (1.2/4.0). All 52 completers were judged as adequate or higher along with 1 by the final submission of paper 3. (3.5/4.0) 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. (2.2/5.0). All 52 completers were judged as adequate or better on the last submission of the final paper. (3.8/4.0) Discussion and Conclusion: Most students had trouble on the Discussion/Conclusion portion of paper 1 (1.2/4.0). 50 of the 52 completers were judged as adequate or better on the last submission of paper 3. (3.5/5.0)

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

**Target for O1: Appropriate Title that represents actual work done in lab**

90 % of students score 3 or above by the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target was met by the 3rd submission. Most students did not meet target on first or 2nd submission.

**Target for O2: Appropriate Introduction**

Target was not met at first submission but was met by all students by final submission.

**Target for O3: Appropriate Materials and methods**

90% of students score a 3 or better by the final submission

**Target for O4: Appropriate Results section**

90% of students score a 3 or above by the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target was met by 3rd submission by all but one student.

**Target for O5: Appropriate Discussion/Conclusion**

90% of students score a 3 or above on the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target was met by all completers by 3rd submission.

**Target for O6: Figures and Tables**

90% of students score a 3 or above on the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target was met by all completers

**M 2: Final Paper of Capstone Course (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**

44 students took Chem 4160 in 2010-2011. Of these students 32 have received passing grades (the others are in progress). The 44 completers received adequate or better in every category by the final submission. The average number of submissions was 3.1.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Appropriate Title that represents actual work done in lab**
All students receive a 3 or better by their final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Target was met by 3rd submission.

**Target for O2: Appropriate Introduction**
All students receive a 3 or better by the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Target was met by 3rd submission.

**Target for O3: Appropriate Materials and methods**
All students receive a 3 or better by the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Target was met by 3rd submission

**Target for O4: Appropriate Results section**
All students receive a 3 or better by the final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Target was met by 3rd submission

**Target for O5: Appropriate Discussion/Conclusion**
All students receive a 3 or better by their final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Target was met by 3rd submission

**Target for O6: Figures and Tables**
All students receive a 3 or better by their final submission

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Target was met by 3rd submission

**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 thinking skills in the areas of the rubric.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Barrow

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

Reduction in the number of overall submissions by students

**Challenges for Next Year**—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

It looks like there may be an increase in enrollment so new sections may be opened.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

None

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

None
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### 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. The CIS definition of CTW in consistent with the University's definition for the following reasons: 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); The need to recognize ethical and social responsibilities is addressed in point 4; Identifying problems, solutions, and evaluating solutions requires the formulation and expression of convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Articulate Requirements and Constraints (M: 1)</td>
<td>Articulate Requirements and Constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions (M: 1)</td>
<td>Identify and Evaluate Potential Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Consider Ethical and Social Issues (M: 1)</td>
<td>Consider Ethical and Social Issues within potential solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4: Select Best Solution with Justification (M: 1)</td>
<td>Select Best Solution with Justification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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. The Spring 2011 instructions document is linked below. Sample solutions from previous semesters are provided.

#### Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**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.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The average was 3.9 with no one making less than 3.2.

**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.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The average was 3.8 with 11% 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...
### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The average was 3.75 with 6.5% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The average was 3.9 with 2.2% less than 3.2.

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

#### 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:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Preserve the objective component scores when assessing student submissions.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Instructor

#### Guage CIS Progress From Entry to Exit CTW Courses
CIS needs to coordinate with BUSA 3000 to gather the information needed to evaluate progress from the entry level CTW BUSA 3000 to the CIS exit level CIS 4980 / CIS 4970.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** As stated above, coordinate with BUSA 3000 to gather the information needed to evaluate progress from the entry level CTW BUSA 3000 to the CIS exit level CIS 4980 / CIS 4970.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CIS CTW ambassador (working with the MGS 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?**

Computer Information Systems completed the integration of CTW into our CIS 4970 Field Study course. Our CIS majors must take either CIS 4980 System Development Projects (where CTW was initially integrated) or CIS 4970 Field Study (with CTW now fully integrated). The second accomplishment was to capture individual finding scores for the CIS measures rather than the scores being the aggregation of all findings.

**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?**

CIS does not yet have sufficient coordination with and information from the entry level course BUSA 3000 to analyze progress. Gaining this coordination and information acquisition will be an action item for 2012-2013.

**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?**

CIS is making good progress with all findings meeting the established measures. Being able to guage progress from entry level CTW course to final CTW course is a next goal. At this point, no additional resource needs are anticipated.

**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?**

Integration of CTW into our program has raised the awareness of the benefits of more structured critical thinking. Students and faculty more formally consider and articulate analysis of circumstances, consideration of potential resolution paths including ethical aspects, and the justified selection of a final set of actions. CIS now has individual findings for each measure and can track progress for each as we move forward. This will enable us to focus more on objectives needing additional work.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Computer Science**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the computer science department is to educate students in fundamental topics like programming languages, data structures, algorithms, data base systems, computer architecture, communications, and software engineering. For Computer Science, critical thinking is defined as documentation, clearly stating assumptions, explaining logic for 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, 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 2: 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.**

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Assignments to introduce CTW to our students (M: 1, 2)**

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, both assignments as well as students' work, are provided in the attached files. (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. There are however, a few (very few) students who think that the CTW with all of the documentation for a program is a waste of time. We also looked at students' success in class.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

### Target for O1: Assignments to introduce CTW to our students

Getting students to be able to think through a problem and thereafter come up with a most suitable algorithm/solution. Then be able to document the process through which they came up with the solution/algorithm so that it can enhance future maintenance.

**M 2: Projects for Software Engineering (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, while 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), understand-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.
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 pre and post conditions listed for all (or at least) most 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. However, a few students did complain that they that the CTW is a waste of time and that they should not be graded for the documentation but just the program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Adjust the software engineering instructions to allow students more room to make the type of decisions that project managers make.
Responsible Person/Group: 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 for projects/programs being done by the students. As the example project and assignment shows, I think that we have fairly comprehensive documentation that explains in detail how a solution for the particular problem was achieved. In relation to the Action Plans from last year - I think that most of the projects are realistic enough considering the time constraints pertaining to development and implementation.

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 has 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?
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 in educational program are projected nor any changes in curriculum.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? 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 t1 record such analysis via documentation.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

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: How will you use your findings from this year? 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 rooms 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.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

I think that the students are better able to analyze a problem so that they can come up with a solution. Also, I think that their ability to express themselves are improving.

**Challenges for Next Year**—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

We would like the limit to one of our CTW classes to be increased. We are experiencing bottleneck whereby the students must finish CSc 3410 before they can take many of our 4000 level classes. Owing to the small size of the class, we are experiencing quite a few request for overflows which we cannot grant. Unfortunately, if we open a third section of the class, we are afraid that we may not get more than 14 students (which I think is required by the university to be a minimum size). If only we could have increased the class size from 25 to 32, this may take care of our problem. Also, if the CSc 4350 could have been increased to about 30, it will also help.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

None

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

None

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Criminal Justice**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses (G: 3, 6) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information (G: 2, 3, 6) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Application and analysis (G: 3, 6) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Generation of conclusions (G: 3, 4, 6) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Written communication (G: 6) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Associations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Identification of ethical issues (G: 3, 4) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to identify and evaluate the criminal justice system and issues that arise within it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

A 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 or 3 in their ability identify and state topic issues or hypotheses. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels. A separate goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased scores (where possible) on the ID/Summarize Issue rubric dimension from the first to the final draft submission.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

There were 3 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2011 and spring 2012: 1 in Fall 2011 (N=41) and two in Spring 2012 (N=34 and 13). The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data 2011-2012 contains data for these 88 students. At the end of the year, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.7 (2.5 in fall section and 3.1 and 2.3 in the spring sections). 89% of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 (N=78 of 88) earned a score of 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the ID/Summarize Issue rubric dimension. 47% of these students (N=41 of 88) earned a score of 4 on a 1-4 scale for the ID/Summarize Issue rubric dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 73% (64 of 88) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 1% exhibited a decrease and 26% showed no improvement in the ID/Summarize Issue rubric dimension 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 a 4 or 3 in their ability to comprehend and synthesize information. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 in this rubric dimension. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels. A separate goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased scores (where possible) on the Comprehend & Synthesize Information rubric dimension from the first to the final draft submission.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
There were 3 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2011 and spring 2012; 1 in Fall 2011 (N=41) and two in Spring 2012 (N=34 and 13). The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data 2011-2012 contains data for these 88 students. At the end of the year, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.6 (2.4 in fall section and 3.0 in the spring sections). 78% of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 (N=68 of 88) earned a score of 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Comprehend & Synthesis of Information rubric dimension. 45% of these students (N=40 of 88) earned a score of 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Comprehend & Synthesis of Information rubric dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 38% exhibited an increase in the Comprehend & Synthesis of Information rubric score or remained at the highest possible point between the first and final submission, 3% exhibited a decrease, and 49% showed no improvement in the rubric score where improvement was possible. (see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point). These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 59% (52 of 88) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 1% exhibited a decrease and 37% showed no improvement in the Comprehend & Synthesis of Information rubric dimension score where improvement was possible.

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 a 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. A separate goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased scores (where possible) on the Application & Analysis rubric dimension from the first to the final draft submission.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
There were 3 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2011 and spring 2012; 1 in Fall 2011 (N=41) and two in Spring 2012 (N=34 and 13). The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data 2011-2012 contains data for these 88 students. At the end of the year, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.9 (2.3 in fall section and 3.2 in Spring sections). 84% of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 (N=74 of 88) earned a score of 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. 50% of these students (N=44 of 88) earned a score of 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Application and Analysis rubric dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 70% (58 of 88) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 2% exhibited a decrease and 27% showed no improvement in the Application & Analysis rubric dimension 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 a 4 or 3 in their ability to generate conclusions and implications pertaining to criminal justice subject matter. Additionally, 50% of students should be rated as a 4 in this rubric dimension. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels. A separate goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased scores (where possible) on the Conclusions & Implications rubric dimension from the first to the final draft submission.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
There were 3 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2011 and spring 2012; 1 in Fall 2011 (N=41) and two in Spring 2012 (N=34 and 13). The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data 2011-2012 contains data for these 88 students. At the end of the year, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 2.7 (2.4 in fall section and 2.9 and 2.6 in the spring sections) on the Conclusions & Implications dimension of the rubric. 80% of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 (N=70 of 88) earned a score of 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Conclusions & Implications rubric dimension. 44% of these students (N=39 of 88) earned a score of 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Conclusions & Implications rubric dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 59% (52 of 88) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 1% exhibited a decrease and 40% showed no improvement in the Conclusions & Implications rubric dimension 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 a 4 or 3 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 in this rubric dimension. Please reference the assessment rubric to identify the specific skill level denoted by these numeric levels. A separate goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased scores (where possible) on the Writing Quality & Style rubric dimension from the first to the final draft submission.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
There were 3 sections of capstone class (CRJU 4930) during fall 2011 and spring 2012; 1 in Fall 2011 (N=41) and two in Spring 2012 (N=34 and 13). The attached file named Capstone Rubric Data 2011-2012 contains data for these 88 students. At the end of the year, the average score on the 1-4 rubric scale was 3.3 (3.1 in fall section and 3.3 and 3.5 in the spring sections) on the Writing Quality & Style rubric dimension of the rubric. 83% of the students enrolled in CRJU 4930 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 (N=73 of 88) earned a score of 3 or 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Writing Quality & Style rubric dimension. 41% of
these students (N=36 of 88) earned a score of 4 on a 1-4 scale for the Writing Quality & Style rubric dimension. These scores correspond to the final draft of the paper and consistently show significant improvement over the first draft numbers in that 64% (56 of 88) either maintained the best possible score of 4 or showed improvement in their scores across the two submissions of the paper. Only 5% exhibited a decrease and 31% showed no improvement in the Writing Quality & Style rubric dimension score where improvement was possible.(see attached rubric for skill levels associated with each rubric point).

**M 2: Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice (O: 2, 5, 6)**

This two-part writing assignment is designed to assess students’ ability to identify an ethical issue facing the criminal justice system and then engage the extant literature to both locate and evaluate existing research on the topic. The same assignment was used in all 5 of the sections taught by the department in fall 2001, spring 2012 and summer 2012. Assignment #1 comes at the outset of the term. Students must identify an ethical issue of their choosing. Next, they must identify at least 3 scholarly sources that critically analyze the issue. They must create and justify criteria upon which they will assess the quality of each source and then apply these criteria toward the end of the term, after being exposed to various ethical thinking frameworks and critical assessments steeped in these approaches, the students revisit this assignment. They are required to think critically about the criteria and application of these criteria as applied to the same 3 sources and re-visit their assessments (see attached file named Ethical Issue Assignment). This assignment is 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 O2: Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information**

Our initial goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased overall scores (where possible) in the Total Rubric Score across the initial (Assignment #1) and revised (Assignment #4) submissions for the Learning to Think Critically about Ethical Issues assignment (see attached Ethics in CJ Revision Assignment file for text of the two assignments).

**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.

**Target for O6: Identification of ethical issues**

Our initial goal is for 50% of the students to achieve increased overall scores (where possible) in the Total Rubric Score across the initial (Assignment #1) and revised (Assignment #4) submissions for the Learning to Think Critically about Ethical Issues assignment (see attached Ethics in CJ Revision Assignment file for text of the two assignments).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

There were 5 sections of the Ethics class (CRJU 3060) offered for the period of fall 2011 and spring 2012 (2 courses in the fall and 3 in the spring). Due to miscommunication of reporting expectations, the adjunct faculty member who taught the section of 10 students in the spring did not amass usable assessment data. A GTA taught a section of 24 in the fall and 36 in the spring; we did not ask this individual to participate in assessment activities, as she was new to teaching. As such, the fall section of 32 and spring section of 35 students taught by Dr. Mary Finn are the only source of our assessment data for this reporting cycle. The attached file named Ethics Rubric Data contains data for these 67 students. For the final submission (Assignment #4), the average total rubric score was 9.6 out of 15. This compares to an average total rubric score of 12 on the draft submission. Clearly, the students did not meet the instructor’s expectations. Turning to the issue of individual-level improvement, only 7 of the 59 (12%) who turned in both assignments exhibited improvement from the first submission to the second. 8% showed no change while the vast majority (80% scored lower on the final submission than they did on the draft submission (See attached Ethics in CJ Rubrics for the dimensions of the assignment rubric).

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

**Continued data collection**

We will continue to collect data on this component of critical thinking through the capstone seminar across instructors. We will increase our collection of data in different semesters to see if we have variance in assessment techniques across instructors. We want to determine if our overall rates are meeting our overall goals and to identify where discrepancies occur.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | **Outcome/Objective:** Application and analysis
- **Measure:** Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information | **Outcome/Objective:** Generation of conclusions
- **Measure:** Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses | **Outcome/Objective:** Written communication
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice | **Outcome/Objective:** Identification of ethical issues

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty involved with Capstone seminar in conjunction with CTW Ambassador.

**Emphasis on student improvement over time**

Graduation 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:** Application and analysis | Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information | Generation of conclusions | Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses | Written communication
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice | **Outcome/Objective:** Identification of ethical issues | Written communication

**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:** Identification of ethical issues

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador

---

**Develop set rubric for CRJU 3060 use**

The adhoc CTW committee will develop and present to the faculty a set array of rubrics to be used by all instructors teaching CRJU 3060. This will allow for more consistent feedback across all assignments but also allow for a book end assignment in CRJU 3060 and CRJU 4930.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice | **Outcome/Objective:** Identification of ethical issues

**Implementation Description:** The committee will solicit feedback from existing instructors and develop a series of rubrics for faculty consideration.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador, ad-hoc CTW committee, section instructors

**Additional Resources:** none

---

**Implement Book End Assignment across CRJU 3060 and 4930**

The ad-hoc CTW committee will propose a critical thinking writing assignment to be completed by students in CRJU 3060 and then again in CRJU 4930. Such an assignment will allow for improved within and across student tracking of progress.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | **Outcome/Objective:** Application and analysis | Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information | Generation of conclusions | Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses | Written communication
- **Measure:** Critically Assess Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice | **Outcome/Objective:** Identification of ethical issues

**Implementation Description:** Ad-hoc CTW committee will seek to adapt the existing Ethics in CJ revision assignment to allow for it to be replicated in both CRJU 3060 and 4930. Corresponding rubrics will be proposed to the faculty to allow for uniform within and across student assessment over time.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador, ad-hoc CTW Committee and section instructors

**Additional Resources:** none

---

**Revisit CRJU 4930 Rubric**

An ad-hoc CTW committee has been formed within the department to consider revisions to the rubric used for the Critical Issue Essay in CRJU 4930. We anticipate proposing to the faculty a series of more flexible rubrics that allow the assignment to be built and submitted in pieces over the course of the term as opposed to using a single complete draft submission process. This should allow for more nuanced feedback to students and make better use of CTW writing consultants.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Analysis of Criminological/Criminal Justice (CJ) Issue Essay | **Outcome/Objective:** Application and analysis | Demonstrate knowledge and ability to synthesize information | Generation of conclusions | Identify and state topical issues or hypotheses | Written communication

---
**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 CTW Ambassador, section faculty, and CTW writing consultants worked to improve communication, training, and better use of the rubric for CRJU 4930. CRJU 4930 showed improvement in both their rubric scores on the inital submission and the majority consistently showed within student improvements across the two submissions of the paper.

**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 CRJU 4930 showed within student improvement across all sections, rubric scores improved from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. Tracking of improvements over the two paper submissions in CRJU 4930 suggest consistent advances in the quality of thinking and 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?**

We are moving to revise our use of rubrics in CRJU 4930 to provide instructors with more flexibility on the Critical Issue Essay. This approach will also encourage use of rubrics in the other assignments in the class. We are also moving to develop a set of rubrics for use in CRJU 3060. These combined efforts will improve student feedback and allow for the implementation of a book end assessment of the students' critical thinking through writing. Clearly, we need to work to generate better results in the assignments within the CRJU 3060 course. We will expand the assessment next year to include multiple 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 creation of an ad-hoc committee signaled increased attention to the department's CTW efforts. We have achieved a level of proficiency in adding faculty and writing consultants to the CTW initiative and now need to work on tracking student improvement across semesters not just within semesters. Added momentum is clearly present heading into this 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 managed to institute uniform assessment efforts in CRJU 3060. While the results of the data analysis were not positive, we were able to collect data and identify the need for more systematic efforts in the class.

**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 formed an ad-hoc committee to assess the rubrics and assignments offered in CRJU 3060 and CRJU 4930. This will allow a close look at how we approach CTW locally and globally and surely produce well crafted changes.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

Upon reflecting on the poor outcomes in CRJU 3060 and our continued lack of within student assessment across semesters we have formed an ad-hoc committee to fully review the CTW and assessment efforts of the department.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

We seem to be achieving solid outcomes in CRJU 4930 due to the standardized approach and consistent delivery of the assignments across instructors. That said, we do not effectively engage students in CTW efforts early in their degree and need to craft means of doing so. We hope that a book-end assignment and the creation of rubrics for CRJU 3060 will significantly aid in this regard.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

They will be reviewed by the ad-hoc CTW committee to craft potential improvements moving forward.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year:** Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

Implementing systematic data collection for CRJU 3060 and forming an ad-hoc CTW committee

**Challenges for Next Year:** Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.
Developing revised CTW rubrics and assignments for CRJU 4930. Creating user-friendly assignments and rubrics for CRJU 3060. Selling the faculty on the use of new/revised rubrics and a book-end assignment across 3060 and 4930.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
We increased our goals for the CRJU 4930 Critical Issue Essay and while not fully reaching them, did see improvements over last year's performance.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
Same as above question

**University-wide Committee Participation**—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
none

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
none

**Academic Teaching Activities**—If the staff participated in teaching (or assisted in the teaching of) academic courses as part of their responsibilities to the department, please note that here.
N/A

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.
none

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.
see report from undergraduate coordinator on full department efforts

**Service to the External Community**—Note here any initiatives or activities of your department that impact the external community (e.g., providing assistance to needy populations).
none

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

In Early Childhood and Elementary 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. In addition to meeting the requirements of the University’s CTW policy, we have aligned our CTW courses with specific American Psychological Association (APA) recommendations related to the development of critical thinking skills in the undergraduate Bachelor of Science in education (hereafter referred to as BSE) program. We operationally define and assess critical thinking as 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," and "demonstrate an attitude... of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, and intellectual engagement" (APA, 2007, p. 15).

**Goals**

**G 1: Informed teachers who evaluate information**

1. Our graduates will be informed teachers who “evaluate the quality of information, including differentiating empirical evidence from speculation” (APA, 2007, p. 15).

**G 2: Informed teachers who use reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize**

1. Our graduates will be informed teachers who “use reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals” (APA, 2007, p. 15).

**G 3: Informed teachers who demonstrate attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement**

1. Our graduates will be informed teachers who “demonstrate an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement” (APA, 2007, p. 15).

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrate developing awareness and use of evaluation methods to think critically in hybrid learning environments (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Our graduates will be able to demonstrate developing awareness and use of evaluation methods to think critically in hybrid learning environments
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.

Standard Associations

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

SLO 2: Recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments based on experiences, readings, and conversations (G: 2) (M: 1)

Our graduates will be able to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments based on experiences, readings, and conversations.

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: Demonstrate an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement (G: 3) (M: 1)

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.

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)

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Measure for Early Childhood Education BSE CTW Assignments (O: 1, 2, 3)

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

Target for O1: Demonstrate developing awareness and use of evaluation methods to think critically in hybrid learning environments

At least 50% of students will score a 5 on the Measurement Scale for Early Childhood education BSE CTW Assignments.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

For each CTW assignment we exceeded our target of 50% of students scoring a 5 on the measurement scale demonstrating developing awareness and use of evaluation methods to think critically in hybrid learning environments. Assignment 1: Exploring Children's Literature (see Slide #5 & 6 of attachment Exploring Children's Literature - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time). Seventy-four percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 80% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Assignment 2: Literacy Autobiography (see slide #5 & 6 of attachment Literacy Autobiography - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time). Seventy-one percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 79% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Assignment 3: Literacy Outreach (see slide #5 & 6 of attachment Literacy Outreach - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time). Seventy-four percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 1. Additionally, 80% of students mastered indicator 2, aligned specifically with Outcome 1.

Target for O2: Recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments based on experiences, readings, and conversations
At least 50% of students will score a 5 on the Measurement Scale for Early Childhood education BSE CTW Assignments.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For each CTW assignment we exceeded our target of 50% of students scoring a 5 on the measurement scale recognizing, developing, defending, and critiquing arguments based on experiences, readings and conversations. Assignment 1: Exploring Children's Literature (see Slide # 7 of attachment Exploring Children's Literature - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time), sixty-one percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 2: Literacy Autobiography (see slide # 7 of attachment Literacy Autobiography - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time), fifty-nine percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 3: Literacy Outreach (see slide # 7 of attachment Literacy Outreach - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time), sixty percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 2.

**Target for O3: Demonstrate an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement**

At least 50% of students will score a 5 on the Measurement Scale for Early Childhood education BSE CTW Assignments.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For each CTW assignment we exceeded our target of 50% of students scoring a 5 on the measurement scale demonstrating an attitude of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity and intellectual engagement. Assignment 1: Exploring Children's Literature (see slide # 8 of attachment Exploring Children's Literature - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time), sixty percent of students mastered indicator 4, aligned specifically with Outcome 3. Assignment 2: Literacy Autobiography (see slide # 8 of attachment Literacy Autobiography - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time), fifty-one percent of students mastered indicator 3, aligned specifically with Outcome 2. Assignment 3: Literacy Outreach (see slide # 7 of attachment Literacy Outreach - Measurements and Findings for delineated information and growth over time), sixty percent of students mastered indicator 1, aligned specifically with Outcome 2.

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** CTW ambassadors and faculty will work together to integrate technology into CTW assignments.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassadors and faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassadors
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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 Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the CTW were problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

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?

Because our CTW assignments are longitudinal across the semester, we are able to use our critical thinking measure (attached), embolded in assignment rubrics, to better understand growth over time. As indicated in the data attached for each assignment, evidence of critical thinking in each outcome improved throughout the school 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?

Because CTW consultants roles are seminal in our ECE 3601 courses, we need strong CTW consultants who are both familiar with our program and philosophy as well as how to support BSE students image of self-as-writer and teacher-of-writer. Rotating CTW consultants has proven to be problematic when not fully prepared for the responsibility. A pipeline of strong CTW consultant recommendations would be beneficial.

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?

As mentioned in CTW Reflection Question #3, the CTW program has helped us reconceptualize the types of writing support we offer students enrolled in our BSE Program. Over the past year we designed, researched and piloted a Writing Support Program for students who may benefit from receiving extra support in the form of a Writing Mentor. The BSE Writing Mentor provides one-on-one writing support for applying and referred pre-service teachers. The Writing Mentor focuses on all aspects of written composition, including content, organization, vocabulary, sentence structure, and mechanics. To support students’ writing development over the course of their certification program, the Writing Mentor is available to students across multiple semesters. The Writing Mentor serves two purposes – to help students develop their own writing abilities and, through the process of teaching and learning, to provide a model for strong writing pedagogy. The Writing Support Program received anecdotal reports that the experience increased students’ self-confidence related to writing, increased academic success in courses, and empowered students to see themselves as writers and teachers of writers. Given this success, and continued need to support our BSE students through writing development, we have expanded the Writing Support Project to include a Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics (GUMs) seminar to be unveiled in the Fall of 2012. These seminars will be specifically tailored to the unique strengths and needs of students enrolled in the BSE program. It is critical for pre-service teachers who will be facilitating literacy learning in elementary classrooms to be fluent in grammar usage and mechanics, as well as effective written expression. As an extension of CTW, we see the Writing Support Program impacting our students throughout their time in our Program in addition to their CTW coursework. We plan to implement the GUMs seminar in a Pilot program this Fall and continual expand upon the strengths of the program. The Writing Mentor is a skilled writer, and served as a CTW consultant for years while obtaining her PhD. Having worked closely with students in the BSE Program as a CTW Consultant our Writing Mentor is poised to help our students become strong writers and teachers of writers. As we believe this support is seminal, we have collected data over the past year, and continue to do so to secure funding for a full-time Writing Mentor position and permanent Writing Support Program. We hope to feature this unique program on our website soon.
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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 define critical thinking as 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 young children (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. It is only through critical thinking processes that the teacher understands the impact of his or her behavior in relation to a child’s behavior and development.

Goals

G 1: Analysis

Students will accurately analyze their literacy and language experiences and beliefs as they relate to their personal language and literacy philosophies.

G 2: Application of Academic Knowledge

Application Students will utilize critical thinking skills to apply information gleaned from in-class experiences and course readings to professional and ethical situations that require thoughtful analysis, evaluation, and application.

G 3: Develop a Personal Philosophy

Students will utilize their personal experiences and beliefs, course lectures and readings, and previous research to generate a personal philosophy about children’s early language and literacy development. Students’ emergent literacy and language philosophies will focus on both (1) how children develop these skills as well as (2) 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

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 scenarios and situations that require thoughtful analysis, evaluation and application. Short Description: 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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

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 Reasonsably reflects on the issue/generally discusses the dilemma posed Surface treatment of the issue at hand and/or failure to address dilemma/problems posed Support & Citations Strong use of course-related texts to support stance; uses citations appropriately Statements drawn from readings are over generalized or under analyzed; uses citations haphazardly Unjustified assumptions and/or opinions; little evidence that class topics/texts are understood; lack of citations or incorrect citations Evidence Uses specific examples and/or strategies to support stance An example or strategy was provided in support stance No examples or strategies used to support stance Communication & Reader Engagement Easy to read; avoids meaningless jargon; writer clearly wants to engage reader Some errors make it harder to read; writer sometimes shows awareness of reader Errors make reading difficult; writer shows no awareness of reader and makes no attempt to engage reader’s interest Inquiry & Flexibility Considers complex alternatives; creatively applies ideas to new situations Differing views are considered; some evidence ideas are applied to new situations Other views are not understood or considered; does not apply ideas to new situations 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.

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 observe structured learning environments in the community, read scholarly books and articles, and participate in course lectures and discussions about literacy and language learning. The emergent literacy and language philosophy is a 2.5-page essay describing preservice teachers’ language and literacy instructional philosophy 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 literate and are
asked to support their thinking by citing relevant research and personal, classroom experiences. Criteria Strong (5-6 points) Satisfactory (2-4 points) Unsatisfactory (0-1 points) Purpose The purpose of the paper is clear. The author effectively captures and reflects on constrained and unconstrained skills argument. Clear purpose. Reflects on the constrained and unconstrained skills generally. Surface treatment of constrained and unconstrained issue. Fails to adequately identify purpose of argument. Support & Citations Strong use of course-related articles and texts to support argument; uses citations appropriately Statements drawn from readings are either under or over generalized. Citations are not consistently used Unjustified assumptions and/or opinions; little evidence that class topics/texts are understood; lack or incorrect use of citations Evidence Examines the evidence and questions/probes its accuracy and relevance. Identifies not only the basics of the issue, but recognizes nuances of the issue or author's viewpoint. Examines the evidence in general terms but without substantial referent to research support or connection with other readings. Little understanding of the issues demonstrated. Fails to distinguish between fact, opinion, and value judgments. Communication & Reader Engagement Paper is easy to read and intent is clearly understood; avoids meaningless jargon Some errors make it harder to read; writer sometimes shows awareness of reader Errors make reading difficult; writer shows little awareness of reader and little attempt to appropriately engage reader's interest Inquiry & Flexibility Considers complex alternatives to problems posed. Creatively applies ideas to new situations or examples. Differing views are considered; some evidence of these ideas are applied to new situations Other views are not understood or considered; does not apply ideas to new situations Total Score: /30

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

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

Constrained/Unconstrained Action Plan
Students performing on this objective was high. The utilization of class time and the opportunity to receive feedback on drafts assisted students in demonstrating strong analysis skills. For future assignments, the opportunities to receive feedback on their drafts will be continued. However, as currently implemented, the provision of faculty feedback on multiple drafts presents a significant time and resource challenge to the course instructor. To help alleviate some of these challenges, opportunities for peer feedback and discussion will be offered to allow students opportunities to interact with and learn from peers through the writing process.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Professional Development opportunities will be offered to the course instructor around the use of collaborative feedback groups to supply comments and critical analysis of student drafts.
Responsible Person/Group: B-5 CTW consultant
Additional Resources: None

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 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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophy | Outcome/Objective: Language and Literacy Philosophy
Implementation Description: We plan to study this assignment in order to determine whether more time to revise drafts produces significantly higher CTW gains (i.e., given a shortened semester is summer the best time to implement this assignment?). We will continue to offer students' significant feedback on their drafts and will also build in opportunities to have them give and receive peer feedback through in class discussions and small group work.
Responsible Person/Group: Gary Bingham & Laura Meyers
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?
We made considerable progress toward improving clarity and impact of our CTW goals during 2011-2012. We continued our re-envisioning process by fine-tuning our assignments to clearly align with course outcomes and professional standards for the Language, Literacy, and Cognition course (BTFV 4370) and the Professional Development and Ethics (BFRV 3250) course. Slight changes were made to assignments to make expectations and grading criteria more clear. In addition, we adopted an electronic submission system (e.g., LiveText) that made submitting and grading students work more efficient and which provided students with timely and specific feedback on drafts. In addition, based upon student performance and feedback from the previous year, we deleted the research article review assignment from the B-5, Language, Literacy and Cognition course (BTFV 4370) and the Professional Development and Ethics (BFRV 3250) course. Slight changes were made to assignments to make expectations and grading criteria more clear. In addition, we adopted an electronic submission system (e.g., LiveText) that made submitting and grading students work more efficient and which provided students with timely and specific feedback on drafts. In addition, based upon student performance and feedback from the previous year, we deleted the research article review assignment from the B-5, Language, Literacy and Cognition course (BTFV 4370) and the Professional Development and Ethics (BFRV 3250) 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?
Student learning was evidenced by student improvement from first drafts to final drafts on the Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophy paper and Professional and Ethical Practice Quick Writings. Students significantly improved their Emergent Literacy and Language Philosophies during the redrafting process. Specifically, students, on average, improved their scores roughly 45% points. This increase was slightly higher than last year's increase. Learning was also 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 90% of students achieving assessment targets (a 9 out of 10) on the quick write assignments on their final drafts. In addition to
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

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). The assignment is the book review in Econ 4999. Students submit the two drafts and a final
book report. We give them feedback on each draft. Our fairly detailed comments (feedback) are issues we expect them to fix before the next submission cycle. The grading is based on a rubric (the same one we have used for the past several years). We maintain a copy of the comments we give on each draft. We use these comments to assign ratings on each of the seven criteria (introduction, explanation of the book, economic concepts, etc.) of the assignment. We rated the drafts and the final report based on the rubric (on a scale of 1 – 4)

### SLO 2: ECON 3900: Short Assignment 1 (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)

Respond to prompts about applications of macroeconomic theory. See attachments for an example of such an assignment.

### Relevant Associations:

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: ECON 4999 Book Review Rubric (O: 1)
See attached document for the rubric for the ECON 4999 book review. Each of the first 2 book review drafts is rated based on the criteria outlined on the rubric (i.e. Introduction, Book explanation, Economic Concepts, Structure of the book review, and valid opinion/conclusion). The Critical Thinking components of the assignment are mainly embedded in the "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the assignment. So we pay closer attention to these components. Our measures are based on the ratings on each of these components. A "1" is assigned for "missing information", a "2" for "incomplete or lack of clarity", a "3" for "complete but needs minor revision" and a "4" for "complete, appropriate, no changes needed". We measure progress in critical thinking (between drafts) by the changes in ratings on the Critical thinking components of the assignment (economic concepts and valid opinion) as well as overall book review grade.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

#### Target for O1: ECON 4999: Book Review

We measure progress in critical thinking (between drafts) by the changes in ratings on the Critical Thinking components of the assignment (economic concepts and valid opinion) as well as overall book review grade. We set the following specific targets:
1. On the 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 an average rating of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-4) 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.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

We did not meet Target 1 (52 percent meet the threshold rating of 2.5). We met Target 2 (about 85 percent of students meet the threshold rating of 2.5). We met Target 3 (about 98 percent of students meet the threshold rating of 3.0 on the final book review). We met Target 4 (76 percent and 97 percent made the 2.0 rating threshold on "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the book review in the first draft). We met Target 5 (about 64 percent and 85 percent made the 3.0 rating threshold on "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the book review in the first draft).

On the final paper, 100 percent of students made a rating of 3 or higher on "economic concepts" and 98 percent of students made a rating of 3 or higher on "valid opinion". We are pleased with these results.

#### 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

We would like to see students earn an average of at least 3 on the 5 point scale of the various components of the rubric. We would like to see improvement as students progress through the course.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The average rubric scores were generally at least a 3 or better. Many students showed improvement as they progressed through the course. See the attachment for more details.

### 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.
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.

get more assessment data for ECON 3900

This year, we only got assessment data from one ECON 3900 instructor. In the future, we want to get more instructors actively involved in the assessment of ECON 3900.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

We have less turnover with the ECON 3900 course as in previous years, so this is an improvement and was part of previous years’ action plans. There are still several different instructors for the course, but at least all of them have taught it as a CTW course in the past already. The ECON 4999 course still has more consistency across sections because that course is team taught by the same two instructors every semester. We still have an issue with turnover of CTW consultants, and will continue to monitor that issue.

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 can see improvement in the ECON 4999 course on the average scores overall and on the 2 components of critical thinking we focus on in the book review (the "economic concepts" and "valid opinion" parts of the rubric) as students move from earlier drafts to the final drafts. We have not tried to match up student performance in the ECON 3900 course and the ECON 4999 course. We may be able to do that in the future. We will discuss it with the Undergraduate Program Committee.

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 have issues with turnover of CTW consultants. It would probably be nice to have more similarity across sections of ECON 3900, but that is more difficult to achieve than in the ECON 4999 course, where the course is team taught by the same instructors every 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?

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. We have not made changes to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report.
**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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical Reading**
Undergraduate English majors are curious and critical readers who question what they read and test their ideas against textual evidence.

**G 2: Literary and Rhetorical Knowledge**
English majors understand and use a wide range of literary and rhetorical forms and conventions. They develop their own points of view within relevant literary, historical, and theoretical frameworks.

**G 3: Effective Writing**
English majors write clearly and persuasively and work towards judging the writing practices of other while developing their own individual voice or style.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Comprehends a complex literary or rhetorical text (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)**
Students successfully engage with the main ideas and arguments in a text and begin to think critically about the text. In the introductory CTW courses, English 3040 and 3050, students practice identifying genres, online personas, and elements of critical theory and rhetoric. 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 or podcasts.

**SLO 2: Questions ideas in a text (G: 1) (M: 3)**
Critical thinking means not just understanding the ideas in a text but questioning them as well. Students use evidence to test the ideas and critique the positions of other writers.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates literary or rhetorical knowledge (G: 2) (M: 2)**
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 identify elements of a genre or convention; in the Senior Seminars, students apply this knowledge to develop their own research projects or to produce their own creative work.

**SLO 4: Writes clearly, with an awareness of style and audience (G: 2, 3) (M: 4)**
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 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. More advanced students should also demonstrate an awareness of how and why writers choose a particular style and approach. Students work towards this objective specifically in assignments that ask them either to defend the rhetorical elements in a piece of writing that they find compelling (English 3050 and 4320), to develop their own arguments in response to those of other writers (English 4300), or to write critiques of pieces of published poetry and fiction (English 4310a and b).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Engagement with ideas (O: 1)**
This measure is one of the key elements of our rubric. We measure engagement with ideas when students respond to a published book or on-line text, such as a blog or podcast.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehends a complex literary or rhetorical text**

We expect all students to show competency with textual engagement; minimal competency means they will score a 2 or higher on our rubric scale. In both our introductory courses and our senior seminars, we expect 75% of students to score a 3 or higher, showing strong competency and some mastery of this skill. In the senior seminars, we are working towards a greater percentage of students who score a 4 and thus prove mastery of critical thinking skills.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In the 3040 course, 62% scored a 4; 31% scored a 3. In the 3050 course, 47% scored a 4; 33% scored a 3. In 4310a courses, 53% scored a 4; 47% scored a 3. In 4310b courses, 38% scored a 4; 40% scored a 3. In 4300 courses, 38% scored a 4; 40% scored a 3. In the 4320 course, 65% scored a 4; 35% a 3. In the 4330 courses, 50% scored a 4; 50% scored a 3.

**M 2: Engagement with literary and rhetorical conventions (O: 1, 3)**

We measure critical thinking about the forms and genres of our discipline using one of the key categories of our rubric: engagement with conventions. Assignments through which we measure engagement with conventions include the analysis of the generic elements of literary or rhetorical work (English 3040 and 3050); the production of an annotated bibliography (English 4330); and the review of a book of poems (English 4310a).
Target for O1: Comprehends a complex literary or rhetorical text

We expect all students to show competency in understanding literary and rhetorical conventions; minimal competency means they will score a 2 or higher on our rubric scale. In both our introductory courses and our senior seminars, we expect 75% of students to score a 3 or higher, showing strong competency and some mastery of this skill. In the senior seminars, we are working towards a greater percentage of students who score a 4 and thus show mastery of critical thinking skills.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Score 4: 3040 58% 41% 3050 21% 59% 4310a 35% 59% 4310b 46% 23% 4300 30% 60% 4320 47% 47% 4330 40% 55%

Overall, a percentage of our students scored lower than in the other categories. While we've still met our target, we'd like to see a greater percentage of students score 4s.

Target for O3: Demonstrates literary or rhetorical knowledge

We expect all students to show knowledge of and competency in using literary and rhetorical conventions; minimal competency means they will score a 2 or higher on our rubric scale. In both our introductory courses and our senior seminars, we expect 75% of students to score a 3 or higher, showing strong competency and some mastery of this skill. In the senior seminars, we are working towards a greater percentage of students who score a 4 and thus show mastery of critical thinking skills.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

In the 3040 courses, 47% scored a 4; 38% scored a 3. In the 3050 course, 8% scored a 4; 61% a 3. In the 4310a course, 47% scored a 4; 47% scored a 3. In the 4310b course, 60% scored a 4; 33% scored a 3. In the 4300 courses, 49% scored a 4; 32% scored a 3. In the 4320 course, 60% scored a 4; 33% scored a 3. In the 4330 courses, 70% scored a 4; 25% scored a 3. Overall, a percentage of our students scored lower than in the other categories. While we've still met our target, we'd like to see a greater percentage of students score 4s.

M 3: Judgement of ideas (O: 2)

We measure students' capacity to evaluate another writer's ideas and modes of expression through one of the key categories of our rubric: judgement. Assignments through which we measure this critical thinking skill include reviews and reading responses that take account of genre, audience, and style.

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

Target for O2: Questions ideas in a text

We expect all students to demonstrate good judgement by questioning ideas presented in a text; minimal competency means they will score a 2 or higher on our rubric scale. In both our introductory courses and our senior seminars, we expect 75% of students to score a 3 or higher, showing strong competency and some mastery of this skill. In the senior seminars, we are working towards a greater percentage of students who score a 4 and thus show mastery of critical thinking skills.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

In the 3040 courses, 70% scored a 4; 21% scored a 3. In the 3050 course, 31% scored a 4; 43% scored a 3. In the 4310a course, 53% scored a 4; 29% scored a 3. In the 4310b course, 43% scored a 4; 43% scored a 3. In the 4300 courses, 41% scored a 4; 39% scored a 3. In the 4320 course, 60% scored a 4; 40% scored a 3. In the 4330 courses, 55%; 45% scored a 3. We consider this target met, even though the score for 3050 falls under 75% by one point. However, we had only one course for the year to collect data from; we believe that a larger data set would yield higher scores, ones that are more in line with our other introductory course (3040). In this category, we would like to see a greater portion of students to score 4s.

M 4: Effective Writing (O: 4)

Students communicate their ideas clearly in writing, showing an awareness of style and convention.

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

Target for O4: Writes clearly, with an awareness of style and audience

We expect all students to write effectively and demonstrate an awareness of style and audience in their writing. Minimal competency means they will score a 2 or higher on our rubric scale. In both our introductory courses and our senior seminars, we expect 75% of students to score a 3 or higher, showing strong competency and some mastery of this skill. In the senior seminars, we are working towards a greater percentage of students who score a 4 and thus show mastery of critical thinking skills.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

In the 3040 courses, 47% scored a 4; 38% scored a 3. In the 3050 course, 8% scored a 4; 61% scored a 3. In the 4310a course, 47% scored a 4; 47% scored a 3. In the 4310b course, 60% scored a 4; 33% scored a 3. In the 4300 courses, 49% scored a 4; 32% scored a 3. In the 4320, 60% scored a 4; 33% scored a 3. In the 4330 courses, 70% scored a 4; 25% scored a 3. We consider this category partially met because the 3050 course percentage falls below the target of 75% by 6 points, coming in at 69%. Again, however, we believe that a larger data set will yield higher scores next year.

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

Design Useful CTW Workshops

In the first few years of CTW, 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. Last year we focused on the faculty actively teaching each semester and worked to break down their training by concentration. For 2011-12, we built on our instructors' familiarity with the CTW initiative and used our workshops to address more substantive questions regarding teaching and the values connected with critical thinking that we hope to communicate to students. We plan to continue regular workshops for CTW instructors and will adapt their structure as needed. We will use these workshops to develop a common pool of CTW assignments that will allow us to establish a common data set for assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus on engagement with literary and rhetorical conventions

Many faculty who taught CTW courses during the past 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. Two years ago 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 like the structure of our current rubric, we plan to streamline it so that it serves instructors in all concentrations better and conveys our goals more clearly.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Lopez and Melissa McLeod

Revise Rubric

Many faculty who taught CTW courses during the past 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. Two years ago 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 like the structure of our current rubric, we plan to streamline it so that it serves instructors in all concentrations better and conveys our goals more clearly.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We will revise and streamline the departmental rubric before Fall 2012 and distribute it to all CTW instructors before the semester begins.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Lopez and Melissa McLeod

Focus on clarity of writing

As the inclusion of "expression" in our rubric indicates, clear expression in writing demonstrates critical thinking in English. We have focused on writing as a key element of thinking in our discipline through encouraging CTW instructors to develop assignments with several cycles of revision; we also coordinated our assessment of these activities by applying consistently the rubric category of expression. In many CTW courses this cycle, students demonstrated outstanding writing skills, especially in 4300 and 4320. We will continue to focus on this skill, however, in the courses in which students fell short of our targets in this area: 3050 and 4310b.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Effective Writing | Outcome/Objective: Writes clearly, with an awareness of style and audience
Implementation Description: In this cycle, we emphasized revision and the process of expressing critical ideas in writing in workshops for CTW instructors. This emphasis helped us to clarify the importance of implementing such a revision process in all the CTW courses, including Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition and the Senior Seminar in Fiction.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Lopez and Melissa McLeod

Focus on engagement with ideas in a text

In our workshops for the next cycle, we will continue to 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 have directed students to engage effectively with ideas and convey their understanding in writing. While we will continue this aspect of the action plan by working to distinguish between understanding the formal and intellectual elements of a text and questioning those ideas, we have substantially met our target in this area in 3040, 4310a, 4320, 4330. We will work to improve student engagement with ideas in text in 3050 and 4310b.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Engagement with ideas | Outcome/Objective: Comprehends a complex literary or rhetorical text
Implementation Description: Co-ordinate CTW assignments and use of rubric through instructor workshops.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Melissa McLeod and Elizabeth Lopez

Focus on engagement with literary and rhetorical conventions

In our workshops for the next cycle, we will continue to 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 have successfully directed students to identify and use the tools essential to their work in the discipline. We have met our target for this skill and will work to sustain our success in teaching it.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Engagement with literary and rhetorical conventions | Outcome/Objective: Comprehends a complex literary or rhetorical
Focus on process of reflection
In our workshops for the next cycle, we will continue to encourage CTW instructors to develop compatible assignments that use four key categories in the rubric as they design their courses, especially for instructors teaching 4310b and 4300, courses in which students scored lower on this rubric category than the others. 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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Judgement of ideas | Outcome/Objective: Questions ideas in a text

Implementation Description: Coordinate workshops to help instructors design assignments that cultivate the process of reflection in each CTW course. Focus on specific assignments that structure the process of questioning a text or a writing project. Establish model assignments and develop variations for each CTW course.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Melissa McLeod and Elizabeth Lopez

Establish expectations
We will establish expectations for standards of comprehension, literary or rhetorical knowledge, and process-oriented assignments in each CTW course. We will also work towards communicating these expectations clearly to students and helping them to meet targets set this cycle. Importantly, we will develop with faculty a pool of common assignments for each concentration to use for CTW assessment. Use of a standard assignment will help us to establish a more reliable data set.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Continue to coordinate CTW instructors via workshops; emphasize communication with students; coordinate CTW assignments within the concentrations.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Melissa McLeod

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 succeeded in continuing conversations among faculty teaching CTW courses and developed concrete strategies for creating and coordinating assignments for each CTW course. The best assignments integrated the course’s CTW elements into processes of either critiquing or creating complex works central to each course; these sequential assignments will be models for future CTW assignments. Our second major accomplishment, a streamlining of the rubric we use to measure critical thinking in our discipline, developed from the first. While we had already narrowed the number of categories we would use to measure progress in critical thinking across our program, when we looked more closely at how the best assignments worked we found that they all concentrated on several key skills. We are continuing to revise the rubric accordingly and hope that it will work better for all concentrations next 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?
Our Critical Thinking faculty report that students developed greater confidence and sophistication in their ability to read texts and began to apply their knowledge better to their own writing. Many noted that students in the Senior Seminars learned from each other; those who may not have been so advanced in their thinking could see how other students solved problems with research and analysis and then could follow their lead. Students also learned that their initial assumptions or topics might need to be discarded in favor of better ideas or topics; as one professor explained their improvement, "Critical thinking at its most basic allows one to say, 'I've changed my mind.'"

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 WOW online system became unreliable, it was difficult for instructors to gather assignments and measure students' progress using the rubric that was part of the WOW system. We had to devise our own spreadsheet and gather data from each instructor. Our four different concentrations in the department also pose a challenge for coordinating our implementation of a single rubric. We are working to revise our rubric for a second time to address omissions noted by Creative Writing faculty.

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 not made major changes to our CTW design since last year. Our CTW courses continue to foster debate about how to design courses and assignments. Through the workshops we hold twice each semester, instructors have an opportunity to share experiences and ideas about teaching. All of us involved with the initiative have become more aware of our common challenges and accomplishments and our common values.
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Entrepreneurship

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Critical Thinking through Writing course Entrepreneurship is to develop in the student an understanding of the key roles that the use of critical thinking skills and effective written communication skills play in the implementation of any entrepreneurial effort, and to enhance the student’s ability to use those skills in practice.

This Mission Statement was revised in May of 2013 to better focus on the mission of the course with respect to the CTW initiative.

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 entrepreneurial activities.

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:

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)

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:

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.

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

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:

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.

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

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 defendable recommendations based on the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered and generated.

Relevant Associations:

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

### M 1: The Case Analysis

The 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.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a 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) i The ability to effectively write a complete analysis of the case. The student always applies proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is clear throughout. The composition flows logically from start to finish. The student largely applies proper grammar and sentence structure. There is little difficulty in discerning meaning throughout and the composition has a rational if not ideal structure. Student shows difficulty with proper grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences occasionally difficult to infer. The structure of the composition is not tight and integrated. Student exhibits poor skills in grammar and sentence structure. Meaning of sentences is often difficult to infer. Haphazard organization of the composition

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The data for the 2011 - 2012 cycle show that of the 34 enrolled students, 3 (8.8%) of the students were rated "Effective," 22 (64.5%) were rated "Competent," 8 (23.5%) were rated "Less Than Effective," and 1 (2.9%) were rated as "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) ii The ability to gather and generate data. The student presents the ability to identify almost all of the relevant data within the case and generates a significant amount of additional meaningful data that is called for (e.g. ratios and similar metrics) Student presents a weak ability to separate relevant data from superfluous data and often omits important relevant data. No or very little meaningful additional metrics are generated. Student shows very limited or no ability to separate relevant data from superfluous data and often omits important relevant data. No meaningful additional metrics are generated.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The data for the 2011 - 2012 cycle show that of the 34 enrolled students, 1 (2.9%) of the students was rated "Effective," 9 (26.5%) were rated "Competent," 19 (55.9%) were rated "Less Than Effective," and 5 (14.7%) were rated as "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) iii The ability to systematically and logically analyze and interpret the data collected and produced. Student analyzes and interprets data with a high degree of accuracy and clarity exhibiting systematic and logical thinking processes. Student analyzes and interprets data with a moderate degree of accuracy and clarity exhibiting acceptable systematic and logical thinking processes. Student presents a weak ability to analyze and interpret data with accuracy and clarity exhibiting limited systematic and logical thinking processes. Student presents a no or very limited ability to analyze and interpret data with accuracy and clarity exhibiting very limited systematic and logical thinking processes.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The data for the 2011 - 2012 cycle show that of the 34 enrolled students, 1 (2.9%) of the students was rated "Effective," 5 (14.7%) were rated "Competent," 21 (61.8%) were rated "Less Than Effective," and 7 (20.6%) were rated as "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) iv The ability to reach conclusions and make recommendations. The student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data analysis to reach clearly supportable conclusions and to make a well argued recommendation. Student presents the ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation. Student presents the weak ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation. Student shows very limited or no ability to use critical thinking skills and data to effectively to reach generally supportable conclusions and to make a consistent recommendation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The data for the 2011 - 2012 cycle show that of the 34 enrolled students, 8 (23.5%) of the students was rated "Effective," 24 (70.6%) were rated "Competent," 2 (5.9%) were rated "Less Than Effective," and 0 (0.0%) were rated as "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 and did not have the core CTW exercises that have been added recently (many did not complete their freshman and sophomore course work at GSU). Thus, unlike students who we hope will matriculate through the entire undergraduate CTW sequence, these students were encountering an explicit CTW approach for the first time in their semester of graduation. Action Plan: 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
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: In the 2010-2011 offering of the course a review module will be added prior to the first case write up that will emphasize effective business writing points with particular emphasis on the importance of this skill in the Entrepreneurship context.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In the Spring 2012 offering of the class the new course instructor, Kelly Robinson, added a new assignment at the front end of the course to provide an initial exercise in the use of critical thinking and effective writing. This exercise will be done prior to the first draft of the case analysis that will be done the same as in prior years.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Kelly Robinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increased Revision Performance

Students were generally found not to be highly engaged in the revision process in spite of the relationship between the revision performance and their final grade. Action Plan: For the 2010-2011 academic year two modules will be added prior to the initial paper being written. If the logic of both effective writing and critical thinking for effective entrepreneurship can be effectively increased by those modules, then the opportunity to have a better follow-up, one-on-one meeting with the students should emerge. At those meetings the opportunity to further develop critical skills will be stressed. The ability to achieve the 0.5 level improvement will be re-measured.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: 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?

Two initiatives in the action plan were to increase the students’ critical thinking skills and to do so prior to the first draft of the major case that students would be assigned to measure and develop CTW skills. Mr. Kelly Robinson, assignment the new instructor in the course, added the new. The instructor’s comments after making the changes were: I believe the practice round assignments are invaluable. It helps level set and smooth out instructor nuances over the years. By the time they have had a chance to be evaluated on official cases, they are not “cold”. Yes, this is more work on instructors who have to give “feedback” on the practice rounds but it is ungraded yet according to the measurement criteria. Still the performance of the students did not meet expectations. Therefore the focus on the CT skills of the CTW, remains a Action Plan item.

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?

This questions difficult to answer because of the nature off the first class on RCB. However, these results on two of the dimensions were quite disappointing by any measure.

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?

Student skills remain disappointingly weak in the "Ability to Generate Data" and "The Ability to Systematically and Logically Analyze and Interpret the Data Collected”. Although this course is situated as the senior-level CTW class, these students did not have the junior-level CTW class and did not have the core CTW exercises that have been added recently (many did not complete their freshman and sophomore course work at GSU). Thus, unlike students who we hope will matriculate through the entire undergraduate CTW sequence, these students were encountering an explicit CTW approach for the first time in their semester of graduation. Action Plan: 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
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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?

Our largest challenge has been to find a person who is both experienced in entrepreneurship as an instructor and who can serve as the ambassador for the class. Prior instructors have strongly embraced the CTW concepts and emphasized them appropriately in the
classroom. However, until now they have not been able to connect the program objectives of the CTW initiative with the course work and to integrate their efforts with what has been evolving in this major. In the Fall Semester of 2011 the ambassador for this class began to work with Mr. Kelly Robinson on developing this course more fully following the resignation of Mr. Stan Little. Spring 2012 Mr. Kelly Robinson began to teach this course. He has also taken over the role as ambassador for the course. Part of the score inconsistencies from the 2010-2011 cycle to this current cycle may well be a replication of this change in instructor. Now that Mr. Robinson has the feedback from the first iteration off the course he should be able to fine tune the class material to address the areas that are still disappointingly weak.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Film
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 5: Theoretical understanding of media
Students are able to apply media theory insightfully to contemporary and historical media.

G 6: Writing effectively about media
Students are able to write clear, persuasive English prose about media.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Evaluating theoretical arguments about media (G: 5) (M: 2)
At the end of this program, students can identify, analyze, and evaluate theoretical arguments about media.

SLO 4: Supporting theoretical arguments about media (G: 5) (M: 2)
At the end of this program, students can formulate and present convincing reasons in support of their own theoretical arguments about media.

SLO 5: Writing about media (G: 6) (M: 2)
At the end of this program, students can write clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct English prose to make a persuasive argument about media.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 6: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Rubric (G: 5, 6) (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: 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.

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.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
The CTW faculty unanimously agreed that the current pilot rubric does not give us a nuanced picture of our student achievement, since 86% of the student assignments in the pilot were evaluated at either "competent" or "exceptional."

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
42% of student assignments were at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level.

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
53% of student assignments were at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level.

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
62% of student assignments were at the "competent" or "sophisticated" level.

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

Grading Rubric Targets for Film Theory and Criticism
The CTW faculty will: revise the Film Theory and Criticism assignment rubric for the 2012-2013 year; implement that assessment rubric across all sections of Film Theory and Criticism; and agree on achievement targets for that new rubric in the coming year.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW Faculty Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Rubric

Responsible Person/Group: CTW Film Ambassador in coordination with CTW Film faculty.

Curriculum Revision
The CTW faculty will revise the structure of the capstone course (Senior Seminar in Film) to enable it to be taught with a broader variety of approaches and foci. The faculty will also create a theory-based course that is intended to serve as an alternative to Film Theory and Criticism in the CTW curriculum.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW Faculty Discussion | Outcome/Objective: Development of Film Criticism Assignment Rubric

Implementation Description: Syllabi will be developed by subcommittees of the Film faculty. Courses will be submitted for approval by the appropriate curriculum committees. Assessment procedures and assignment structures will be developed for these courses. Student performance targets will be set.

Responsible Person/Group: 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 academic year 2011-2012 was the period in which the Critical Thinking through Writing initiative became the centerpiece of discussion for the whole undergraduate Film faculty as more faculty members became involved in teaching CTW classes. As more faculty began to teach the capstone course (Senior Seminar in Film: The Auteur vs. The Audience), we realized that we needed to confront some foundational issues in our CTW curriculum. A core group of five faculty (with expertise in film theory) teach the Film Theory and Criticism course, and the capstone course was designed so that it could be taught by any permanent member of the film faculty. As we began to offer more CTW classes, we realized that this curricular structure meant that either the film theory faculty
would become overburdened (teaching both CTW classes) or would never be able to teach the capstone course (essentially ceding that course to faculty more interested in television, industry, and cultural studies). Neither outcome was intended when we initially established the CTW curriculum. This situation created a great deal of discussion about possible alternative restructurings of the CTW curriculum. The primary possibilities were: to change the capstone course so that it can be taught with a variety of specific foci, or to change the requirement to create two theory options (one taught by those emphasizing film theory and another by those emphasizing television/industry/cultural studies), or both. The faculty voted to alter the structure of the capstone course, and we will be preparing curriculum course change forms to gain approval for this structure and will hopefully be teaching the more flexible, revised version soon. A subcommittee of the faculty are preparing a television/industry/cultural theory course syllabus for the faculty to consider, and early in the 2012-2013 academic year the faculty will vote on adding this to the CTW curriculum as an alternative to Film Theory and Criticism. The primary activity in developing the CTW component of the Film Theory and Criticism class during the 2011-2012 academic year was to pilot an assessment rubric. The film faculty do not have a long tradition of using rubrics, and so the progress in implementing such rubrics has been slow. Using a rubric in Film Theory and Criticism is a particularly sensitive matter, since that course is a well-established component of our curriculum, with various faculty members having developed distinctive approaches to teaching, assignment structures, and evaluation. However, Jennifer Barker created a pilot assessment rubric for the course, and Barker and Alessandra Raengo used that rubric in their classes. Though both faculty though the rubric was useful in communicating feedback to students, we believe that the pilot rubric needs to be a bit more nuanced. The interactive nature of the assignment means that the vast majority of the students' final papers ended up in either the “Competent” or “Exceptional” categories, and so the current rubric is not fine grained enough to allow us to gain insight into our students’ performance on this assignment. The rubric is under revision, and the new version of the rubric will be used in all Film Theory and Criticism classes in the 2012-2013 year. We will develop assessment targets for that rubric in the coming year. In many ways, developing a rubric for the capstone course has been an easier process, since it is a course without a long history in our department. We implemented a rubric across the various sections of Senior Seminar in Film, and student performance met our targets for the use of supporting evidence in argumentation and for written expression. Student performance did not meet the target for the incorporation of theoretical perspectives. Discussion among the faculty who taught the Senior Seminar in Film focused on the fact that the CTW assignment for that class is unlike any other assignment in the film major. The assignment is to write a paper articulating the structure of their final project (the final project may be a paper, a video, or a website) and justifying their choices in structuring the project’s overall argument. In essence, they write a short paper (or making a video or website), and students seem to have difficulty doing this, since they don’t do it for other classes. Those who choose to make videos often do so without having taken our department’s production courses (which currently are limited to a few students), and so few of them have learned how to write a proposal for a video. We feel that this problem will decrease once more of our students are given production experience in our proposed new curriculum. However, it is still awkward that the CTW assignment in Senior Seminar in Film is a very different kind of paper from the writing done in other classes. The faculty who taught this class felt that student papers often left out an overt engagement with theory, partly because of the multiple components of the distinctive assignment and partly because they didn’t perceive Senior Seminar to be a “theory” class (as in Film Theory and Criticism). The assessment for this year allowed us to see this problem, and faculty teaching in the following year will more overtly focus on the need to incorporate theory into the written assignment. Once the changes to the structure of Senior Seminar in Film are approved, we will revisit the assignment structure to determine if there is a better way to promote and assess student learning of theoretical perspectives in this class.

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 Film there are no entry/exit CTW classes; both classes are at the 4000 level and may be taken in any order. The pilot period for the rubric in Film Theory and Criticism confirmed what we already suspected through anecdotal experience with this long-running class: given feedback from instructors, our majors produce at least competent written papers applying theory to media texts. As we further refine our assessment rubric in this class, we hope to be able to measure our student development in this class with more nuance. Students in Senior Seminar in Film met two of our three assessment targets, and the assessment process allowed to focus our future instructional efforts on the theoretical component of the CTW assignment in that 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?

We need further refinement of the Film Theory and Criticism rubric to allow us to do more insightful assessment. Acceptance of assessment rubrics overall within the Film program has been slow in coming, since our area does not have a tradition of using such measures, but we have made strides in that area this year, and we will use a revised version of that rubric in all Film Theory and Criticism classes next year. Because of unexpected inequities in the way the CTW curriculum affected faculty staffing of courses, we have discovered that we need to make significant changes in the CTW courses we offer. The next year will be devoted to making and implementing these changes (a fundamental restructuring of Senior Seminar in Film) and additions (a new theory course) to the CTW curriculum.

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 has been an important one for CTW in Film. We have broadened the number of faculty teaching CTW classes, which has led to a re-evaluation of our CTW curriculum structures. This in turn led to a variety of proposals to alter that curriculum in coming years. In addition, we used assessment rubrics in our CTW courses for the first time. In one class, we discovered an area that needs more focus; in the other class, we determined that the rubric itself needs revision. In both classes, however, we now have a much broader acceptance of assessment rubrics, which is an important gain.
To effectively write in finance, students must learn the difference between business writing and academic writing. Business writing is a unique form of writing with a specific style and focus. Business writers write to transact business and/or to recommend a specific action. Good business writing is often described as “writing to do” as opposed to writing to learn or to describe. Business writers design their documents to be visually attractive, effectively utilizing ‘white space’ in their documents by incorporating powerful heading and subheadings, listing information with bullet points, and effectively using properly constructed graphs and charts. Business writing is concise and conclusion oriented; conclusions or recommendations are directly stated first followed by convincingly structured supporting data. Finally, good business writing uses the active voice, uses ordinary words, and is concrete, personal, and informal.

**Goals**

**G 1: Students will learn how to use financial tools to identify relevant strengths and weaknesses**

Critical thinkers must be able to evaluate financial and economic data in order to identify a firm’s relevant strengths and weaknesses. To accomplish this task, students must first learn financial analysis tools and processes. They must then learn which tools and/or processes to apply to different problems. Finally, they must learn to focus on a few specific strengths and weaknesses to make sure that proposed solutions will address specific weaknesses without negatively impacting business strengths.

**G 2: Students will develop the skills needed to ask pertinent questions**

Critical thinking involves questioning in order to discover the “what” and the “why” behind every assumption and every proposition. We want to teach our students to always seek out proof and evidence, from simply verifying the source of information to determining the difference between speculation and testing to establishing and properly presenting verifiable facts. We also want to teach our students to determine when to seek additional information and how to properly find or request additional information.

**G 3: Students will be taught to gather and assess relevant information**

Critical thinking requires gathering as much information as available and then separating relevant from superfluous information in order to form effective solutions. We want to teach our students to reduce information sets to the minimal amount necessary so that presentation of the problem and proposed solutions are simple and tenable.

**G 4: Students will make well-reasoned conclusions and derive effective solutions**

All conclusions must be supported by facts. Critical thinkers must be able to demonstrate the basis for a conclusion and must be able to show how a proposed solution can solve an identified problem and/or weakness.

**G 5: Students will be encouraged to think open-mindedly and to adopt different perspectives**

Critical thinking requires that problems must be approached with an open mind and makes every attempt to reduce biases in evaluation, assessment and proposed solutions. Critical thinking must also consider the diverse nature of today’s business and management landscape. Problems must be approached from the point of view of the participants. For example, an Asian manager may not view a given problem in the same way as will an American manager. We want to teach our students to consider that although different parties may use the same problem-solving processes, techniques and tools, their different experiences and perspectives can provide valuable insights into the nature of business problems and/or opportunities.

**G 6: Students will use appropriate business writing techniques and processes to communicate effectively**

Students must be able to effectively communicate their assessment of a situation and their proposed solution(s) to a problem. They must know how to communicate to the audience they are addressing, whether that be financial managers, general business managers or individuals with no or very limited understanding of business or finance. The primary CTW vehicle for this class is a series of business analyses. The design criteria are that the business analyses should be relevant to business practice, written in prose, require opinions that are factually based, be integrative of a broad array of subject matter, and provide opportunity for feedback and improvement. The format that has evolved from the design criteria and several years of experience using this approach is a series of three business analyses, one for each of three cases. All business analyses are strictly limited to two pages of prose with additional financial exhibits, such as a cash flow statement. Each business analysis is designed to parallel the work of a loan analyst. A normal part of the commercial loan approval process is for an analyst to write a credit memorandum about the subject company and loan facility. This document typically includes a financial statement spread, institutional and legal detail, business analysis, financial projections, recommendations, proposed loan structure, and required conditions and covenants. Even for small business loans, a credit memorandum can be lengthy. To keep things manageable, only the analysis portion of the credit memorandum is included in the CTW business analysis. The decision to limit the prose part of the business analysis was driven by three factors. First, the two page length forces students to organize, prioritize, and synthesize—all characteristics of good business writing. Learning is significantly enhanced when, because of the strict page limitation, students are forced to go through this process. Shorter analyses require more thought. Second, two pages put a reasonable limit on the amount of student time that is spent on the business analysis. Third, and last, the length requirement facilitates fast turnaround on grading, as essential element to reinforced learning.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: CTW Assignment 1 - Writing for Business (G: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 1)**

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).

**SLO 2: CTW Assignment 2 - "Case Name" Business Analysis (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 2)**

Assignments 2, 3 and 4 are the same assignment applied to 3 different cases. Because this is a case based course, each individual instructor can pick the cases that he/she wants to use for these assignments. A key piece of the commercial loan process for any bank is a credit memorandum. After a potential business customer requests a loan, a credit professional will do an extensive analysis of the request. The output of the evaluation is a credit memorandum. Each bank has its own format but the basic idea is always the same. The memorandum critically evaluates the business, analyzes the funding need, recommends a proposed structure for approval, and provides a lot of technical details about the company. As you might expect, this memorandum can be lengthy and include many exhibits. Rather than do an entire memorandum, we are going to focus on one part—the business analysis.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: CTW Assignment 1 - Writing for Business

The target grade for this assignment was 3.0.

Target for O2: CTW Assignment 2 - "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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
We were unable to access the effectiveness of this assignment because instructors did not use the same case for analysis at a similar time during the semester and/or did not use the assignment rubric for evaluation.

Target for O3: CTW Assignment 3 - "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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
We were unable to access the effectiveness of this assignment because instructors did not use the same case for analysis at a similar time during the semester and/or did not use the assignment rubric for evaluation.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Future Action Plan for All Writing Assignments

Since all of the writing assignments that we used this past year were new, we consider this past year as a learning experience for both our students as well as us. We recognize that it is possible that our target grades were overly optimistic and possibly unrealistic. In the future we will use the average grades from this year as the base standard for future years. We also recognize that perhaps our assignments need improvement. We will work together this summer to clarify the goals in our assignments and make changes as needed. As noted in CTW Reflection 2, we believe that the results from this year show that our students tend to: Struggle when faced with complex issues and "messy" data Experience difficulty when asked to critically assess their arguments or policy decisions Tend to approach every problem believing that it can be solved with a formula Answer case questions using data in the case only - that is, they do not seem to make the connection between academic cases and real world events or effects Often make biased decisions and seldom develop robust conclusions Our major action plan for the future is to determine the best way to help our students improve these critical thinking skills. One issue that we must address is how to best incorporate critical thinking exercises into this already very full and challenging class. Most of us who teach this required class for all finance majors, do not believe there is enough time in the semester to teach the skills, tools, processes and techniques needed to do good financial analysis while at the same time teaching and evaluating critical thinking through writing. Although most students write well (we do have a significant number of students in our classes for whom English is a second language - these students need help outside of what we can do to assist them with basic writing skills, specifically spelling and grammar), since business writing is different from writing literature in an English class, we are forced to spend a significant amount of time teaching business writing skills. To also teach critical thinking through writing skills is challenging for all who teach this course. In addition, adding CTW to this course makes it very difficult to find faculty willing and able to teach the course. Nonetheless, we will continue to work as best we can to make FI 4020 an effective CTW course. We believe that we have 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.

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 has 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 classes 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.

CTW Assignment 2

I am developing replacement assignments and grading rubrics for CTW Assignments 2, 3 and 4 this summer. The assignments will be related to readings that students will be asked to complete instead of cases that can be determined by individual instructors. We have discovered that allowing instructors to pick and choose which cases they use for a given assignment and then during the course they assign the task makes evaluation of the assignment across different classes essentially impossible. I plan to have all

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: CTW Assignment 2 - "Case Name" Business Analysis | Outcome/Objective: CTW Assignment 2 - "Case Name" Business Analysis

CTW Assignment 3

I am developing replacement assignments and grading rubrics for CTW Assignments 2, 3 and 4 this summer. The assignments will be related to readings that students will be asked to complete instead of cases that can be determined by individual instructors. We have discovered that allowing instructors to pick and choose which cases they use for a given assignment and then during the course they assign the task makes evaluation of the assignment across different classes essentially impossible. I plan to have all
I believe that CTW is beginning to have a significant impact on the students in the finance department. The first CTW assignment

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 2011-12 academic year was a difficult year for CTW in the finance department for three reasons: (1) The CTW ambassador (i.e., me) did not teach any sections of FI 4020 this year, (2) the most experienced instructor in this course who has worked with the CTW program for the past many years (Pete Eisemann) did not teach any sections of FI 4020 this year due to his retirement, and (3) four of the six instructors who taught FI 4020 this past year had never taught the course previously and these four instructors are also Ph.D. candidates with limited overall teaching experience. In addition, five of the instructors who taught the class this year, only taught it for one semester. As I have explained numerous times over the past several years of doing these reports, FI 4020 is a very difficult course to teach for those who are not accustomed to the material and/or the cases used in the class. Most new teachers spend all of their time preparing lectures and figuring out how to teach the cases. Consequently, many of these instructors struggled with assigning and grading the course CTW assignments. As such, 2011-12 was somewhat of a “lost year” for the CTW program in the finance department. We learned a lot through the process that will help us to do better in the future, but identifying and measuring our direct student achievements for this year is limited at best. We did not fulfill our goals from last year as specified in our action plan. In hindsight, we now view last year’s action plan as being overly ambitious. Our goal for this year is to redefine many of our assignments to make our goals more practical, particularly in light of the fact that we will most likely have new instructors teaching this class every semester in the future.

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?

Due to large and last minute instructor turnover this year (5 of 6 instructors who taught the course in 2011-12 were teaching it for the first time, the 5 new instructors only taught the course one semester, and 4 of the 5 new instructors were PhD candidates), few instructors used the course CTW writing assignments and fewer reported rubric grades for the assignments they did use. All did require some writing assignments in their courses to promote critical thinking through writing, but because all used different assignments with their own unique grading patterns, the data I received is of little use. Accordingly, our ability to discern improvement in critical thinking among students from the beginning to the end of the semester was limited at best.

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 finance department is fully committed to the mission of CTW, our most immediate focus is to make sure that all students who take FI 4020 learn the course material. As I have noted many times in reports for prior years, FI 4020 is a challenging course that covers a substantial amount of material in a format (many case teaching and learning) that is new and challenging to most students. Much of what is learned in FI 4020 (both course material and case based learning) is reinforced in upper level elective courses. Consequently, students who lack a solid foundation in the principles covered in FI 4020, struggle in the finance elective courses. In addition, as a case based course, FI 4020 is a very challenging course for first time instructors to teach and it is natural for CTW assignments to be considered by many new faculty as an “add on” to an already full course. Indeed, I continue to struggle with transitioning from thinking of CTW assignments as being additional to viewing them as integral to the course. And I have been the department's CTW ambassador, who has considered this concept for several years while attending annual CTW seminars and reflecting on this topic while writing these annual reports. Unfortunately, we will probably encounter a similar situation next year because most of the Ph.D. candidates who taught in 2011-12, will not be teaching the course in 2012-13. Accordingly, I am planning many changes to the program for next year, including rewriting nearly all of the course CTW assignments and associated rubrics to make them more standardized as well as easier to use and grade for first time instructors. I also plan to schedule regular meetings with the course faculty group before and during each semester to more effectively guide faculty along in the transition process. I do not believe that I need any specific assistance to address these issues. The chairman of the department is fully supportive of my plans and efforts. We are committed to figuring out the best way to make CTW an integral part of the 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?

I believe that CTW is beginning to have a significant impact on the students in the finance department. The first CTW assignment forces students to consider the similarities and differences between business writing and academic writing. From my experience with this assignment, students are amazed that there is a difference between these two types of writing. And, because most students will end up working in the business world, they appreciate learning how to properly write a business memo that accurately demonstrates their ability to express and defend a business recommendation. Faculty members in the finance department are generally supportive

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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 CTW is beginning to have a significant impact on the students in the finance department. The first CTW assignment forces students to consider the similarities and differences between business writing and academic writing. From my experience with this assignment, students are amazed that there is a difference between these two types of writing. And, because most students will end up working in the business world, they appreciate learning how to properly write a business memo that accurately demonstrates their ability to express and defend a business recommendation. Faculty members in the finance department are generally supportive
of CTW, but they tend to resist grading writing assignments for critical thinking. Most grade on the basis of content and accuracy. A wrong and/or unsupported recommendation is wrong no matter how well the argument is thought out or written. Considering the proper way to encourage and evaluate critical thinking in a subject matter where there are definite right and wrong answers remains a challenge.

**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?

We did not make any changes to the assessment process in 2011-12, but we plan significant changes for 2012-13. Significant turnover of instructors assigned to teach this course resulted in little data being collected and thus little assessment for the year. For 2012-13, we are working on revising some of the course learning objectives (specifically adding a global component to the course), creating new assignments and associated measures, and developing new achievement targets.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages is to give students the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the modern and classical languages, to acquaint students with the literary and cultural productions of other countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for their future careers. In accordance with the University's regulations regarding the Critical Thinking through Writing component of courses, the French section of the MCL department 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. In so doing, they participate in fulfilling the mission of the MCL department, by developing language proficiency, becoming acquainted with literature and culture of France and francophone countries and by acquiring analytical skills.

**Goals**

G 1: Goal for French

A large majority of French majors must be at least good critical thinkers when writing in the target language.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Objective (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

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, the objectives when rating students who think critically about French culture and literature are related to a CTW skill: 1. They can interpret: categorize, decide significance, clarify meaning.

**SLO 2: Objective**

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, the objectives when rating students who think critically about French culture and literature are related to a CTW skill: 2. They can analyze: examine ideas, identify arguments, analyze arguments.

**SLO 3: Objective**

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, the objectives when rating students who think critically about French culture and literature are related to a CTW skill: 3. They can evaluate: assess claims, assess arguments.

**SLO 4: Objective**

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, the objectives when rating students who think critically about French culture and literature are related to a CTW skill: 4. They can infer: query evidence, conjecture alternatives, draw conclusions.

**SLO 5: Objective**

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, the objectives when rating students who think critically about French culture and literature are related to a CTW skill: 5. They can explain: state results, justify procedures, present arguments.

**SLO 6: Objective**

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, the objectives when rating students who think critically about French culture and literature are related to a CTW skill: 6. They can 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.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
In 2011-2012, the target was once again partially met; two courses reached the target, two did not. These results are difficult to interpret yet as they differ from the previous years in two respects: 1) students who failed to write all assignments are no longer counted in the figures and 2) the contemporary civilization course made the target for the first time since the implementation of the CTW initiative, and made it with excellent results: 94% of the students who did all assignments reached the target. Therefore, more years are needed to find out if: 1) students who do not want to cooperate are a new trend or simply a question of chance for this year and 2) if the FREN 4123 will continue to obtain such results. The other, quite interesting finding, is that students cooperate much more if they have only one assignment during the semester, although it is a longer one; they tend to think that they have too much work when they have two assignments (although shorter!) to rewrite during the semester; one must explain to them that this is simply an illusion to stimulate their cooperation.

M 2: Written papers (O: 1)
In civilisation courses (FREN 4123 and FREN 4013): two papers, two phases for each paper. In the literature course (FREN 3033): one essay, one text commentary.

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

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

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: Finished
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.

FREN 3033: discrepancies between the two assignments
In FREN3033, students have for their assignments two types of exercises allowing us to rate their CTW skills: 1) an essay; 2) a text commentary (which is usually a poem). There are strange discrepancies between the ratings that some students obtain, for instance a very high one for the essay question and a poor one for the commentary. Although the CTW skills are rated the same way and with the same rubric, this may stem from the fact that the commentary question requires far more analytical qualities. As one of the instructors of FREN 3033 states: students find the poem analysis more difficult, few have ever read a poem closely in any language, and most think they hate poetry. We must reflect on that in the coming semesters if the same figures are repeated.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Definition of the source of the discrepancies

Train New Faculty Member
Train the new faculty member who will teach CTW courses

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Training of the new faculty member, fall 2012

Projected Completion Date: 11/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Eric Le Calvez

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) The ambassador managed to convince instructors teaching CTW courses to use the same rubric for the first time (last year, we had managed to simplify the rubric so that it would fit on one page); this will be easier to compare the results from one course to the
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 entrance level to the exit class?

It depends on the course but also on the student participation. As one of the instructors of the FREN 3033 course states: writing papers in drafts is an excellent way to help students improve their French if they will cooperate, as several on my list did, by thinking critically and reflecting on the corrections to take into account on the final draft. I am so convinced of the value of the approach that I have made certain we have maintained the same approach in our French 3023 course, Composition and Conversation. In the FREN 4123 course, the improvement in critical thinking is clearly related to the improvement of the organization of the thought (reflected in the structure of the paper, the phase one being a detailed outline of a minimum of two pages, which helps to analyze students’ thoughts and train of thoughts).

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 do not need any assistance but we need to focus on the students’ response, which is becoming more and more problematic. This year, we have decided to take into account for the report only students who did all of the assessments, because otherwise the results are deformed; we must find a way to stimulate their participation in their exercise (for instance, in the FREN 4123 course, 43% of students did not do all of the assessments, which is a far too high number). Students feel in general that this gives them too much work (although it is not the case, in practice, because they need to build up a detailed outline before beginning to write anyway). This has consequences on the instructor also: in FREN 4123, most of the deadlines were not respected so the instructor felt like he was grading papers all the time 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?

No change from the department as no changes are needed so far. The faculty members involved in this initiative think in general that this is an additional workload (and it is). However, since most students definitely improve their CTW skills in the target language, they continue to believe that it is overall a very positive initiative.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

1) The ambassador managed to convince instructors teaching CTW courses to use the same rubric for the first time (last year, we had managed to simplify the rubric so that it would fit on one page); this will be easier to compare the results from one course to the other. 2) For the first time since the implementation of the CTW courses, FREN 4123 (see last year’s action plan) met the goal of having over 80% of the students. Actually, for the second assignment there were 100% of the rated students who obtained a rating equal or superior to 4.

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

Deal with students participation for all assignments. There were four CTW courses in French this year. FREN 3033, fall 2011: 22% of students did not do all the assignments (four only); FREN 4123, fall 2011: 43% of students did not do all the assignments (four only); FREN 3033, spring 2012: 9% of students did not do all the assignments (four only); FREN 4103, spring 2012: all students did all of the assignments (two only). The discrepancy between FREN 4103 and the other courses in terms of student participation leads us to believe that students have a tendency to participate more in the exercise if they have fewer assignments, which corresponds with the feeling they have to have too much work (especially for students who take several CTW courses during one single semester).

We must reflect on this situation.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

No modifications of intended outcomes.

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

The new rubric was modified last year; no changes this year.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the reflection paper number 1, 55% of students did not meet the 4 average score on each element of the rubric, and only 1 student did not meet the score for the final reflection paper. Importantly, however, 89% of students improved from reflection paper 1 to the final reflection paper.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
For the synthesizing paragraph turned in at the beginning of the semester, 26% received an average score of 4 or better on the seven elements. On the final paragraph, 68% of students received a score of 4 or better. 84% of student either stayed the same or improved from the first paragraph to the final paragraph.

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Students turned in at least two drafts of a final research paper. The first draft and the final draft were evaluated based on the
rubric. For the first draft, 16% of students achieved an average score of 4 for the rubric elements. For the final draft, 76% received an average score of 4 or better. 100% of students improved in their rubric scores from draft 1 to the final draft.

**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 to the assignment to the final draft.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

40% of students achieved scores that equalled or exceeded 20 for the first draft of the assignment, whereas 96% of students achieved scores of 20 or better for the final draft. 96% of students improved from the first draft to 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

76% of students achieved a score of 20 or better on the final assessment score. 100% of students improved from draft 1 to the final draft.

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

**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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**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:** Terminated
- **Priority:** High

**Action plan for Urban Geography**

The instructor plans to include an hour-long active learning exercise in which together the students and instructor work through a reflection paper assignment.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
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 accomplishment for this year was that the CTW instructors in the department had a clear sense of what was expected of the CTW process. The collection, assessment, and reporting among faculty members went exceptionally smoothly. Likewise, for the most part, students met the anticipated objectives by performing well on critical thinking through writing assignments.

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?

Improvement in critical thinking skills is evident within classroom performance—that is from one initial assignment to the next. On the whole, we have not discerned trends in improvement between the first CTW course and the final capstone 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 Department of Geosciences anticipates B.A./B.S. degrees in Geosciences and faculty members will carefully scrutinize the curriculum during the 2012-2013 school year. The department anticipates identifying specific critical thinking goals in multiple classes—not just in CTW—and carrying that throughout the curriculum.

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 operation of CTW in Geosciences is that it is no longer a new concept but instead it is much more accepted and a B.S. in Geology.

Curriculum evaluation with the merger of geology and geography degrees

Over 2012-2013, the Department of Geosciences anticipates B.A./B.S. degrees in Geosciences (rather than a B.A. in Geography and a B.S. in Geology). This process, along with the expressed intention as outlined by the department in its active Strategic Plan, will entail a careful curriculum analysis. This analysis may result in the creation of new CTW courses and the deactivation of existing ones.

In-class demonstration of paragraph construction

In order to facilitate greater achievement, the CTW instructor will conduct an in-class session with the students to demonstrate, through active learning, how a paragraph demonstrating critical thinking skills could be constructed.

Curriculum evaluation with the merger of geology and geography degrees

Overall, I think this year's findings reveal that we have a relatively effective set of assignments and assessments in place for CTW.
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 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 = Auseinandersetzungsmögen (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 lexis with sub textual subtleties. Our mission includes providing the tools necessary to use language effectively to present the line of reasoning that follows from the students’ identification and evaluation of their argument.

Goals
G1: Student Goals BA German
1. Students are competent in the language and culture of German speaking countries. 2. Students have advanced knowledge in their concentration: pedagogy, international business or literature. 3. Students acquire though course work, exchange programs and study abroad the critical skills needed for success in their chosen career, whether it be teaching, business, translation and interpretation or other supranational opportunities. 4. Students should develop the skills requisite for critical thinking, thereby enabling them to query their own intellectual and personal positions and to contextualize them in the broader scope of cultural understanding, adaptability in global settings and an aptitude in navigating diversity.
SLO 5: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology (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.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 4: Student Portfolio (O: 6)

Student portfolio to collect and reflect on all assignments. The central feature of portfolios is that these samples of evidence demonstrate the progress the student makes toward self-defined objectives whose attainment requires creativity, self-discipline and inter-disciplinarity. At the end of the semester the portfolio should contain:

- 2 essays
- 1 oral presentation
- 1–2 poems or song texts
- an outline of the final project
- individual vocabulary lists (20–30 entries per topic)
- a self evaluation

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

Target for O6: Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives

This measure is a repository for student work and not a measure in the sense that there are individual findings for a specific assignment measured here. It is listed here to document how the graphs were created for the tracking of findings.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Based on the review of the portfolio for German 3301 from the first week to the last week of the semester, only 60% of the students met MCL standard. 100% of students showed improvement.

M 5: Speed Essay German 3301 Entry Level Course (O: 6)

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.

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

Target for O5: Critique/Analysis of a Cultural Ideology

To meet departmental standards on the MCL rubric, all students should score at least a 4.

Findings 2011-2012 - 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). 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. 2 to 3 on Rubric Student 2: a growth from a single somewhat ego-centric perspective to a more thorough examination of historical evidence and global implications. 2 to 4 on Rubric Student 3: a growth from a limited expose that failed to recognize context and ethical implications to an essay that at least succinctly addresses the ethical dimensions of the issue. 4 to 5 on Rubric Student 4: a growth from a rather unfocused essay on the advantages of neutrality with no clear definition of the moral issue to one with historical perspective and a respectful analysis of other positions. 2 to 5 on Rubric 75% of students met MCL standard. 100% of students showed improvement.
M 7: CTW Average Score Entry Level to Capstone (O: 6)

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Results: 3 out of 5 students showed improved critical thinking skills as related to the rubric averaged over all assignments which were culture based. Only 1 student remained at level below expectations and actually showed diminished skill development.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Results (see graph): 3 out of 5 students reached the departmental average of 4 by the end of the semester. 4 out of 5 students showed improved critical thinking skills as related to the rubric averaged over all assignments which were culture based. Only 1 student remained at level below expectations and actually showed diminished skill development.

Findings: Only 20% of the students achieved the target goal of 4 on the essay, although only 20% of the students were below the lowest score of 3. The objective of examining a particular cultural trend in the German-speaking world was measured in a speed essay format after a class discussion and reading on the topic of Germany’s "free body culture." Despite the lower scores, the exercise was considered a success and provided a good springboard for a class discussion on how to formulate a relevant argument and formulate a structured intellectual and/or personal position less focused on biased preconceptions. I made the decision after this first essay to track 5 students (roughly 18% of the class) throughout the semester to track CTW writing skills in the domain of cultural understanding and the ability to contextualize a personal position. This type of assessment and discussion will be added to the action plan.

Findings: 75% of the students reached the departmental goal of 4 on the capstone assignment and even those who scored below showed notable research skills, thoughtful inferences from research sites and the ability to contextualize a controversial topic in the broad scope of international cultural trends and historical precedence. There was also substantial evidence of below showed notable research skills, thoughtful inferences from research sites and the ability to contextualize a controversial topic in the broad scope of international cultural trends and historical precedence. There was also substantial evidence of across the board fair-mindedness in evaluating the statistical evidence and making sound judgments based on that evaluation. No samples were documented as they were in German.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Results (see graph): 4 out of 5 students showed improvement in the measures for CTW writing skills over the average of all CTW assignments. Only 3 students were shown to attain the departmental goal of 4. 1 student had a marked decline in overall CTW rating from 3.5 to 2. This may perhaps be attributed to the student taking the entry level and capstone course in the same year and the difficulties resulting from the exponentially higher expectations.

M 8: Capstone Assignment German 4402 (O: 6)

Capstone CTW assignment on Death Penalty. Goal 4 Objective 2

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Findings: 75% of the students reached the departmental goal of 4 on the capstone assignment and even those who scored below showed notable research skills, thoughtful inferences from research sites and the ability to contextualize a controversial topic in the broad scope of international cultural trends and historical precedence. There was also substantial evidence of across the board fair-mindedness in evaluating the statistical evidence and making sound judgments based on that evaluation. No samples were documented as they were in German.
limited (traditional essays with “controversial topics”). We plan to implement more “speed” paragraphs in which comprehension of and/or reaction to a class discussion point is “tested” immediately and then used to further enlighten the topic being examined. It is hoped that from these spontaneous reactions the students can develop a greater sense of what a longer critical thinking assignment entails. A curriculum change throughout the entire major has been drafted and will focus on German Studies rather than on traditional language and literature. This should facilitate communicating expectations to students as the courses will be designed around a theme or cultural focus rather than a historically delimited body of work.

### 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."

### Action Plan to Improve Student Performance 2012-2013

With the orientation of a new faculty member from Germany, we hope to brainstorm as a team to draw up an action plan for our learning outcomes as a whole, thereby addressing recurring and persistent problems that have hampered the realization of many of our goals: a) Competence in the language and how to assess that learning outcome objectively b) How to better “teach” critical thinking skills, perhaps through a peer tutoring program to ensure development over the junior/senior year c) Address the issue of CTW errors/inequities based on language competence and ability to express ideas in the target language d) Develop a list of skills and the corresponding best practice topics that would showcase those skills in writing assignments rather than randomly assigning topics each semester per instructor e) Revisiting the same skill sets throughout the program to better track progress

---

**Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>Implementation Status:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
<th>Additional Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Assignment German 4402</td>
<td>Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ambasador and German section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTW Average Score Entry Level to Capstone</td>
<td>Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ambasador and German section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level CTW German Semester Development</td>
<td>Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ambasador and German section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Essay German 3301 Entry Level Course</td>
<td>Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ambasador and German section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Portfolio</td>
<td>Undergraduate Learning Outcome Objectives</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ambasador and German section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Implementation for next academic year via planning committee - German section

**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?

I think the major accomplishment was the experimental student portfolio. Although we did not develop a central repository of assignments for the German section as per our Action Plan, we did provide the students with a clearer understanding of the goals of the CTW initiative and some structural tools to track their progress. Despite the failure of all students to reach the departmental standard of 4 in the CTW rubric, there was noticeable improvement in students’ attitude toward the assignments and a willingness to learn from their mistakes. The addition of self-evaluations after each assignment and reflections on errors insured that corrected essays and other assignments were not simply discarded or filed away unread. By requiring: “All these samples (in the portfolio) should be accompanied by a brief reflection on how and why you chose these documents to be in your portfolio, how they were created, and in what capacity they document your learning experience.” the students were made an equal partner in the CTW experience and empowered to be a witness to and a catalyst in their own development and improvement.

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 were able to track 5 students enrolled in both the entry level and capstone course over a full academic year. 4 out of 5 students showed improvement in the measures for CTW writing skills over the average of all CTW assignments. Only 3 students were shown to attain the departmental goal of 4. 1 student had a marked decline in overall CTW rating from 3.5 to 2. This may perhaps be attributed to the student taking the entry level and capstone course in the same year and the difficulties resulting from the exponentially higher expectations. However, 75% of the students reached the departmental goal of 4 on the capstone assignment and even those who scored below showed notable research skills, thoughtful inferences from research sites and the ability to contextualize a controversial topic in the broad scope of international cultural trends and historical precedence. There was also substantial evidence of across the board fair-mindedness in evaluating the statistical evidence and making sound judgments based on that evaluation.

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 reviewing our goals for 2011/2012, I am forced to admit that most were not realized in the past year. The rubric was considered for revision but the older rubric was determined to be more compatible with the scoring of the other languages within the department and with the learning outcomes rubric used for administrative reports. The central repository was never realized and document storage is still based on the aptitude and meticulousness of the individual CTW instructors. I taught both CTW courses this past year and did experiment with speed essays and portfolios with mixed results. Many students were not able to meet the departmental goals, despite the shorter format and opportunity to have one written assignment in English. We need a core set of assignments based on the cultural, literary and global topics of the texts (which are fairly standard in the major) so that we can objectively assess student performance across the junior/senior year and have a measure that is developed by the whole section and consistent with the learning outcomes of the department. I will need the assistance of faculty from the College of Education or other departments with on line portfolios to implement this type of tracking system for student work and performance.

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 renamed some courses plan to 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.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.
N/A

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.
N/A

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.
N/A

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.
N/A

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
N/A

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.
N/A

Academic Teaching Activities—If the staff participated in teaching (or assisted in the teaching of) academic courses as part of
**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 Thinking**
Students will understand how to differentiate between different historical periods and different perspectives within history.

**G 2: Historical Interpretation**
Students will be able to ask relevant questions of primary and secondary texts.

**G 3: Communication and Presentation**
Students will be able to communicate their findings clearly and concisely.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 2: Historical Context (G: 2) (M: 2, 5)**
Students will be asked to place primary sources within their proper temporal, geographical, political, and cultural contexts and analyze them appropriately. Students will likewise be able to judge historical arguments by their sensitivity to context.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Historical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 1, 5)**
Students will be given assignments that require them to understand the multiple perspectives within history and the relationships over time between causes and consequences, change and continuity, and structure and agency.

**O/O 3: Interpretive Skills (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)**
Students will be asked to differentiate between primary and secondary sources and identify the major points of disagreement in historical interpretation.

**O/O 4: Historical Communication (G: 3) (M: 4, 5)**
Students will be able to communicate findings in essay form effectively, elegantly, and concisely.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: HIST 3000 Historical Thinking Rubric (O: 1)**
This rubric tracks students’ ability to comprehend historical change through various levels on a zero to five point scale, from absent to advanced: Absent (0): Unable to distinguish between past, present, and future Developing (1-2): Understands history from multiple
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Historical Thinking**
Students in the gateway course (HIST 3000) should display competency, scoring between 3 and 4 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students met expectations in the realm of historical thinking, demonstrating consistently the ability to identify multiple perspectives and identify change over time. According to a representative sample, 95% of undergraduates in the gateway course met these expectations and nearly 30% exceeded them. Less than 5% are not meeting expectations. The distribution by term and instructor indicates that the performance of students is stable over time and in different classes. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 4.13 on the rubric.

**Target for O2: Historical Context**
Students in the gateway course (HIST 3000) should display competency, scoring between 3 and 4 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students demonstrated competency in assessing historical context, scoring on average a 4.1. 91% met expectations and 36% exceeded expectations. Distribution over time Students met expectations in the realm of historical context, demonstrating consistently the ability to temporally and spatially locate evidence and interpret it appropriately. According to a representative sample, 90% of students in the gateway course met these expectations and 36% of those exceeded them. 10% are not meeting expectations. The distribution by term and instructor indicates that the performance of students is stable over time and in different classes. The distribution does indicate that Summer and Spring students tend to perform better. This may be due to the more advanced nature of students taking courses in these terms relative to the Fall term. The summer classes are also typically smaller, likely resulting in closer instruction and better results. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 4.1 on the rubric.

**Target for O3: Interpretive Skills**
Students in the gateway course (HIST 3000) should display competency, scoring between 3 and 4 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Students demonstrated some competency in interpretive skills, scoring on average a 3.85. More telling is the distribution. While 80% of the students met expectations and 15% of those exceeded them, 20% of students did not meet expectations. These students did demonstrate developing skills, which is acceptable for the gateway course, but this demonstrates a deficiency compared to the same students’ ability to think historically and work within historical context. It appears that students may be stronger at thinking about the big picture of historical analysis while not refining individual analytical skills. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 3.85 on the rubric.

**Target for O4: Communication and Presentation**
Students in the gateway course (HIST 3000) should display competency, scoring between 3 and 4 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
This rubric tracks students’ ability to document sources, and communicate stylistically on a five point scale, from absent (0) to advanced (5). Absent (0): Unable to identify and document sources; cannot understand concepts such as plagiarism or unable to properly attribute information and ideas. Developing (1-2): Able to communicate findings, but with serious structural or stylistic deficiencies. Competent (3-4): A clear ability to differentiate his/her work from others and the scholarly apparatus needed to make this evident; Able to communicate findings with minimal structural or stylistic deficiencies. Advanced (5): A superior ability to communicate findings through mellifluous prose and a flawless documentation system.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.
Students demonstrated core competency in communication skills, while the results were not as impressive as those associated with the objectives of Historical Thinking and Historical Context. On average, students scored 3.85 on their communicative abilities. 90% met expectations, and of these 14% exceeded them. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 3.85 on the rubric.

**M 5: HIST 4990 Capstone Assignment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

In History 4990, students produce a capstone project, a research paper of 15-25 pages in length. The papers are assessed according to the CTW rubric.

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

**Target for O1: Historical Thinking**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students largely demonstrated mastery of the subject, demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of multiple perspectives within history, and to identify change over time. According to a representative sample, 83% of students demonstrated mastery of this subject, and only one paper clearly did not meet expectations. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 4.24 on the rubric.

**Target for O2: Historical Context**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students largely demonstrated mastery of the subject, demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of the contextual nature of evidence. According to a representative sample, 83% of students demonstrated mastery of this subject, and only one paper clearly did not meet expectations. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 4.29 on the rubric.

**Target for O3: Interpretive Skills**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Students largely demonstrated mastery of the subject, although this was the weakest of the assessed students kills. According to a representative sample, 77% of students demonstrated mastery of this subject, and only two papers clearly did not meet expectations. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 4.00 on the rubric.

**Target for O4: Historical Communication**

Students should demonstrate competency to mastery of the subject, scoring between 4 and 5 on the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students largely demonstrated mastery of the subject, being able to present their findings clearly, concisely, and elegantly. According to a representative sample, 89% of students demonstrated mastery of this subject, and only one paper clearly did not meet expectations. The attached graph shows the distribution of assignments from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012 and ends with the mean score of 4.32 on the rubric.

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Refine document collection strategies.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jared Poley

**rubric evaluation**

Self-evaluation of the rubric to see if it continues to hold meaning as an assessment instrument.
Refine Capstone Course Data Collection
At present, History faculty turn in assessments from HIST 4990 to both the undergraduate studies committee and to the CTW ambassador for separate assessment. This double assessment might be combined not only to increase efficiency, but to add a level of observation. At present, for instance, the undergraduate studies committee provides an individual assessment of the 4990 capstone project. If we refine the CTW assessment instrument and add this to the list of duties of the undergraduate studies committee, we would have another level of independent assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: HIST 4990 Capstone Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Historical Communication
| Historical Context | Historical Thinking | Interpretive Skills

Implementation Description: I will meet with the director of undergraduate studies to determine if we can combine assessment, and then present a plan to the undergraduate studies committee.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013

Refine Students' Analytical Skills
Students in both the gateway (HIST 3000) and capstone (HIST 4990) showed slightly less aptitude in the area of applying direct interpretive skills than in other measured areas. This indicates that students might need to participate in more focused assignments that develop individual interpretive skills. At present, instructors use more general assignments (essays and essay exams) that test a multitude of skills rather than isolating them.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: HIST 3000 Interpretive Skills Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Interpretive Skills
Measure: HIST 4990 Capstone Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Interpretive Skills

Implementation Description: During training sessions with faculty about the gateway CTW course, faculty will be encouraged to use a multitude of writing assignments that allow students to isolate particular interpretive skills and develop them.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013

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 refined data collection, asking teachers to send representative samples of assessed work to the CTW ambassador. In addition, we opened a dialogue between the faculty working on core and major reporting to further refine and improve our 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?
Our samples still do not permit for a direct analysis of students from entry to exit class, as this is only our second year of data collection. Data collected this year measured the skills of our students in both the entry and exit courses, and found them generally strong or developing. Exiting students demonstrate particularly stronger presentation and communication skills, as well as a greater understanding of historical context than those in the entry course. The refinement of these skills in 3000 and 4000 level courses, which involve multiple writing assignments (both written tests and formal essays) are clearly impacting students’ critical thinking skills. Students have proven much better at crafting essays, clearly communicating findings, and thinking historically. They have shown improvement, albeit marginally, in the development of specific interpretive skills. Students also showed marginal improvement in historical thinking skills, but this was due more to exceptionally strong scores at the entry level than weak scores at the exit level.

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?
It would be helpful to have more coordination between the CTW instructors, especially in the gateway (entry) course. Our gateway courses are successful, and the students are performing better in these courses than they have in years past. It would be helpful to know at this stage how observations gleaned from the CTW instructors at the gateway courses could help our instructors plan more effective assignments at the 3000 and 4000 level to develop specific interpretive skills.

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?
The primary impact has been to get our majors into the CTW gateway course early on in their academic careers. This has had the beneficial effect of directing students in the development of their research, writing, and critical thinking skills. As such, the CTW initiative has worked well with a timeline of how we want students to progress through the major in order to develop strong critical thinking skills. This has been my first year as CTW ambassador, and as such I made no changes this past year to the initiative.
Mission / Purpose
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.

Goals
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 operate in isolation.

G 4: 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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)
Through case study analysis, 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.

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: Prioritization of recommended operational practices (M: 2)
The case studies assigned in HADM 4800 incorporate realistic business situations including operational decision-making and the prioritization of operational practices.

SLO 3: Knowledge of what factors support high-level team performance (G: 2, 3, 4)
The strategic models incorporated in the case analyses include employees considered as resources as well as stakeholders critical to the success in meeting organizational goals. Group functioning within organizations is discussed in class. Application of group dynamics is experienced by the students in this course as they work to modify their individual case analyses into an oral group presentation based on a consensus of recommendations for the companies being studied.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 2: Case Studies (O: 1, 2)
Students were assigned two case studies each semester in addition to other course assignments/requirements. For fall semester, students were assigned cases based on two articles: "Exporting a North American Concept to Asia - Starbucks in China" and "Strategic Analysis for the Hospitality Industry." These were done on an individual basis with group work involving the comparison of opinions and modifying strategies based on group input. For spring semester, students were assigned the case, "Strategic Analysis for the Hospitality Industry." The second case was based on an in-class presentation on the food truck industry segment. Students applied the strategic planning model to a food truck business. As in the fall, the case work was done individually but did involve group interaction in the final stages involving discussion of individual recommendations and development of group recommendations.

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

Target for O1: Effective identification and prioritization of business factors
The target is for all students in HADM 4800 to achieve competency in delineating and prioritizing at least 80% of the relevant business factors featured in each assigned case.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The target was achieved for all students in both semesters.

Target for O2: Prioritization of recommended operational practices
The target was for every student to appropriately prioritize the top three to five recommendations for business strategies for the case involved.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The target was met with all students being able to appropriately prioritize at least three of their recommendations. Prioritization was defined in terms of what recommendations required action to be taken most immediately in the organization or with a group/business impacting the organization.

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
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: Planned
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

Hospitality business cases
Locate additional up-to-date hospitality business cases

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Will explore with publishers at annual hospitality education conference in early August
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?
Our CTW course, HADM 4800 - Hospitality Human Resources, was more focused in 2011-2012 on the case method of teaching and case study assignments. Although the course still incorporates tests and an industry leader interview, for CTW purposes, we selected to focus on the cases for assessment. The cases, in that they provide realistic business scenarios, provide effective indicators of essential strategic planning factors.

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 talking with the instructor for this course over the past year, he felt that the students did demonstrate critical thinking abilities with appropriate applications to real-life business situations. This particular instructor was new to Georgia State and had been at a more residential university. He felt that GSU students were functioning at a higher level in terms of critical thinking skills than at his former university.

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 constantly have to look for up-to-date cases reflecting the current business environment not only for the United States but globally. This will expand and improve the tools used in CTW development. Cases with more detailed financial information are also being sought. This process of looking for better teaching tools is ongoing. The annual conference of hospitality educators often includes sessions related to this topic and it will be attended by three faculty this summer.

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?
All faculty have become more aware of CTW initiatives even if not teaching our CTW course. One driving factor that keeps CTW very alive for this department is that our recruiters and employers are desiring the same outcomes as the CTW courses. They want students who can think "on their feet," and express their opinions effectively in both written and oral form.

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 School of Hospitality will go through re-accreditation in 2014 and assessment is very key to that process. We have started discussions this past year of our plans for a comprehensive review of our courses and course content. This fall, we will begin surveying and interviewing (sometimes through focus groups) our alumni and industry employers to gain their opinions on our offered courses and content. We will also benchmark several top programs to review curricular issues. Since our program is in the “Top 20” of hospitality programs nationwide, our focus will be on about five on the same list.

**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 need to evaluate the difficulty level of the cases and confirm that the cases are sufficiently challenging as well as being comprehensive and up-to-date. The prior question discussed our plans for a curriculum review process in the department and the CTW data will be incorporated into that review process.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1**: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

In past years, the feedback received from the CTW assessment was that we did not have to include data on all assignments or even for all students. For this year (2011-2012), the attempt was to focus on the key assignment of the case studies. These were selected because case studies do reflect realistic business situations that require critical thinking abilities. The case studies incorporated both written and oral presentation assignments.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2**: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

As we have found in past years, the critical thinking abilities are often present with our students. The written communication skills are often lacking. Many of these problems reflect basic grammatical mistakes. Some of the communication problems reflect speaking English as a second language. While most faculty address the need for correct grammar in written assignments, the consistency in the degree that they provide needed remedial work varies.

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

Starting fall 2012, we are considering content changes for HADM 4800, Hospitality Strategic Management, that would include an industry certification reflecting many of the CTW objectives. A decision will be made early this summer. The advantage would be a clear metric of how students apply their knowledge through a vehicle developed by the hospitality industry.

---

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

New cases were used with more attention placed on the case analysis assignments.

**Challenges for Next Year**—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

There will probably be a new faculty member teaching this course - if not fall 2012, it will be spring 2013.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

Measures were limited to the case study analyses.

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

One international student exchange agreement was added this past academic year with our first student arriving in spring 2012. She was from the Institute for Tourism Studies in Macao, China. We also had a student from our partnership at the Universite de Savoie in France at GSU this spring.

**Service to the External Community**—Note here any initiatives or activities of your department that impact the external community (e.g., providing assistance to needy populations).

We are academic partners with the Club Managers Association of America and the National Association of Convenience Stores.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Human Resources**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)
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 of 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 be knowledgeable about the legal implications of HR policies and programs.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills**  
Students will be good critical thinkers.

**G 3: Organizationally-sensible Decision-Making**  
Students will be aware of considerations beyond just the legal when making decisions related to human resources.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Specify Relevant Facts (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will differentiate important information from trivial or unrelated facts</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.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Identify Pertinent Legal Issues (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will identify pertinent legal issues.</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.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Explain Underlying Legal Principles. (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to explain underlying legal principles associated with statutes, cases, and regulations.</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.

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 draw reasonable conclusions based on relevant legal and HRM principles.

**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 Persuasively (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)**
Students will write clearly, present ideas logically, and argue convincingly.

**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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Vignette (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Students analyze "in-class" and on-line critical incident vignettes. These "minicases" are based on actual legal findings, but written from the perspective of the management professional rather than an attorney. Vignettes often describe situations that have ambiguous legal implications. To draw reasonable conclusion and write persuasively, student must identify consequential issues, generate alternatives, and anticipate outcomes. Students learn to distinguish what is illegal from what is unethical, invalid, or pragmatic. Realistic situations improve retention and motivate interest in learning. This reduces resistance (Smith, 2003. Beyond CT and decision making: Teaching business students how to think. Journal of Management Education) and enhances transfer of learning by depicting situations that are similar to the actual work environment, providing a variety of situations, inculcating theory and concepts, and facilitating practice (Baldwin & Ford, 1988. Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. Personnel Psychology). 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, 2003)."

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

**Target for O1: Specify Relevant Facts**
100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 70% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 50% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end of the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 70% and 75% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 45% and 55% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher. Early in the semester, I place considerable emphasis on the first three criteria of the rubric including the ability to "specify relevant facts" because it is impossible to draw reasonable conclusions (criteria four) and write persuasively (criteria five) without
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 as the typical multiple-choice test. Students perceived SJTs are the typical multiple-choice test. This reduced their anxiety about 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 may have enabled students to more quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class.

**Target for O2: Identify Pertinent Legal Issues**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 70% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 50% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 70% and 75% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 45% and 55% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher. Early in the semester, I place considerable emphasis on the first three criteria of the rubric including the ability to "specify legal issues" because it is impossible to draw reasonable conclusions (criteria four) and write persuasively (criteria five) without specifying pertinent legal issues. Students have their first vignette by the second class. Some students do well immediately but most require several measures before they learn to specify the legal issues. I return assignments quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class.

**Target for O3: Explain Underlying Legal Principles.**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 70% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 30% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was fairly consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 55% and 70% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 35% and 50% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher. Early in the semester, I place considerable emphasis on the first three criteria of the rubric including the ability to "explain underlying legal principles" because it is impossible to draw reasonable conclusions (criteria four) and write persuasively (criteria five) without explaining legal principles. Students have their first vignette by the second class. Some students do well immediately but most require several measures before they learn to discuss all legal principles. For example, in a sexual harassment complaint, does the student explain the difference between qui pro quo and hostile work environment. I return assignments quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class.

**Target for O4: Draw Reasonable Conclusions**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 60% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 30% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was fairly consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 40% and 60% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 20% and 25% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher. Many students successfully perform the first three objectives (specify relevant facts, identify pertinent legal issues, explain underlying legal principles) but draw the wrong conclusions. For example, when analyzing a vignette depicting coworker bullying, a student may do an "outstanding" job of explaining the difference between qui pro quo and hostile work environment, but incorrectly conclude that the targeted employee was sexually harassed. The tendency to draw conclusions contrary to the evidence may be the result of cognitive biases (Roehling & Wright, 2006. Organizational sensibility versus legal-centric approaches to employment decisions. Human Resource Management).

**Target for O5: Write Persuasively**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 40% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 20% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, 90% of students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 25% and 35% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 15% and 25% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher. Students perceived SJTs as the typical multiple-choice test. This reduced their anxiety about 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 may have enabled students to more quickly (usually by the next class) and provide detailed feedback. I use the rubric to discuss the vignette in class.

**Target for O1: Specify Relevant Facts**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 80% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 60% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

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 about 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 automobile repair shop.
I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 70% and 85% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 55% and 65% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Target for O2: Identify Pertinent Legal Issues**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 80% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 60% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 70% and 85% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 55% and 65% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Target for O3: Explain Underlying Legal Principles.**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 70% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 30% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 55% and 70% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 25% and 35% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Target for O4: Draw Reasonable Conclusions**

100% of students will score at the "Marginal" level or higher; 60% will score at the "Satisfactory" level or higher; 30% will score at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

I taught five sections of this course during the current cycle, but the distribution was consistent across the sections. By the end to the semester, all students scored at the "Marginal" level or higher. Depending on the section, between 45% and 55% scored at the "Satisfactory" level or higher and between 20% and 35% scored at the "Outstanding" level or higher.

---

**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 online 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 CT. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31: 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
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Vignette
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Specify Relevant Facts

**Improve Persuasive Writing Skills**

This is an area where students show the greatest weakness. A review of the literature shows that persuasive writing is an essential skill for business professions. The typical role of a student may be to merely demonstrate their decision-making abilities. However, managers must be informed consumers of HR information in order to evaluate the recommendations of others or persuasively challenge dubious advice. The ability to conceptualize and articulate solutions is essential for convincing various stakeholders to adopt a strategic rather than legalistic view.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Vignette
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Write Persuasively

**Implementation Description:** Clark and Fischback (2008. Writing and learning in the health sciences: Rhetoric, identity, genre, and performance. The WAC Journal) described a role-playing approach to teaching Public Health students "the performance nature of writing." I plan to develop several role-playing activities.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013

**Promote Metacognitive Awareness**

Metacognition is essential for CTW because it helps students better manage their cognitive skills, and to recognize their weaknesses. Schraw (1993) recommends that teachers start with making students aware of metacognition. The next step is to teach strategies for improving metacognition.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Situational Judgment Test
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Draw Reasonable Conclusions
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 review of the literature suggests that many students have negative perceptions of writing assignments which undermine their performance. This research reinforces my own experience. During the first few weeks of class, many students respond negatively to writing assignments. Some students exhibit various nagging behaviors (Dunleavy, K. N., Martin, M. M., Brann, M., Booth-Butterfield, M., Myers, S. A., & Weber, K. 2008. Student nagging behavior in the college classroom. Communication Education) while others passively "fail" the first couple of assignments. However, after reviewing the comments on my 2010-2011 assessment report and attending several assessment workshops, I realize that I failed to make a clear link to assessment findings. My action plan focused on the moderating variable of resistance, but I not measuring resistance directly. Consequently, for the purposes of this assessment process, I am terminating this action plan and adding a plan more directly linked to assessment findings. Because written assignments are returned to students with feedback, vignettes cannot be "recycled." Consequently, I created dozens of new vignettes and SJT items based on legal rulings. I taught eleven courses including five CTW sections. Providing quick turnaround and student feedback is a challenge but the addition of SJT items was beneficial. 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 build CTW abilities quickly. Students perceived SJTs are the typical multiple-choice test. This reduced their anxiety to writing, although justifying a response required complex thinking. My concern that students required to take a CTW course would be more resistant was not apparent. If anything, there were fewer negative behaviors this cycle. Perhaps, this is the result of two years of piloting and the excellent CTW training the University provides. Also, much to my surprise, my received higher evaluations for my CTW sections than my other 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?
As in previous cycles, 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. As the semester progressed (Dunleavy, K. N., Martin, M. M., Brann, M., Booth-Butterfield, M., Myers, S. A., & Weber, K. 2008. Student nagging behavior in the college classroom. Communication Education, 57, 1-19). For a few students, I think this course changes self-conceptions beyond reasoning and writing. They leave this class feeling a sense of accomplishment. A typical comment from a "late-bloomer" was "I'm smarter than I thought."

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 continue to enjoy teaching this course despite the grading demands. 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. The intrinsic rewards are enormous, especially when I encounter a student who begins the semester virtually despondent over the prospect of CTW and ends the semester wanting to "show off" his or her CTW skills.
as described below: 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.

### 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. Using the combination of full-time and part-time instructors continues to complicated comparisons across sections. Nevertheless, we continue to use the rubrics as modified for 2010-2011 as a guide for both GRA/writing consultants and for the professors to better capture the nature of the writing assignment and to maintain consistency across sections as much as possible. 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. GRAs and professors were surveyed obtain their feedback on the progress of the course. The full results have these surveys are posted as "Documents." Most of the responded in both categories supported the current outline of the writing assignment. Most of the dissatisfaction involved the use of WAC. Since some instructors opted out of WAC all together it remains difficult to compare results across sections. It was clear from the surveys and the consultations of the ambassadors with CTW authorities that the goals and objectives needed to be reviewed. Our conclusion was that the "Goals" should be put in a more general format and could be better linked to the new GSU goals under the Global Education Initiative. This was done and can be demonstrated by the Goals and Objectives document. In turn, review of the objectives specified on the course syllabus indicated that the existing CTW goals should be more appropriately classified as the CTW "Objectives."

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 difficult 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. These conclusions continue to apply in 2012.

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 BUSA 3000 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. Faculty will be asked to bring in examples of poor, average, and outstanding papers. Then, the faculty will be engaged in a discussion to better define the problem areas and the characteristics of excellent work. 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

#### Action Plan 2012-2013

Action Plan: 2012-2013 BUSA 3000 1. Review the surveys conducted with the faculty and CTW GRAs (posted in “Documents”). 2. Evaluate the possibility of using partial grades to motivate students to post drafts (given recommendations of faculty and GRAs) 3. Press for improvements in the performance of WAC 4. Recruit and train a new set of CTW GRAs (see “Documents” for selection process) 5. Orient new full-time professors (New positions in the department have been filled. Some of these professors will probably replace some of our PTIs.) 6. Review the appropriateness of the new course goals adjusted to relate to the GSU Global Education Initiative

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **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 have continued to successfully manage a course with 16 to 18 sections each semester plus 4 in the summer. This means 600 to 700 students per semester. To accomplish this we need to train regularly on the use of CTW not only a number of writing consultants but also new professors. Given these numbers, we have not been able to pre-test the writing capabilities of the students. We have refined our assignment based on obtaining more focus in the writing technique of the students to reflect the nature of business communications.

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?

Given our large number of students and the turnover of faculty and consultants, comparison over time has been particularly difficult. There are too many students to permit pre-testing.

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 single problem has been the lack of reliability and consistency in using the WAC, Several professor opting out and only use hard-copy or set up their own website.

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 BUSA 3000 course was selected as the core Business School CTW course, in part, because it already had a writing assignment. CTW has helped to provide greater definition to that assignment and has provided the GRA assistance that makes the use of drafts possible. The Institute of International Business has recently hired several new full time professors. Some of these will most likely replace some of the current PTIs. Over time, this will help to provide more consistency across sections and across semesters.

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Journalism

Missions / 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)
operation(alized: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Writing Competency (O: 1, 2, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: •Think critically, creatively and independently</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of the students in the senior capstone course will score 16 or higher on the 20-point Critical Thinking rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.4% of the sample of students in Jour 4800 scored 16 or higher on the Critical Thinking rubric. 57% of the sample of Jour 4040 students scored 16 or higher on the Critical Thinking rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: •Critically evaluate their own work and that of others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score will be a minimum of 16 out of 20 points on the rubric item (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average score for the sample of Jour 3010 students was 14.9. The average score for the sample of Jour 4800 students was 14.9. The average score for the sample of Jour 4040 students was 15.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Understand concepts and apply theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score will be a minimum of 32 out of 40 points (80%) on the combined rubric items of Writing Competency and Research Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average score for the sample of Jour 3010 students on the Writing Competency rubric was 16.5 and on the Research Competency rubric was 14.7 for a total of 30.2. The average score for the sample of Jour 4800 students on the Writing Competency rubric was 14.4 and on the Research Competency rubric was 13.6 for a total of 28. The average score for the sample of Jour 4040 students on the Writing Competency rubric was 13.9 and on the Research Competency rubric was 14.8 for a total of 28.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Critical Thinking (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: •Think critically, creatively and independently</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score will be a minimum of 16 out of 20 points on the rubric item (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average score for the sample of Jour 3010 students on the Critical Thinking rubric is 14.9. The average score for the sample of Jour 4800 students on the Critical Thinking rubric is 14.9. The average score for the sample of Jour 4040 students on the Critical Thinking rubric is 15.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Audience Awareness (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>understanding of the academic nature of the report and use of appropriate format and syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: •Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average score of 8 out of 10 or 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average score for the sample of students in Jour 3010 on the Audience Awareness rubric is 8.9. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4800 on the Audience Awareness rubric is 9.3. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4040 on the Audience Awareness rubric is 7.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Research Competency (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>survey of credible sources to provide historical context and to include diverse viewpoints not only from those supportive of the author's arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
The average score for the sample of students in Jour 3010 on the Research Competency rubric is 14.7. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4800 on the Research Competency rubric is 13.6. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4040 on the Research Competency rubric is 14.8.

**M 5: Logic/reasoning (O: 3)**
Factual information and opinions presented in a logically consistent manner

**Target for O3: •Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles**
average score of 8 out of 10 or 80%

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
The average score for the sample of students in Jour 3010 on the Logic/reasoning rubric was 7.7. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4800 on the Logic/reasoning rubric was 7.7. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4040 on the Logic/reasoning rubric was 7.3.

**M 6: Content (O: 4, 5)**
Report contains facts and opinions that meet the requirements of the assignment

**Target for O4: •Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate**
average score of 16 out of 20 points or 80%

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
The average score for the sample of students in Jour 3010 on the Content rubric is 15.8. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4800 on the Content rubric is 14.7. The average score for the sample of students in Jour 4040 on the Content rubric is 10.2.

**Target for O5: Apply appropriate tools and technologies**
average combined score of Content + Logic/reasoning of 24 out of 30 or 80%

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
The sample of students in Jour 3010 scored 15.8 Content + 7.7 Logic/reasoning to total 23.5. The sample of students in Jour 4800 scored 14.7 Content + 7.7 Logic/reasoning to total 22.4. The sample of students in Jour 4040 scored 10.2 Content + 7.3 Logic/reasoning to total 17.5.

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

**content for Jour 3010**
The average score for the content of Jour 3010 was 71.1%, below the target score of 80%. This low score can be partially explained by the low score for the learning outcome of research competency because not enough sources with varied perspectives were found or used by the students in their stories. A meeting with the Jour 3010 instructors will help strategize how to improve the quality of the story content, including earlier interventions by the instructors before the final stories are written. One reason why the score is so low is that the stories were not randomly chosen for the assessment process. The instructor provided several in each of the categories of "superior," "average" and "below average," and clearly the submissions in the latter two categories resulted in such poor content quality to drive down the overall learning outcome average. More on this in the analysis section.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Content | Outcome/Objective: •Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate

Implementation Description: meeting with Jour 3010 instructors
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador and Jour 3010 instructors
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Critical Thinking**
The average score for Jour 4800 was below the target of 16 out 20 points or 80% on the rubric item: 15.3 or 76.5%. The average score for Jour 4040 met the minimum of 80%, and so the combined average score for the two senior capstone courses in Journalism was below the target of 80%; 15.7 or 78.5%. There can be several explanations for the underperformance to be detailed in the analysis section. A few items to consider for next year to improve the critical thinking component: - improved instruction on finding, evaluating and interpreting credible sources of information; - a detailed rubric for critical thinking to help determine if there is one or more specific components of the critical thinking process that is lacking so better instruction can be targeted to help students improve; - a random selection of students' reports to have better representation of Jour 4800 student performance; - an assessment of the students' annotated bibliography to determine at an earlier stage in the course if their critical thinking skills need to be...
improved prior to the start of the final research report.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Think critically, creatively and independently

**Implementation Description:** meeting with Jour 4800 instructors  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador and Jour 4800 instructors  
**Additional Resources:** none  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### logic/reasoning for Jour 3010

The average score for logic/reasoning was 73%, below the target of 80%. This score was low because most of the stories written by the students did not have a logical structure and poorly transitions within the stories. The CTW Ambassador will meet with the instructors of Jour 3010 to determine if more emphasis should be given to improving the outline of stories before they are written to allow greater input from the instructors before the first draft of the story is submitted.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Logic/reasoning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles

**Implementation Description:** meeting with Jour 3010 instructors  
**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador and Jour 3010 instructors  
**Additional Resources:** none  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### logical content for Jour 3010

The average combined score of Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 71.7% for content and logic/reasoning was below the target of 80%. This demonstrates that the stories were not well constructed and should have had more diverse sources included in the stories. A meeting with the Jour 3010 instructors will help strategize how to improve the students’ writing to emphasize more perspectives and better transitions among the different viewpoints that should be included in their stories before writing the final draft.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**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  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### 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
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: In-Progress
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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Writing Competency | Outcome/Objective: Understand concepts and apply theories

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
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
Applying appropriate tools

The samples from CTW courses did not meet the targets. The content component was worse in the samples from the capstone courses than in the sample from Jour 3010. The assignments in the lower-level course are practical writing, e.g., news stories, whereas the assignment in the capstone courses is a 20-25 page research report. It’s clear from this year’s performance that the sample of students performed worse on the lengthier report than the sample of students writing shorter news stories which didn’t require the collection of information from many sources. Applying appropriate research skills and evaluating information from a variety of sources is vital to students about to graduate from a Journalism program. The instructors and the CTW Ambassador will have to meet to discuss strategies to improve on the evaluation of information and how relevant information is included in the writing of stories and reports based on the best of the information.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Evaluation emphasis

The CTW Ambassador will meet with instructors of the Journalism capstone courses and Jour 3010 to devise ways to emphasize how information from a variety of sources can be evaluated for inclusion in research reports and news stories. This seems to be the component of critical thinking the sample of Journalism students lacking. Some of the information provided by the students should not have been included in the report and news stories. It may have been “filler” by the students to meet the rigorous course requirement of writing a 20-25 page report or lacking judgement of what is worthy information to include in a news story, but the evaluation of information is a vital aspect of journalism. It should be well developed by students about to graduate, yet this year’s performance was dramatically below the performance of students from previous years.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Evaluation emphasis

The CTW Ambassador will meet with instructors of the Journalism capstone courses and the Jour 3010 course to devise ways to emphasize how information from a variety of sources can be evaluated for inclusion in research reports and news stories. This seems to be the component of critical thinking the sample of Journalism students lacking. Some of the information provided by the students should not have been included in the report and news stories. It may have been “filler” by the students to meet the rigorous course requirement of writing a 20-25 page report or lacking judgement of what is worthy information to include in a news story, but the evaluation of information is a vital aspect of journalism. It should be well developed by Journalism students, yet this year’s performance was dramatically below the performance of students from previous years.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Evaluation emphasis

The CTW Ambassador will meet with instructors of the Journalism capstone courses and devise ways to emphasize how information from a variety of sources can be evaluated for inclusion in research reports and news stories. This seems to be the component of critical thinking the sample of Journalism students lacking. Some of the information provided by the students should not have been included in the report and news stories. It may have been “filler” by the students to meet the rigorous course requirement of writing a 20-25 page report, but the evaluation of information is a vital aspect of journalism. It should be well developed by students about to graduate, yet this year’s performance was dramatically below the performance of students from previous years.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Evaluation emphasis

The CTW Ambassador will meet with instructors of the Journalism capstone courses and devise ways to emphasize how information from a variety of sources can be evaluated for inclusion in research reports. This seems to be the component of critical thinking the sample of Journalism students lacking. Some of the information provided by the students should not have been included in the report. It may have been “filler” by the students to meet the rigorous course requirement of writing a 20-25 page report, but the evaluation of information is a vital aspect of journalism. It should be well developed by students about to graduate, yet this year’s performance was dramatically below the performance of students from previous years.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Evaluation emphasis

The CTW Ambassador will meet with instructors of the Journalism capstone courses and devise ways to emphasize how information from a variety of sources can be evaluated for inclusion in research reports. This seems to be the component of critical thinking the sample of Journalism students lacking. Some of the information provided by the students should not have been included in the report. It may have been “filler” by the students to meet the rigorous course requirement of writing a 20-25 page report, but the evaluation of information is a vital aspect of journalism. It should be well developed by students about to graduate, yet this year’s performance was dramatically below the performance of students from previous years.
Evaluation emphasis
The CTW Ambassador will meet with instructors of the Journalism capstone courses to devise ways to emphasize how information from a variety of sources can be evaluated for inclusion in research reports. This seems to be the component of critical thinking the sample of Journalism students lacking. Some of the information provided by the students should not have been included in the report. It may have been "filler" by the students to meet the rigorous course requirement of writing a 20-25 page report, but the evaluation of information is a vital aspect of journalism. It should be well developed by students about to graduate, yet this year's performance was dramatically below the performance of students from previous years.

Organizing appropriate information
The targets for all three CTW courses were nearly met, and this does not appear to be as pressing of a problem as the critical evaluation of information described elsewhere. It does indicate that the information was not presented as well as it could have been. Several of the students in the Jour 3010 sample did not follow the standard of descending importance of information in the news stories. This is an indication of news judgement which is linked to the evaluation of information. In the sample of reports from the capstone courses several students should found redundant information by proofreading before submitting the final draft. The reports could have been more focused on the task if the students had better organization of the voluminous information they had collected.

Relevant Information
The sample of students in Jour 3010 nearly met the target which was a significant improvement from previous years. The worst performance was in the sample of Jour 4800 students as many did not complete the required task. The information provided in several of the reports was not about coverage of an historical event, but rather, information about the event itself collected from sources other than contemporary journalists. The evaluation of information was discussed in another action plan for this report as was staying on task to complete the requirements of an assignment. Students who are about to be graduates of a Journalism program must be able to assess source credibility and include only relevant information in their writings. Several of the sample in Jour 4800 did not present their skill to provide relevant information suitable for the assignment. The sample of students in Jour 4800 were better in relation to the other capstone course, but there should have been much better performance on what was included in those research reports. In both capstone courses it would be expected that there would be more scores indicating a mastery of evaluating and presenting relevant information rather than indications of developing that skill. That would be expected from students in the lower-level CTW course.

Staying on task
Several of the students in the Jour 4040 sample did not stay on task with the writing of the research report. The journalism coverage of events was not emphasized in the report, but the circumstances about the event were included. This was a flaw which may be detected by an earlier intervention by the instructor with the partial draft submission. The students may have ignored or misunderstood the feedback regarding the assignment. Staying on task to write a lengthy report can be a daunting exercise for some students, and the instructor's is to provide the necessary criticism and motivation to students to complete the assignment with all of its requirements fulfilled. The sample of students in the other CTW courses did stay on task and recognized the requirements of the assignments.
Writing Improvement

The writing by the sample of students in the Journalism capstone courses was below the target, and just above the target for the Jour 3010 sample of students. The ad hoc faculty committee has made recommendations on how to improve the writing of Journalism students. One of them is to have a Writing Center installed in the Dept. of Communication and staffed by GLAs to help undergrads improve their writing skills. The center would be located in new space the Dept. is obtaining when it moves into a different building in December 2012. The immediate improvement of Journalism students' writing is unlikely to be measured in AY 12-13, but the goal is to find measurable improvement in their writings in the future. This is a significant allocation by the Dept. to improve students' writing which may not have occurred without the assessment findings of the writing samples. The research competency component was below the target for the samples from all three CTW courses. This shortfall is likely linked to the poor performance in evaluating information which has an action plan discussed elsewhere in this report.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Writing Competency | Outcome/Objective: Understand concepts and apply theories
Implementation Description: Writing Center
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Ad Hoc Writing Committee of Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: Space for the center, GLA staffing
Budget Amount Requested: $18,000.00 (recurring)

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 achievements are disheartening. The performance of the capstone course students was particularly disappointing in that the scores were often below those of the Jour 3010 sample. The results of the past action plans have not been realized except for the slight improvement by the Jour 3010 sample. The results may be explained in a number of ways. It's possible that the sample was skewed, and although random selection would diminish the chances of this occurring, it is possible that enough poor performing students were included in the sample that the results are not representative of all of the student performance in the capstone courses. It's more likely that the problems identified in the past by the Journalism faculty regarding the poor writing performance of undergrads has appeared in this year's assessment data. Because of this problem being recognized in the past, an ad hoc Writing Committee was formed and developed a strategy for addressing/solving the problem. In addition to the Committee's recommendations, immediate changes should be discussed about how instructors can more fully develop the critical thinking skill of evaluation of information. This would involve more instruction on newsworthiness in Jour 3010 while in the capstone courses an emphasis will have to be placed on critically analyzing information from a variety of sources. There also has to be greater emphasis on the organizing of relevant information in the lengthy reports required of the capstone 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?

The expected improvement in critical thinking skills has not occurred among the sample of students in the capstone courses this year. The findings are disappointing, and they must be a motivator for the Journalism faculty in general—not only the CTW course instructors—to brainstorm how to improve on the critical analytical skills the Journalism program expects of its students. There must be more emphasis on the evaluation of information, source credibility and how only relevant information is used by student writer. Too many of the sample of students in the Jour 4040 course did not stay on task by providing information that was not satisfying the assignment of writing about the coverage of an historical event. The content of the writing was not proofread well and the assessor could only assume that the critical analytical skills expected of students in a capstone course were not employed or not developed regarding source information or the student's own writing. There will have to be a change in instruction of critical thinking skills at lower level courses, and that kind of instruction cannot be confined to the CTW 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?

The poor performance of the sample of students in the capstone courses may be the result of an emphasis on rudimentary writing skills by instructors at the expense of critical thinking skills. More time taken on the basics of grammar and punctuation may have resulted in less time taken on how to evaluate sources and discerning relevant information. Poor writing is universal and not solely in CTW courses. Assistance in the form of a Writing Center will be started next academic year. But that does not address the vital instruction of critical thinking skills. Analysis of source credibility, information relevant for an audience and the organizing of the information in a logical manner. More and better training of CTW instructors is the responsibility of the CTW Ambassador who must devise initial strategies to talk with CTW instructors to determine their own improvements to teaching critical thinking skills.

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?

The most significant impact has been the collection data to verify that Journalism instructors have talked for years about the poor writing and critical analytical skills of students. It's not anecdotal evidence but assessment data which confirms that students have poor skills, and additional assistance is necessary to improve those skills. The Dept. has committed to having a Writing Center with dedicated space in the building where the Dept. will be located in for spring semester. Although this is a significant allocation of resources by the Dept. for the improvement of writing by Journalism students, it does not address how to improve critical thinking skills. It's likely that the implementation of a revised curriculum, which has had its approval delayed for three years now, will improve the writing and critical thinking skills. However, those results are not likely to be realized in the next two years. The curriculum revision was spawned from the CTW requirement, and it's frustrating that more writing courses that are part of the curriculum have not been implemented. It is expected that the curriculum will be approved at the beginning of the next academic year, and the transition made concurrently with the initiation of the Writing Center. Combined these two items are expected to have a significant impact on Journalism students' writing and critical analytical skills.
### 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)
2. 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)
2. 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%

**Target for O4: Reflection papers**
Achievement Target was set at 83%.

**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%.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
91.9% of students completed assignment with a grade of 80% or higher

**Target for O2: Student Laboratory Assignments**
Achievement target was set at 83%

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
72.3% of students completed assignments with a score of 80% or better

**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
- **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
Raise target
Based on student performance it appears as if the assessment target was set too low. Target will be raised to 83% for the next review cycle.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exercise physiology Journal Assignments | Objective: Exercise physiology journal summaries

Implementation Description: Raise target.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target
Based on student performance it appears that the assessment target was set too low. The target for the next review cycle will be set at 83%.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: 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
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 | 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 | Objective: Student Laboratory Assignments

Implementation Description: Raise target.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Raise target measure
Based on student performance, the current target of 73% appears to be low. The target for next year will be 83%.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Structured Academic Controversy | Outcome/Objective: Structured academic controversy

Implementation Description: Discussion will occur that the department faculty retreat concerning raising the target measure.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: CTW instructors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Student compliance
The students who scored below the target simply did not turn in the assignment. While this is rare, it does happen. No further action is needed.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Fitness Facility Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Fitness facility evaluation

Implementation Description: N/A
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course instructor
Additional Resources: none

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

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
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW coordinator and course instructor

Structured Academic Controversy
Consider raising achievement target for next year.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Marketing Department, with respect to the undergraduate major, is to produce students who can analyze business situations, define problems accurately based on their analysis, evaluate the options, and make sound recommendations regarding the best decision for their organization. This will be accomplished through the use of pedagogies designed to give students hands-on experience with marketing decision-making that goes beyond a simple descriptive knowledge of marketing to build skills that will permit the student to apply their knowledge of marketing and related business concepts.

Goals

G 1: Making logical, coherent recommendations
Students need to be able to define a specific recommendation and logically defend it based on the qualitative and quantitative analysis they have conducted.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Situation Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will be able to conduct a situation analysis which identifies facts related to the industry, company and trends.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
A total of 107 students in five sections were evaluated using the rubric in Academic Year 2011-2012. The average for all students on the situation analysis dimension was 83% thereby exceeding 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%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The average score which is a measure of precision in accurately defining the problem in the case was 87%. The score is based on an average of 107 students individual scores and exceeds the target of 75%.

M 3: Alternative Identification and Evaluation (O: 3)
The rubric that measures students' knowledge of the alternatives in the case evaluates their understanding of the options available and their understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Alternative Evaluation
The average score on the rubric items related to alternative identification and evaluation shall be 75% or greater out of a total of 100%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the 107 students evaluated using the rubric between summer semester 2011 and spring semester 2012, the average score for the evaluation of alternatives was 76% which is slightly greater than the target 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The average score on the recommendation measure was 79% during the academic year summer 2011 through spring semester 2012. This average score exceeds the target score of 75%.

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
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 the past year there was a clear improvement in the student scores on two dimensions and both the alternatives goal and the recommendation goal were raised above the targets. While the scores were not severely deficient in 2010-2011, both were a cause for concern. This year there was an improvement in all of the scores but there remains room for improvement and it appears that the focus should be more clearly placed on the evaluation of alternatives. To focus greater attention in discussions on the specific options available and doing more comprehensive development of as many advantageous and disadvantages as possible, which should lead to improvement in the recommendation goals scores.

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?

Because of the Critical Thinking Through Writing initiative as well as a general sense that students were not as well prepared for the capstone course as they should be, we have initiated changes to the curriculum. Specifically we have added a new course in Marketing Metrics which should greatly help the situation where students were entering the capstone, Marketing Problems CTW course, feeling that they were not prepared for the types of quantitative analysis that they were asked to do. In addition, a new initiative that began only fall semester 2011, is to require at least one case analysis in every course in the undergraduate marketing curriculum. The case analysis pedagogy had become increasingly rare in our business school and students were largely unfamiliar with it. Adding this requirement, provided it is implemented using cases that include quantitative analysis should begin to pay some dividends as well. Finally, we have attempted to impose greater uniformity across all sections of a particular course to make certain that students that have taken a particular course, are familiar with the same concepts, tools and techniques. There is a growing concern about the implementation of the CTW gateway course in the business school. Many instructors feel that the course should not be a general business course required of all students in the college, but instead it should be a course in the major. The first CTW course that students take should have direct application to their major and help in socializing the student to the profession. At present, we do not have this and, as a result, it is difficult to discern improvement.

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 obstacle to CTW is the failure of some instructors to implement it in their courses. There is no carrot and no stick. People pay lip service to it. Who wouldn't want better thinkers and writers in their classes? But there is no real oversight to assure that all instructors teaching the CTW class tow the mark and use the same measures, rubrics, etc. The administrators have no time to monitor compliance and the CTW ambassadors have no authority except moral suasion which doesn't work too well with morally bankrupt faculty. The bottom line some faculty members bask in their ability to beat the system. Other faculty that tow the mark are left feeling that they are getting ripped off.

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 was an important reason that we have overhauled our curriculum for the first time in many years. We have added a course and we have changed several courses in part as a result of CTW. Unfortunately, there are not many faculty in my department who would be willing to invest the time and energy in CTW grading and reporting. Good teaching is not rewarded. In my opinion, the CTW process has added a lot of administrivia to the process. It was sold as a way of reducing grading but the rubrics seem to have added a new layer of evaluation. It certainly has not reduced my time spent grading and it feels as though it has increased my grading time significantly. I am not saying that CTW is not a good thing. It is certainly the right thing to do fo students because it makes everyone more accountable. But it is a labor of love and it takes time away from other work-related tasks. CTW has not caused anything to happen in and of itself. But it is an important independent variable among several that have combined to result in an 18 month long process of curriculum evaluation and revision. I have mentioned elsewhere the actual things that have changed partly as a consequence of CTW: a new Marketing Metric class required of all majors, at least one significant case analysis required in every marketing undergraduate class, a system of course coordinators, etc.
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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Writing proofs or disproofs (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
Students will be able to write a proof or a disproof of a given mathematical claim.

SLO 3: Understanding math articles (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)
Students will be able to understand the results and proofs in a mathematical article.

Other 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 1: Solving problems by math softwares (G: 1, 3) (M: 3)
Students will be able to solve a computation problem by using a math software, 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, 2)
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.

**Target for O2: Writing proofs or disproofs**

88% of students will score at least Marginal on the simple assignments rubric. 66% of students will score at least satisfactory on the simple assignments rubric. 33% of students will score excellent on the simple assignments rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**


**M 2: Rubric for projects on reviewing articles (O: 3, 3)**

Excellent: student understands the article under review very well and writes a review with the following content: 1) detailed introduction to the problem, 2) the result(s) with main proofs, and 3) detailed references. Satisfactory: student has a reasonable understanding to the article; her/his review contains necessary content but has some flaw. Marginal: student does not fully understand the article; her/his review has several flaws or a major hole. Poor: student does not understand the article; their reviews are not complete.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Reviewing papers**

At least 70% score satisfactory or excellent.

**Target for O3: Understanding math articles**

88% of students will score at least Marginal on the simple assignments rubric. 66% of students will score at least satisfactory on the simple assignments rubric. 33% of students will score excellent on the simple assignments rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Math 4991 2011-2012, total 20 Excellent 12, Satisfactory 7, Marginal 1, Poor 0

**M 3: Rubric for Math Software problem 4991 (O: 1)**

Excellent: Student is able to solve assigned problems correctly by applying required software. Satisfactory: Student essentially solve the problems but has some minor mistake. Marginal: Student somewhat understands what is to be done but can not obtain meaningful results. Poor: does not understand the assignment or does not know how to apply the software.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Solving problems by math softwares**

88% of students will score at least Marginal on the simple assignments rubric. 66% of students will score at least satisfactory on the simple assignments rubric. 33% of students will score excellent on the simple assignments rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Math 4991 2011-2012 total 20 students Excellent 10, Satisfactory 4 Marginal 3 Poor 3 Excellent 50%, Satisfactory and above 70%, Marginal and above 85%

---

**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**

2009-2010 some 4991 students complained about the amount of writing. 2010-2011 we redesigned 4991 projects so that they require less writing. Student have not complained about this since then.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Improve students performance on projects using math software

In 2012 spring, students of Math 4991 did not perform well on the project using math software. The instructor admitted that the project was a bit challenging.

I will work with this instructor closely in the future to avoid this.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Rubric for Math Software problem 4991 | Outcome/Objective: Solving problems by math softwares

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) Students of Math 3000 performed better on writing proofs. This was listed as one of our action plans and it is the result of joint efforts of Math 3000 instructors, CTW ambassador, and the department administrators. 2) Students of Math 4991 performed better on writing projects. In the past students complained about writing projects. One of our action plans was to redesign these projects and as a result, students did better on these projects.

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 Math 4991, all students improve their analytical skills and writing skills. Before taking 4991, most of them have never read any journal paper and have little experience on conducting research in math. In the classes of 4991, they are required to read and review several journal papers and are taught how to conduct research.

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?
Computer support. At present university computer centers do not have Latex, a program for writing math articles, installed. Thus the students of Math 4991 have to download this program to their own computers.

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 have always been a key skill for math majors (before the CTW initiative). The CTW initiative emphasizes the role of writing in critical thinking and fits the need of our program very well. Because of this initiative, students and faculty in two CTW classes have to pay extra attention to writing assignments, which ultimately require a deeper understanding of the topics, and a clearer and more organized logic.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Middle Level Education
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 identify and critically analyze various educational practices and strategies that affect learners in metropolitan contexts, and (2) the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning."

Goals
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 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.
(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. 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 (Key Assessments), 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
100% of students will score at the level of "3: proficient" or higher in all parts of the rubric; 75% of students will score at the level of "4: exemplary" in all parts of the rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
100% of the students did score at the level of "3: proficient" or higher. In three of the five rubric sections, at least 75% of the students scored at the "4: exemplary" level; however the remaining two sections of the rubric only "critical event analysis" and "action plan" only had 69% and 61% respectively at the exemplary level.

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 "2: partially proficient" level or higher. 90% of students will score at the level of "3: proficient" level.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
100% of students will score at the "2: partially proficient" level or higher. However, there were no elements of the rubric in which at least 90% of students scored at the level of "3: proficient" or higher. This will be addressed in the action plan section.

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. 70% of students will score at the level of "exemplary".
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Assignment Outcomes**
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 Course Plan to Implement Fall 2010**
The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started in Spring 2010, will take their first CTW course this Fall 2010 and their second CTW course in Spring 2011. Because our program is new, this action plan relates to what we have done and will continue to do related to course development. Assignment Development: During Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, our BSE MLE faculty developed course assignments for the two CTW courses. Both courses include informal writing assignments (such as journals and weekly reflections) and formal writing assignments (such as research papers and text development). Rubric Development: During Spring 2010, we developed rubrics for specific writing assignments, in addition to an overall CTW assignment rubric included in this report. Faculty Development: The CTW coordinator has met with the other CTW instructor (a reading/writing specialist) three times over the past two semesters to refine our program CTW definitions, write program goals, and create course assignments. We will continue to meet in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 to evaluate CTW course assignments and make adjustments for future courses. Collection/Analysis of Student Work: During Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, the CTW instructors will work to evaluate CTW assignments based on our included rubric. With student permission, we will share assignments across instructors in order to evaluate student work and the overall effectiveness of assignments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** see above
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and CTW instructor for course 2) and Gladys Yarborough (CTW Instructor for course 1)

**Analyzing and taking action on teaching events**
Instructors will model for students how to analyze their own teaching episodes. Instructors will also model how to develop and write about action plans based on that analysis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Critical Incident Video Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Students demonstrate the ability to think critically through written reflection
  - Implementation Description: Several students appeared to struggle with analyzing their critical teaching event (as reviewed on video) and developing appropriate action plans based on that analysis. Moving forward, we will suggest that instructors model what lesson plan analysis and action plan development might look like when using video (either through a whole class example of the instructors’ teaching, or through the analysis of some peer teaching work from a volunteer).
  - Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross

**Revise book group discussion reflection rubric**
We will revise the book group discussion reflection rubric for next year. Right now, the rubric only contains 3 levels for each element of the project (proficient, partially proficient, and incomplete). There needs to be more variability within the rubric for the student to really understand the areas that need improvement, and for the instructors to give usable feedback within the constraints of a rubric.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Book Group Discussion Reflection Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments
  - Implementation Description: These revisions of the rubric will be completed before the start of Fall 2012 (when the rubric is to be used again).
  - Responsible Person/Group: Gladys Yarbrough and Stephanie Behm Cross

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?**
In the 2011-2012 cycle, only 60% of the students were able to carefully articulate the reasons behind why certain aspects of a professional book were useful or not useful in their professional development as teachers. Because we feel that this critical thinking skill is necessary, given that teachers will be asked to defend, orally and in writing, their instructional decisions, we decided to focus...
more instructional time to this critical thinking skill. We increased opportunities for students to defend their thoughts on various instructional strategies in EDRD 4600 AND in EDCI 3200 (an earlier, required course 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 time from the entry level to the exit class?

We finally discovered this year, during our analysis for the WEAVE report, that we have a hard time measuring students' growth within a class and between the two CTW courses because we have no common rubrics. Instead of having common rubrics, we have created specific rubrics that only relate to one assignment in a given class. This makes comparisons over time very difficult. One of our goals for this upcoming academic year is to develop a generic rubric that can be used for all CTW assignments within and between 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 plan to develop a general CTW rubric that can be used for all assignments in both CTW classes. This will do two things: (1) improve our ability to identify areas of growth in our students, and (2) eliminate the need for faculty to use certain assignments (and they will instead only be required to use a generic CTW rubric to assess their own assignments.

**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?

Our faculty have started to appreciate the importance of writing assignments that are both formal and informal. Faculty have also started to use writing as a way to engage students in critical thinking during class. This is an exciting new approach that we are excited about for the upcoming academic 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?

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 the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

How will you use your findings from this year? 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 Critical Thinking in the School of Music is to provide students the skills to identify, interpret, 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) in music can be defined as the written interpretation, analysis, and evaluation of the knowledge, the performance, and the creative, technical and instructional skills associated with music.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Applicability of Music**

Using creative, interpretive, and analytical methods students of music will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the applicability of music relative to its professional, social, cultural and cognitive significance. The overall goal will be achieved through the implementation of a three part assignment: (1) a proposal for a research paper, an outline for the paper, and an annotated
bible (2) a draft of the research paper, and (3) the final paper (a revision of the draft and the additional of more critical thinking). Students are provided a rubric designed specifically to accompany the draft of the research paper and a rubric to designed to accompany the final revised paper with emphasis placed on critical thinking.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Analysis (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Evidence of analysis of music and/or song text, or historical or cultural data, or comparative research

**SLO 1: Proposal for Research Paper Assignment (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 2: Synthesis of Personal Findings (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students will demonstrate the ability to synthesize (1) data gathered from scholarly sources and (2) the results or concluding thoughts drawn from such data

**SLO 3: Central Position and Primary Objective (M: 1)**  
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 4: Methodology, Concept, and Theories of Inquiry (M: 1)**  
Evidence of the use of methods, concepts, or theories of inquiry appropriate research in music from a cultural or historical perspective

**SLO 5: Relevance of Research in Concluding Thoughts (M: 1)**  
Students will demonstrate the ability to express in written form the current relevance of their specific research on a cultural or historical perspective of music and raise related topics for future research on the subject.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Rubric for Research Paper (O: 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**  
The revised research paper is the third and final component of a three-part critical thinking through writing assignment. The two parts that precede the revised paper are (1) the research proposal with an outline and an annotated bibliography and (2) the draft of the research paper. The instructor provides comments on the research proposal, outline, and annotated bibliography concerning the scope and applicability of the proposed topic and research objective(s). The instructor provides detailed comments on drafts of the paper concerning the use (or lack thereof) of adequate supporting scholarly research, the organization of the paper, how the use of citations in the body of the paper and the works cited section. The CTW component of the Revised (or final) Research Paper is graded on a rubric. The rubric is composed of eight components, five of which have been identified as significant to critical thinking for this assignment. These components are (1) Central Position and Primary Objective - CTW, (2) Methodology, Concepts, and Theories of Inquiry - CTW - (3) Organization of Data, (4) Context of Data and Scholarly Support, (5) Analysis of Data - CTW, (6) Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research - CTW, (7) Relevance and Implications in Concluding Thoughts - CTW, and (8) Writing Style and Quality of Communication. Up to twelve (12) points can be earned in each of the eight sections and up to four (4) points for an appropriate title for the paper. A maximum of one hundred points (100) can be earned for the revised critical thinking research paper. The findings listed below do not include target figures. However the list does include comparative numerical data to show the change in assessment scores from Summer 2010 to Fall 2011. Assessment data for each of the five CTW components listed on the rubric are provided in the corresponding target/findings section. The 2012-2013 CTW report will focus on target figures for two components of the rubric: “Analysis of the Data” and “Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research” (which will be renamed “Synthesis of Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research”). See the following attachments in the Document Management section for specific findings in each semester.: 1) Comparison of Composite Scores - Sum2010 and Fall 2011, 2) World Music MUS 4820 Findings Sum 2010, 3) World Music MUS 4820 Findings Fall 2011, Central Position and Primary Objective - Differential = +0.1; Methodology, Concepts and/or Theories of Inquiry - Differential = +1.8; Organization of Data - Differential = +1.2; Context of Data and Scholarly Support = Differential = 0.0; Analysis of Data - Differential = +1.3; Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research - Differential = +0.4; Relevance and Implications of Concluding Thoughts - Differential = +0.7; Writing Style and Quality of Communication - Differential = +0.8 Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 - Overall Differential = +0.8. In conclusion, findings show that a comparison of components identified on the rubric demonstrate an increase in all but one section of the rubric. The scores remained the same in this section. Findings show that the remaining seven sections reflected increases ranging from 0.1 to 1.8. I think this is substantial improvement on the part of the students in understanding the assignment and completing it. Since this the first music report that identifies specific outcomes/objectives, target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 findings.

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

**Target for O1: Analysis**  
The target score for Analysis is 10.1, representing an increase of 0.5. (Target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 findings.)
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:** Finished  
**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Meetings with CTW instructors and rubric data tabulation  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Oliver Greene

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

**Summary**

*2011-2012 Target Figures*

- **O1: Proposal for Research Paper Assignment**
  - Target: Met
  - Sum 2010 Student Average = 9.6; Fall 2011 Student Average = 10.9; Differential = +1.3 (Improvement)

- **O2: Synthesis of Personal Findings**
  - Target: Partially Met
  - Synthesis is Personal Findings is identified on the current rubric at Personal Finding Supported by Scholarly Research

- **O3: Central Position and Primary Objective**
  - Target: Partially Met
  - Central Position and Primary Objective is identified on the current rubric.

- **O4: Methodology, Concept, and Theories of Inquiry**
  - Target: Met
  - Methodology, Concept, and Theories of Inquiry is identified on the current rubric.

- **O5: Relevance of Research in Concluding Thoughts**
  - Target: Met
  - Relevance of Research in Concluding Thoughts is identified on the current rubric.

**Notes**

- **O1: Proposal for Research Paper Assignment**
  - 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.

- **O2: Synthesis of Personal Findings**
  - The target score for "Synthesis of Personal Findings" is 10.5, representing an increase of 0.5. (Target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 findings.)

- **O3: Central Position and Primary Objective**
  - The target score for "Central Position and Primary Objective" is 10.7, representing an increase of 0.5. (Target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 findings.)

- **O4: Methodology, Concept, and Theories of Inquiry**
  - The target score for "Methodology, Concept, and Theories of Inquiry" is 9.0, representing an increase of 0.5. (Target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 findings.)

- **O5: Relevance of Research in Concluding Thoughts**
  - The target score for "Relevance of Research in Concluding Thoughts" is 9.9, representing an increase of 0.5. (Target figures will be deemed as "met" if there is an increase of the of at least 0.5 when comparing Sum 2010 to Fall 2011 findings.)
Action Plan for CTW Music Courses for 2012-2013

The action plan for ctw music courses for the 2012 - 2013 year is two fold: 1) To provide formal training for the three faculty members, in addition to myself, in the areas of music history and world music who will be teaching these two ctw courses offered at the School of Music. Currently, one instructor of the CTW music history course and two instructors of the CTW world music course have students do a research paper for the class. The music history instructor required that the students do the three part assignment (1. research proposal with an outline and annotated bibliography, 2. draft of the research paper, 3. final revised paper) and provided students with the rubrics for the draft and the final revised paper. The instructor in the second section of the world music course was approached shortly before the Fall semester 2011 to teach one of the two sections of the course and was provided copies of the syllabus for the existing ctw world music course and the two rubrics. However, there was not sufficient time for adequate ctw training and the instructor did not request student to complete the three part assignments. As in previous semesters, since the implementation of the ctw course, I required students to complete the three-part assignment, discussed the assignment in detail, and directed them to the requirements as well as both rubrics and supporting materials as listed online in ULearn. The music history instructor has retired and has been filled by another instructor. Based on conversations with the Associate Director of the School of Music plans are to have two sections of the CTW course in music history and two sections in the CTW course in world music. 2) To identify two specific CTW objectives for which numerical data will be provided from all courses for the 2012-2012 CTW report. Based on preliminary discussions with coordinators of the CTW program, two objectives currently listed or implied as research components on the draft of the Action Plan for the Action Plan for 2012 - 2013 in the areas as Analysis and Synthesis are as follows: 80% of students should exhibit at least a low level of competency (7) 40% of students should exhibit competency (8 to 9) 25% of students should exhibit a mastery (10 to 12 on rubric)

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The training session will include discussion of the following: 1) the three-part assignment and its value relative to critical thinking in music, 2) the clarity of applicability of rubrics, 3) gathering numerical assessment data from rubrics for the CTW report. I would like to provided an honorarium of $500 to each of the three music instructors, because the training session may require several meetings and the collection of data for reporting is beyond the normal requirements of teaching.

Responsible Person/Group: Oliver Greene - CTW Ambassador - School of Music
Budget Amount Requested: $1,500.00 (one time)

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 CTW accomplishments in the School of Music for 2011 - 2012 was two fold: 1) the improvement in the quality of critical thinking and writing as displayed in the rubrics comparing assessment scores from Sum 2010 to Sum Fall, the last two times the course was offered under my direction and 2) increase involvement in CTW initiative by other members of the department. This past year the instructor of the CTW course in music history utilized the rubrics for both the draft and final revised paper for the first and commented on the improvement in student writing and critical thinking.

Per the findings listed in a pervious section of this report the comparison of student CTW paper between Summer 2010 and Fall 2011 reveal the following concerning differentials in score: Central Position and Primary Objective - Differential = +0.1; Methodology, Concepts and/or Theories of Inquiry - Differential = +1.2; Context of Data and Scholarly Support = Differential = 0.0; Analysis of Data - Differential = +1.3; Personal Findings Supported by Scholarly Research - Differential = +0.4; Relevance and Implications of Concluding Thoughts - Differential = +0.7; Writing Style and Quality of Communication - Differential = +0.8 Fall 2011 - Overall Differential = +0.8 In conclusion, findings show that a comparison of components identified on the rubric demonstrate an increase in all but one section of the rubric. The scores remained the same in this section. Findings show that the remaining seven sections reflected increases ranging from 0.1 to 1.8. I have also noticed a general improvement in the understand of the three-part assignment, the quality of papers each semester, and in an underestimation of the value of the assignment for future study in music.

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?

Per the rubrics used for the critical thinking component of the three-part assignment, the quality of papers each semester, and in an underestimation of the value of the assignment for future study in music.

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?

Greater instructor participation is needed in the School of Music on the part of the instructors. Thus far two instructors, including me, have taught the two CTW music courses. The other instructor improved his use of materials (rubrics and accompanying documents) in his class and informed me that he indeed noticed an improvement in student writing and critical thinking. Because there was substantial resistance from this instructor initially concerning the CTW initiative in general and the use of the rubrics, I did not attempt to have a training session with him. His resistance waned substantially after the first semester of requiring the CTW assignment. Though he did give me copies of the three contrasting students with his comments on each paper, per my request during the first semester of the CTW course offering, he never provided me with numerical assessment scores from the rubrics. Therefore I could not report on his class. He has retired and plans are to train two colleagues to teach this CTW course for future offerings. In the Action Plan for the coming year I have requested $1500 ($500 each) for the training of two instructors for the CTW music history course and one instructor for the CTW world music, since the CTW assignment and the proper gathering of data are beyond the normal requirements for teaching and because it will probably be necessary to have more than one training/advisement session with the 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?

There were few changes in the CTW program in music during the 2011-2012 year. However, as previously stated the quality of papers improved substantially. In general, students seem more receptive each semester to the CTW research assignment and more of them are understanding the value of the CTW initiative. I remind students that their CTW papers should be kept and revised for possible use with application for admission to graduate school. I also inform them that in past years I requested writing samples from students seeking graduate scholarships to serve as Writing Across the Curriculum assistants in the School of Music.
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 learning outcomes, measure, and targets during the 2011-2012 academic year. However, changes will be made for the 2012-2013 year. Plans are to (1) revise the draft and final rubrics, (2) conduct training sessions with each of the other three potential CTW instructors for 2012-2013, and (3) revise the School of Music curriculum so that both CTW courses will be offered twice during a calendar year and so that instructors will be required to teach the course no more than once during the academic year. This will help assure varying perspectives in the teaching of the course and provide adequate time for professional development endeavors.

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 previously stated, plans are to revise the School of Music curriculum so that both CTW courses will be offered twice during a calendar year and so that instructors will be required to teach the course no more than once during the academic year. This will help assure varying perspectives in the teaching of the course and provide adequate time for professional development endeavors. Plans are to offer two sections of World Music CTW during each fall semester and two sections of Music History CTW during each spring semester. Each section will have a different instructor and sections will be offered at different times each semester to minimize conflicts students may have in scheduling the course.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

Each year I compile data from the annual CTW Weave report to complete a CTW report specifically for the School of Music. I keep the Director and Associate Director of the School of Music abreast of significant changes in the CTW initiative and in the reporting process. No significant changes were made as a result of last years report. However, the decision was made to offer two sections of the each CTW course in an academic year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

I have gained a better understanding of specifically how the students are improving be comparing composite in each section of the rubric from Fall Spring 2010 to Fall 2011. I think this reveals that in the world music course music students are gaining a better understanding of the value and relevance of critical thinking and writing in general. This is significant because the vast majority of our students are performance majors and have historically been more resistant to writing and research assignments than students in non-performance or non-arts oriented majors, who are accustomed to such assignments.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

I will discuss the rubrics, the process of compiling numerical data, and comparative findings of recent semesters with the other music faculty members assigned to teach the CTW courses in the 2012-2013 academic year. We will discuss the three-part assignment and how the rubrics might be improved and which components of the rubric we will report on next year. If I have participation from each the other three individuals slated to teach the CTW courses, I anticipate that they will become vested in the initiative and in doing so stress its importance to the students and the department as a whole.
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Mission / Purpose
To meet the requirements of the University's CTW policy, the neuroscience CTW courses are designed to develop critical thinking skills in undergraduate neuroscience majors. We define and assess critical thinking by the students' ability to evaluate the quality of information using available empirical evidence and to use logic and reasoning in recognizing, constructing, defending and critiquing scientific arguments.

Goals
G 1: Critical thinking skills in neuroscience
Use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach to solve problems related to neural processes.

G 2: Integrative writing in neuroscience
Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats (e.g., essays, position papers, technical papers, literature reviews) and for various purposes (e.g., informing, defending, explaining, persuading, arguing, teaching).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Uses critical thinking effectively (M: 1)
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: NEUR 3020: First and last written products (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The Neuroscience undergraduate program has only been in existence for a very short time with the first neuroscience courses offered in the 2012 fall semester. Consequently, we have only taught one CTW class during this reporting period: one section of NEUR 3020: The Scientific Method in Neuroscience. The second CTW course, NEUR 4910: Topics in Neuroscience, will be taught beginning in the 2012 fall semester. NEUR 3020 provides neuroscience majors with experience in research design, data analysis, and scientific communication needed for higher-level understanding in 4000-level courses, the development of writing of senior-year theses, and graduate study. Topics include the structure and style of scientific writing in neuroscience, experimental design, statistical techniques, and preparation of a formal literature review in the appropriate discipline. Course assignments focused on developing students' abilities to effectively analyze and evaluate concepts, formulate and present persuasive arguments, and describe ideas clearly and thoughtfully in writing. Using the CTW Neuroscience Rubric, CTW assessment for this course compared the student's first written product and the last written product. The first writing product was a brief paper that analyzed and reviewed an empirical neuroscience paper using twelve analytical questions from the text (e.g., "What was the "big question" of the study? What were the specific research questions of this study?"). The last written product was a longer review paper, using several peer-reviewed papers that covered a particular topic in neuroscience; assessment was on the post-feedback product.

Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively

In the 2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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. For NEUR 3020, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Organization and Logic on this assignment. 1. Ideas are arranged in a chaotic way, with no logical connection between them (i.e., within sentences and/or paragraphs). 2. Ideas are arranged in an associative, digressive, elliptical, or circular manner; the logical connections between ideas are consistently unclear. 3. Ideas are arranged in a way that makes sense to the author, but is inappropriate for the purpose or audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are frequently unclear. 3. Ideas are arranged with some consideration for the purpose and audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are sometimes unclear. 4. Ideas are arranged in a manner appropriate to the purpose and audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are almost always clear. 5. Ideas are thoughtfully and effectively arranged in a manner appropriate to the purpose and audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are consistently clear. In the 2011 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. For NEUR 3020, 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. 1. Is unquestioning of his/her acceptance of unproven or poorly supported claims. 2. Takes a consistent position on the issue. 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Organization and Logic for both the first and last written product was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and all 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 for the first written product was 3 and 3.5 for the last written product, which are both in the 'developing' range. 92% and 100% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher for the first and last written assignments respectively. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Figure 1.

Target for O2: Uses reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments

In the 2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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. For NEUR 3020, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Position and Balance on this assignment. 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, thoroughly addressing relevant counter-evidence and/or alternate points of view.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Position and Balance for both the first and last written product was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and all 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 for both the first and last written products are summarized in Figure 2.

Target for O3: Approaches scientific problems creatively and effectively

In the 2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, the instructor rates the student's written product 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. For NEUR 3020, 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. 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Use of Evidence for the first written product was 3 and 3.5 for the last written product, which are both in the ‘developing’ range. 92% and 100% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher for the first and last written assignments respectively. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Figure 1 or 3.

Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes

In the 2011-2012 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. For NEUR 3020, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Grammar and Mechanics on this assignment. 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 reader's intentions are clearly expressed. In the 2011-2012 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Content and Development 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. For NEUR 3020, 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. 0. No details 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner. In the 2011-2012 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. For NEUR 3020, our junior/entry CTW course, the target is for the majority of students to be in the Developing (2-3) range for Citation and Use of Sources on this assignment. 0. Has committed unintentional plagiarism by inappropriately paraphrasing one or more sentences from a source 1. Has committed unintentional plagiarism by inappropriately paraphrasing one or more sentences from a source and does not use quotation marks or a citation to indicate the ideas are not his/her own 2. Has committed unintentional plagiarism by inappropriately paraphrasing one or more sentences from a source or has a citation that is incomplete or incorrect 3. Properly paraphrases some sources and provides citations for them, but has errors in citation mechanics 4. Properly paraphrases and cites all sources, but doesn’t consistently or skillfully integrate the cited material with his/her own ideas 5. Properly paraphrases and cites all sources, while consistently and skillfully integrating the cited material with his/her own ideas.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the first written product was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 92% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. The median score for Grammar and Mechanics for the last written product was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and all of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development for both the first and last written product was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and all of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development for both the first and last written product was 3 and 3.5 for the last written product, which are both in the ‘developing’ range. 58% and 100% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher for the first and last written assignments respectively. The proportions of students in each performance category for both the first and last written products are summarized in Figure 4.

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

Grow course offerings

The CTW program in Neuroscience will be fully operational as we will offer, for the first time, both the junior/entry level course (NEUR 3020) and the senior/exit-level course (NEUR 4910). NEUR 3020 will be taught both in Fall 2012 and in Spring 2013 whereas we will offer one section of NEUR 4910 in Fall 2012 and two sections of this course for Spring 2013. Different faculty will teach each of the three sections of NEUR 4910, demonstrating significant faculty enthusiasm for teaching this seminar course. This number of sections will be sufficient to accommodate anticipated student demand from our small, but rapidly growing, major for 2012-2013. Nevertheless, a main goal will be to staff and train instructors for four sections of NEUR 4910 for the successive reporting year (2013-2014). To that end, the CTW Ambassador will continue to strongly encourage and work with faculty to develop new sections for the senior/exit-level CTW class.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012  
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?**

The major accomplishment this year was to start the CTW program for our nascent Neuroscience major. We identified the CTW Ambassador (Dr. Aras Petrulis), developed our CTW rubric, taught one section of our junior/entry level course (NEUR 3020) and recruited three faculty members to teach the senior/exit level course (NEUR 4910) for the 2012-2013 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?**

As only one CTW course was taught, all assessment of student improvement for this reporting period comes from rubric scores of the first written assignment and the last written assignment from this course. Most students’ median scores on measures of critical thinking (i.e., Organization and Logic, Use of Evidence, and Position and Balance) were in the Developing range at the outset and all showed improvement throughout the course. Specifically, all students were within the Developing range for the final written product, with Use of Evidence showing the greatest improvement across assignments. Students’ writing skills (i.e., Grammar and Mechanics, Content and Development, and Citation and Use of Sources) improved considerably from the first to last assignment. Specifically, for Grammar and Mechanics the percentage of students in the Mastery range doubled from ~25% in the first assignment to 50% on the final product. Even more dramatic gains were made on Citation and Use of Sources: a large minority of students was in the Emerging category on this measure for the first assignment whereas none of the students were in this category on the last assignment and half of the students were in the Mastery range.

**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 will need more faculty to submit proposals for the senior/exit level CTW course (NEUR 4910) to accommodate the rapidly increasing number of students in the Neuroscience major. Currently, we have three versions/sections of this course proposed for the 2012-2013 reporting period; none have been taught. By 2013-2014, we plan on offering four sections of NEUR 4910 per year. This will likely require recruiting additional faculty in order to maintain a diversity of topic offerings. We plan to continue developing the CTW Writing Assessment Rubric and may modify it to assess a broader range of dimensions in writing assignments in the senior/exit level 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?**

As noted, this reporting period is the first one for the CTW in Neuroscience and so we do not have much experience or data on the impact of CTW on our academic program. Nevertheless, the demonstration of substantial student improvement within the junior/entry level course suggests that most students in the senior/exit level will function at the Mastery level.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Nursing**

*As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

#### 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 patients and/or work environment.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 3)**

The students will demonstrate critical thinking skills necessary to interpret patient data and formulate appropriate nursing interventions in the care of their clinical patients.

**SLO 2: Integration from research to practice (G: 1) (M: 4)**

The students will integrate research information pertaining to leadership, care delivery, and staff utilization from the literature into practice.

**SLO 3: Analysis and Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 4)**

The student will be able to analyze existing leadership styles and evaluate their effectiveness.
**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 3: Rubric for 2080 (O: 1)**

The Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric is used to assess a critical thinking paper in the 2080 course. The rubric examines completeness, critical thinking, and communication. It is constructed on a 6 point scale and utilizes the emerging, developing, and mastery terminology.

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

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking**

By the third paper of the semester, 100% of students will reach the developing level on the rubric (at least a score of 3) on the critical thinking section of the Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric 60% of students will reach the upper developing category or lower mastery level (between 4 and 5) on the critical thinking section of the Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric 25% of students will reach the upper mastery level (between 5.5 and 6) on the critical thinking section of the Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students reached the developing level (at least a score of 3) on the critical thinking section of the Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric 98.55% of students reached the upper developing category or lower mastery level (between 4 and 5) on the critical thinking section of the Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric 43.47% of students reached the upper mastery level (between 5.5 and 6) on the critical thinking section of the Critical Thinking in Patient Care: Rubric

**M 4: Rubric for 4600 (O: 2, 3)**

The Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric is used to assess a critical thinking paper in the 4600 course. The rubric assesses students' ability to integrate research into practice and their ability to analyze existing leadership styles and evaluate their effectiveness. The rubric is constructed on a 6 point scale and utilizes the emerging, developing, and mastery terminology.

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

**Target for O2: Integration from research to practice**

4600 is divided into two sections but they have the same assignment and utilize the same rubric. 4600 Section A & B: By the final paper 100% of the students will reach the developing level on the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric (at least a score of 3) on the rubric, 80% of the students will reach the upper mastery level on the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric (between 4 & 5) and 60% of the students will reach the upper mastery level between on the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric (5.5 and 6) for sections: 2, 3, 4, & 5 of the Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Findings for 4600 Section-A: The findings are measured by the critical thinking sections (2, 3, 4, & 5) of the Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric and tabulated numbers of students that fell into each category. 100% of the students reached the developing levels (at least a score of 3) on the rubric. 94% of the students reached the upper mastery level (between 4 & 5) on the rubric. 53% reached the upper mastery level between (5.5 and 6) on the rubric. Findings for 4600 Section-B: The findings are measured by the critical thinking sections (2, 3, 4, & 5) of the Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric and tabulated numbers of students that fell into each category. 100% of the students reached the developing level (at least a score of 3) on the rubric. 100% of the students reached the upper developing category or lower mastery level (between 4 and 5) on the rubric. 48% of the students reached the upper mastery level (between 5.5 and 6) on the rubric.

**Target for O3: Analysis and Evaluation**

4600 is divided into two sections but they have the same assignment and utilize the same rubric. 4600 Section A & B: By the final paper 100% of the students will reach the developing level on the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric (at least a score of 3) on the rubric, 80% of the students will reach the upper mastery level on the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric (between 4 & 5) and 60% of the students will reach the upper mastery level between on the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric (5.5 and 6) for sections: 2, 3, 4, & 5 of the Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Findings for 4600 Section-A: The findings are measured by the critical thinking sections (2, 3, 4, & 5) of the Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric and tabulated numbers of students that fell into each category. 100% of the students reached the developing levels (at least a score of 3) on the rubric. 94% of the students reached the upper mastery level (between 4 & 5) on the rubric. 53% reached the upper mastery level between (5.5 and 6) on the rubric. Findings for 4600 Section-B: The findings are measured by the critical thinking sections (2, 3, 4, & 5) of the Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric and tabulated numbers of students that fell into each category. 100% of the students reached the developing level (at least a score of 3) on the rubric. 100% of the students reached the upper developing category or lower mastery level (between 4 and 5) on the rubric. 48% of the students reached the upper mastery level (between 5.5 and 6) on the rubric.

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

**2080 Action Plan**

Meet with both consultants at the same time to ensure that the consultants are critiquing the papers consistently.

**Established in Cycle: 2011-2012**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: High**

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

- **Measure:** Rubric for 2080
- **Outcome/Objective:** Critical Thinking

**Implementation Description:** The course coordinator will call a meeting with the CTW consultants to discuss the assignment. This meeting will occur with both consultants present.

**Projected Completion Date: 08/2012**
**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.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Interpretation (M: 3)
Assignment: Research Papers for NUTR 3010 and 4950 Students write research papers for both CTW courses. Goal 1 is met through these assignments since each student translates information from research articles and writes a paper with the intent of interpreting the source without altering the intended meaning. The assignments vary in the depth of the written paper. For NUTR 3010, each student writes a "mini-review" of a stated problem using 10 peer reviewed journal articles. NUTR3010 is taken the first semester of the first year of the two-year program. For NUTR 4950, a course taken during the last semester of the program, each student writes either a position paper or review paper based on a research question. Each student selects at least 30 references to answer her/his research question. Seventy-five percent of the references must be evidence-based. Each student critically examines the evidence and sources of such evidence, questioning accuracy, relevance and completeness. The paper for NUTR 4950 evaluates the student's ability to translate information from the nutrition literature.

SLO 2: Analysis (M: 1)
Assignments: Research Paper (NUTR 3010) and Review or Position Paper (NUTR 4950) For NUTR 3010, students are expected to be able to distinguish causality from correlation, analyze evidence and question its accuracy, and to determine relevance and completeness. As the students advance through the program, they should strengthen their critical thinking skills. In NUTR 4950, papers should reflect their ability to synthesize the evidence and provide analytical discussions of the study results. The papers should be discursive prose not a listing of research studies. Analysis of articles should be a review that demonstrates sophisticated and integrated thought.

SLO 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 using 10 peer reviewed journal articles. Each student demonstrates ability to evaluate evidence-based references and to integrate information into a research paper. Students are expected to justify their views while respecting others. Paper should include connections to conclusions. The paper should examine evidence and its source 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. Paper should clearly and effectively communicate conclusions that are comprehensive and scholarly. Ambiguities are considered and conclusions are related to consequences.

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 differentiate the established position and own views 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 Points: _________________

M 3: Grading Rubric for Research Paper (O: 1, 3)

Target for O2: Analysis
We expect 85% of the students to receive at least 50 total points on the assignment.

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 using 10 peer reviewed journal articles. Each student demonstrates ability to evaluate evidence-based references and to integrate information into a research paper. Students are expected to justify their views while respecting others. Paper should include connections to conclusions. The paper should examine evidence and its source 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. Paper should clearly and effectively communicate conclusions that are comprehensive and scholarly. Ambiguities are considered and conclusions are related to consequences.
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Revision of Rubrics for Grading Papers

The grading 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 progress at least one performance level from NUTR 3010 to NUTR 4950.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Rubric revised August 2010 and implemented Spring semester 2011.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors for NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950.

CTW and Curriculum

Goal is to incorporate CTW strategies into other courses in the major. Currently, the first CTW course is taken the first semester in the undergraduate didactic program in dietetics (DPD) and the second course is taken during the final semester. Since the program is 4 semesters, we plan to include CTW strategies in one course the second semester and another course the third semester. Both of these courses have a heavy writing component. We (current CTW instructors and other faculty) are developing a tool to guide the instructors of the courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** In Progress

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** NJTR 4300 (juniors) and NJTR 4400 (seniors) are the courses where the CTW strategies will be implemented. Faculty are meeting monthly to establish learning activities and evaluations tools for implementation Spring 2013.

**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW instructors and faculty who teach NJTR 4300 and NJTR 4400.

Rubric Update

Rubrics for NUTR 3010 and NUTR 4950 were updated: terminology, criteria for evaluation, and alignment of progression.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Both rubrics were used for 2011-2012 courses and reported in CTW 2011-2012 report.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011

---

**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; 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 view points and 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 or integrates 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All of the students in NUTR 4950 performed at or exceeded the goal-oriented level. Seventy 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All of the students performed at or exceeded the goal-oriented level. Sixty percent of the students advanced one performance level.

---
**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?**

Faculty continue to meet to discuss how to incorporate critical thinking assignments at all levels of the curriculum. A rubric folder will be created on the division l-drive, whereby all faculty will have access to a variety of rubrics. Faculty also created "guiding principles" for all rubrics so students will see connections between course and assignment evaluations.

**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 revision of the rubrics, we are able to evaluate how well students progress from the entry CTW course to the capstone course. Many students progress to the goal-oriented level; some attain some components of the mastery level. However, very few students reach the mastery level. We need to do a better job with students during the time between the two 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 will continue to improve our rubrics and assignments. Faculty buy in and involvement is crucial. Working with faculty who do not teach CTW courses is an on-going process.

**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 courses help the students improve their writing and critical thinking skills. End of year program evaluations reflect this sentiment. Division faculty support CTW and are committed to making it a component of other courses in the curriculum.

**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.

Although targets were met, a lower percentage of students progressed to a higher performance level. CTW faculty will meet to review assignment and rubric grading to identify any discrepancies.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

The annotated bibliography was eliminated as an assessment measure and more weight was given to the research papers.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

CTW is complex, time-consuming, rewarding, and an on-going process. Rubrics are not perfect and require yearly evaluation.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will review the two rubrics and make necessary changes. Create guidelines for faculty on how to incorporate more CTW-like assignments in their courses. We expect to continue to meet/exceed our targets.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 CTW Operations Management**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 foci: Critical thinking is an intellectually disciplined process that has three main components. First is skillfully and broadly gathering or generating data. Second is analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating the information in that data through the use of systematic, logical reasoning processes and the applications of relevant decision assisting tools developed ex ante. And third is the ability to reach conclusions and make recommendations for action that are logical, supported by evidence, and devoid of pre-existing individual bias or preference. Operations Managers should be able to use rational problem solving techniques and be able to express in a cogent manner what the problem is, set criteria for evaluation of potential solutions, establish alternatives to the problem and analytically evaluate the alternatives based on the established criteria.
**Goals**

**G 1: Business Plan Vision**
We expect our students to demonstrate their ability to organize, develop and advance a service operation business plan vision for a start-up business 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, value discipline, target market 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 development 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. The Business Plan is scored based on the Syllabus Rubric and how well the student developed the eight sections of the paper with regard to appropriate facts and details, competency and sophistication.

**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. The Business Plan is scored based on the Syllabus Rubric and how well the student developed the eight sections of the paper with regard to appropriate facts and details, competency and sophistication. Additional language dealing with the "Process Analysis" was added to the CTW Business Plan to ensure a discussion of what the process chosen for the paper was attempting to achieve.

**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 syllabus rubric is designed for the benefit of the student as a guide for the development of the CTW Final Paper with respect to relevant details, context, content, grammar competency and sophistication.

*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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average score for the target was 1.83. Of the 23 students who fulfilled the assignment, 15 scored a "2" or better which is 65%.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average for the 1st draft exercise was 2.43. For this assessment measurement, 21 out of 23 or 91% scored a "2" or better. 12 out of the 23 scored a "3" or better, representing a 52% of the population.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average for the Final Business Plan based on the 4 point rubric was a 3.44. 88% of the students who participated in the final business plan, scored a "3" or better. This was 8 percentage points above the goal. Secondarily, 13 students scored a "4" on the final business plan or 54% of the participating students. This was a significant achievement as it was 34 percentage points above the 20% target.

**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. Adding additional language to Section 8 of the business plan to include a discussion of the process analysis. Todate, students have not included a discussion on what the process is attempting to achieve, nor the cycle time analysis.

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

*Implementation Status: In-Progress*
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

One scheduled student/ instructor office visit during semester dealing with CTW assignment.
A student/ instructor scheduled office visit will be made mandatory to discuss the executive summary, body of the paper and process analysis to be developed in their assigned CTW paper. Students in some cases are reluctant to talk about the subject matter and content of their CTW paper, outside of class unless it is part of their grade. I plan to establish a schedule at the beginning of the semester for each student to spend a minimum of 30 minutes up to one hour with me discussing issues they are having and foresee with their development and writing of their paper. One on one gives me an opportunity to be quite specific to their needs and address issues before they become obstacles.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Add new verbage to the syllabus requiring a one on one with each student regarding their CTW assignment.
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor
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?
The achievement of the established learning objectives based on the rubric scores for the three separate components of the CTW Business Plan. All of the targets were exceeded.

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 improvement has come in getting off to a good start with the Executive Summary for a viable service oriented company vision. If the student can comprehend the importance of this initial document's importance, then the first draft and final paper come together more readily. Supporting their efforts at the beginning of the semester pays dividends well into the semester for the CTW assignment.

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 use and understanding of the syllabus rubric has taken some time to grasp. Scoring based on a rubric has taken some time to develop for the instructor as well the student. Getting off to a good start with the selection of a viable service company vision takes time for the student and then to translate into an "Executive Summary" limited to two pages has been a struggle for many students. Students want to write the complete eight page paper and call it the executive summary. Students struggle with the concept of an executive summary. More clarity on the instructor's part at the beginning of the semester is critical for developing this initial document.

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 realization by the student that writing in their discipline is vitally important to the success of their career going forward. From the instructor's perspective, the importance of the CTW assignment and how it is administered for the benefit of the class.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Philosophy
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The writings of Aristotle, Descartes, Hume, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind. They are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history. Much philosophical work is concerned with abstract and fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Are there objective moral truths? Is there a God? Although some of these issues are unlikely to have practical consequences, they are no less important. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of an educated person who has not systematically grappled with these questions. At the same time, philosophy is deeply involved with practical issues, such as the nature of the good life and what constitutes a just society. In the last two decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law, philosophy of science, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in this country has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Clearly, critical thinking and writing are central here. In philosophy, critical thinking is the skill of correctly evaluating the arguments made by others and composing good arguments of one's own. We do this in writing and in conversation and our mission is to help students develop this skill.

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)
Students in Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 write papers as part of the requirements for the course. These typically account for at least 30% of the course grade. The final papers of the semester, in particular, are likely to be a substantial portion of their grade. Students are allowed and encouraged to rewrite these papers in order to improve their critical thinking and writing skills. The instructors give detailed written feedback on the papers in order to facilitate such improvement. We assess this outcome by having our Assessment committee evaluate the final papers, scoring them for critical thinking ability. The scoring uses the following rubric: A: A paper scoring an A provides a complete 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 instructor presents an original argument, one that goes beyond what was said in class and in the readings. B: A paper scoring an B 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 paper scoring a C provides an explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to its thesis, but this explanation is inadequate 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 paper scoring 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. E: A paper scoring 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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Writing Skills (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students in Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 write papers as part of the requirements for the course. These typically account for at least 30% of the course grade. The final papers of the semester, in particular, are likely to be a substantial portion of their grade. Students are allowed and encouraged to rewrite these papers in order to improve their critical thinking and writing skills. The instructors give detailed written feedback on the papers in order to facilitate such improvement. We assess this outcome by having our Assessment committee evaluate the final papers, scoring them for writing ability. The scoring uses the following rubric: A: A paper scoring an A 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 paper scoring a B 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 paper scoring a C 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 paper scoring a D 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: A paper scoring an F 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.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Critical Thinking (O: 1)**

Three 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. The scoring uses the following rubric: A: A paper scoring an A 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 a beyond what was said in class and in the readings. B: A paper scoring an B 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 paper scoring a C 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 paper scoring 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. E: A paper scoring 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.75 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 3.21. In both cases, then, we are exceeding our targets. Given that the CTW classes are new, however, we do not think we should alter those targets at this point. It also noticeable that the scores here indicate a nice improvement, as one would expect, from a mid-level philosophy major to a senior philosophy major.

**M 2: Writing Skills (O: 2)**

Three 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. The scoring uses the following rubric: A: A paper scoring an A 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 paper scoring a B 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 paper scoring a C 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 paper scoring a D 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. E: A paper scoring an F 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's writing skills were assessed a 2.88 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 3.11. In both cases, then, we are exceeding our targets. Given that the CTW classes are new, however, we do not think we should alter those targets at this point. It also noticeable that the scores here indicate a nice improvement, as one would expect, from a mid-level philosophy major to a senior philosophy major.

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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We will continue to discuss the program as needed.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Andrew Jason Cohen
- **Additional Resources:** none

Improve Data Gathering Per Other Assessment Activity

This plan for 2011-2012, which was considered at the end of 2010-2011 was approved in February of 2012. We now use data from...
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 met our goals for student learning in CTW classes. We also refined our methods of data collection.

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 this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.75 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 3.21. In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's writing skills were assessed a 2.88 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 3.11. In both cases, we see improvement in critical thinking among students 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?

We take our program to be fully functioning and well-developed. The problems along the way include scheduling the courses and attracting faculty to teach the CTW courses instead of the other courses they ordinarily teach. No assistance 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?

No changes since last year have been made to our CTW program (though we instituted one change for the assessment of the program). The CTW program impact on the department is hard to assess, but its clear that it offers our students a selection of additional courses that they would not otherwise have had the opportunity to take (and it similarly allows faculty to teach classes they might not have been able to, though some are reluctant to do so). It may be that the greatest benefit to the department--both for students and for faculty--is the existence of a standard class all majors are expected to take after Phil 2010 (Intro to Philosophy) and before upper level classes. In the past, many students would make the large step from 2010 to 4000-level classes with some difficulty as they did not get enough instruction in writing philosophy papers in 2010; all get such instruction now in 3000.

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?

We have refined our data collection for CTW to be in line with our assessment of our other programs. We now concentrate data collection in the Fall semester, which allows us a streamlined process without sacrificing any quality. We have also streamlined data collection for Phil 4990, recognizing that as fewer students we should reduce the number of papers from those classes used in the assessment process. We also altered the system so that the instructors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 provided the assessment scores for content knowledge. This vastly improves our reporting of student 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.

With our advising program, we now push harder to have all students take Phil 3000 immediately after Phil 2010 and before taking any 4000 level classes. We have also successfully added additional 3000 level classes as we find such classes aid students in their progression to 4000 level classes.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

We refined our data collection, as indicated above.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

As the scores on the collected papers from 4990 are significantly better than those on the collected papers from 3000, we believe the Department is highly effective at teaching our majors how to critically think and write.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will continue to monitor the program but plan no major changes at the moment.
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, 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

In Fall 2011, 20 physics majors took Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory. Each student in this course performed a number of advanced labs and wrote laboratory reports in the style of journal articles appropriate to physics research publications. Students were given comments and allowed to revise these reports before the final product for which they were graded. The laboratory reports were assessed using the Physics Rubric. At this time the assessment data has not been provided to the ambassador.

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

Adapt course to allow for higher enrollments

The BS in Physics is undergoing a much-desired increase in enrollments after sustained efforts by the department over the last few years. This has brought about growing pains for the Advanced Laboratory CTW course (Phys3300). As many as 20 students may be enrolled in this course in the Fall of 2011 after previous two years' enrollments of 9 and 15. Since this is an advanced laboratory course, strict time and equipment limitations have created the need for changes in the course. The probable solution will be to divide the students into two sections. There are two instructors for this course who teach different aspects of the instruction. Dividing into two sections will mean that both instructors will be teaching at all times with one section in the lab with instructor A while the other section is in the computer lab with instructor B. This should allow the instructors to give individuals and small groups the attention needed.

The additional work load associated with lab reports may require some reduction in the number of lab reports scored and for which feedback is given. Possibly the number will be reduced from the 5 reports submitted in Fall 2010 back to the 3 reports submitted in Fall 2009. It was observed that the increased number of lab reports assigned in 2010 meant that the students performed fewer revisions on each report than in 2009 but about the same number of written reports overall. In Fall 2011 there were 20 students who took Phys3300, Advanced Physics Lab, which was difficult to handle. Additional computers were provided by the College of Arts & Sciences and by the Department of Physics & Astronomy to allow 20 students to be accommodated in one class. Enrollments for Fall 2012 may exceed 20 and so the class will be offered with two sections taught at the same time each meeting Mondays and Wednesdays from 2 to 4:30 PM. If total enrollment of the two sections exceeds 20, then the class will be divided in half with one group performing labs on Mondays with instructor 1 and performing computer and data analysis on Wednesdays with instructor 2. The other half of the class will do the reverse, requiring each of the two instructors to teach twice as much.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms, Xiaochun He, Ramesh Mani

Train new instructor in CTW

In Fall 2011 a new instructor will co-teach this course and take over the evaluation of writing assignments. This instructor will be trained through one-on-one meetings with the CTW ambassador in Summer 2011 and throughout the Fall 2011 term. One on one training was performed to prepare new instructor for teaching of critical thinking and assessing using the physics rubric. Additional training will continue when course is taught again in Fall 2012.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Phys3300 Physics Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Laboratory Experiment Reports
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

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?

In the 2011-2012 academic year two major CTW achievements for the B.S. in Physics program were accommodating the growth in the program and training a new CTW instructor. The first CTW course, Phys3300, is typically taken by physics majors at the beginning of their junior year. Since the BS in Physics program has nearly doubled in size in about 3 years, the demand for this course has also greatly increase. The enrollment was 9 in Fall 2009, 15 in Fall 2010, and 20 in Fall 2011. Since this is an advanced laboratory course, having access to appropriate equipment including computers, appropriate lab space, and enough individual attention from the instructors are all important to success of the students. Through hard work by the course instructors we have been able to handle the growth in the course. In addition, one of the instructors who created the course was replaced by a new instructor. This required training and coordination especially with the new demands created by increasing enrollment. One additional major achievement was being able to offer the second CTW course, Phys4900, Research Project, as a regular course with 7 students enrolled. This allowed the students to get and give feedback from other students in addition to the course coordinator. It also allowed for group discussions of issues related to research, scientific writing, and other topics.

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 second CTW course, Phys4900, Research Project, students exhibited a very high level of critical thinking and scientific writing abilities. Before Phys4900 was created physics majors were required to complete only one credit hour of research and the structure of that research project was completely up to the research adviser. Also, students did not have a coherent preparation to their research project before the creation of the first CTW course, Phys3300, Advanced Physics Laboratory. Prior to that time physics
majors completed several one credit hour lab courses which did not provide a coherent preparation for research, scientific thinking or scientific writing. A common complaint from research advisers was that students doing projects with them were very unprepared and therefore often not very successful in their projects. In contrast, the 5 students who completed the Phys4900 course in Spring 2012 were extremely successful in these projects performing high quality research and producing very high quality research reports. Comparing scores on the physics rubric for these students with scores on the same rubric for Phys3300 (first CTW course) in Fall 2010 shows that final performance increased on average from about 3.5 to 3.75 out of 4.

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 major struggle is with the growth in enrollments. Future enrollments are hard to predict but the department has put into place a structure to offer the first CTW course in two sections to allow us to handle the demands and give the students the feedback they need. However, the extra demands on the instructors and the space demands are an important issue and may cause future difficulties.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Political Science
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The Department endorses the definition of Critical Thinking proposed to the Faculty Senate. Political Science courses will be designed to train students to “develop the wide range of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions needed to effectively identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments and truth claims; to discover and overcome personal prejudices; to formulate and present convincing reasons in support of conclusions; and to make reasonable, intelligent decisions about what to believe and what to do.” The political science CTW courses will be designed to develop and practice the following specific critical thinking skills - identification of a question or issue, consideration of assumptions and/or context, formulation of a testable hypothesis, collection and presentation of facts/data, analysis of facts/data, integration and synthesis of other perspectives and presentation of conclusions.

Goals
G 1: Identifying the Issue
Students will be able to identify a question or issue to investigate

G 2: Consideration of assumptions and context
Students will be able to consider assumptions and/or context of the issue

G 3: Formulation of testable hypothesis or thesis
Students will be able to formulate a testable hypothesis or clear and compelling thesis

G 4: Collection and presentation of data
Students will be able to collect, organize and present of facts/data

G 5: Analysis of Data
Students will be able to analyse facts/data

G 6: Integration of perspectives
Students will be able to integrate and synthesize of other perspectives

G 7: Presentation of Conclusions
Students will be able to effectively present conclusions of their research

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Effective Formulation of Research Question (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate through a paper or oral presentation the effective formulation of a research question. The central question, embedded and subsidiary issues, as well as relationships needed for effective analysis will be clearly identified, underlying assumptions will be identified and analyzed, and a clearly stated and testable hypothesis with a clear understanding of its drawback developed

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

O/O 2: Effective collection and use of data (G: 4, 5) (M: 1, 2)
Students will demonstrate effective collection and use of data through a paper in which they will identify most relevant facts, show evidence of search, selections and source evaluation and using appropriate methodology subject the data to complete analysis including an examination of possible shortcomings of the data

Standard Associations
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
**O/O 3: Effective Communication of results (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate effective communication through a paper and/or oral presentation of conclusions by providing clearly stated conclusions with examination of implications or consequences of conclusions. Students will also integrate other perspectives thoughtfully and respectfully

**Standard Associations**

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

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Rubric for Political Science 3800 (O: 1, 2, 3)**

In Political Science 3800, we used a rubric which measured the following CT skills (see Rubric): 1. Identification of research question 2. Formulation of a Testable Hypothesis 3. Analysis of facts/data 4. Presentation of Conclusions Student achievement was scored on a three level scale - Absent (0), Developing (1), Competent (2) - on each of the four CT skills above. For descriptions of each level of scoring see rubric POLS 3800

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

**Target for O1: Effective Formulation of Research Question**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the hypothesis portion of the rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

286 students completed POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2011-2012. 14 sections of the course were taught during the period. Two assessment scores were used to assess outcomes for this objective. On the Identification of Research Question assignment 69.0% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 33.2% scored a 1(Developing) 1.4% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 62.7% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 35.3% scored a 1(Developing) 2.8% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off.

**Target for O2: Effective collection and use of data**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the analysis portion of the rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 58.7% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 38.5% scored a 1(Developing) 2.8% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off. [Preview Formatting] [Preview Formatting]

**Target for O3: Effective Communication of results**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 1 or better out of 2 on the presentation portion of the rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill 63.6% of our students scored 2 (Competent), 33.9% scored a 1(Developing) and 2.4% scored 0 (Absent)

---

**M 2: Rubric for Political Science 4900 (O: 1, 2, 3)**

In Political Science 4900, we used a rubric which measured the following CT skills (see Rubric): 1. Identification of research question 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context 3. Formulation of a Testable Hypothesis 4. Collection and Presentation of facts/data 5. Analysis of facts/data 6. Integration and synthesis of other perspectives 7. Presentation of Conclusions Student achievement was scored on a four level scale - Absent (0), Developing (1-2), Competent (3-4), Sophisticated (5) - on each of the four CT skills above. For descriptions of each level of scoring see rubric POLS 4900 Items 1-3 above are related to the outcome of effectively formulating a research question Items 4-5 above are related to the outcome of effective collection and use of data Items 6-7 above are related to the outcome of effective communication of results

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

**Target for O1: Effective Formulation of Research Question**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 3 or better out of 5 on Items 1-3 of the rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

139 students completed POLS 4900 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2011-2012. 6 sections of the course were taught during the period. As of the deadline for this report assessment data was available on 115 students. The following sections are based on the available data. On the effective formulation of the research question portion of the rubric (items 1-3) the scores were as follows 1. Identification of question or issue - 29.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 59.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 11% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 23.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 58.5% scored 3-4 (Competent), 18.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 18.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 64.6% scored 3-4 (Competent) 15.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.

**Target for O2: Effective collection and use of data**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 3 or better out of 5 on the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

On the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric (items 4-5) the scores were as follows 4. Collection and presentation of facts/data - 32.9% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 51.2% scored 3-4 (Competent) 15.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 26.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 59.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 13.4% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.
**Target for O3: Effective Communication of results**

We expect that 80% of our students score a 3 or better out of 5 on the effective communication of the results portion of the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

On the Effective communication of results portion of the rubric (items 6-7) the scores were as follows: 6. Integration and synthesis of other perspectives - 26.6% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 54.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 18.7% scored 1-2 (Developing). 7. Presentation of conclusions - 25.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 55.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 19.4% scored 1-2 (Developing). Percentage figures are rounded off.

**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 on 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.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Rubric for Political Science 3800</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Effective Formulation of Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** The Plan requires the following enhancements to the teaching of POLS 4900: 1. A review session on developing a testable hypothesis early in the semester 2. An in-class or online peer review session devoted to discussion of research hypothesis development 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:** 05/2013
**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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Rubric for Political Science 4900</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Effective Formulation of Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Implementation Description:** Three actions will be implemented as part of the plan to improve CT skills in this area: 1. Students will be assigned readings reflecting a wide spectrum of viewpoints as part of the course. 2. The course will include one exercise devoted exclusively to the development of this CT skill 3. Greater weight will be given in grading to the ability to show competence in this area.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador and faculty teaching POLS 4900

**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 following are the main accomplishments of the CTW program in the Political Science Department: 1. The Department continued to meet its targets in all 7 goals and 3 outcomes/objectives of its CTW program. Assessment scores in both the CTW courses showed continued improvements. 2. The department also developed two additional rubrics to be used in the POLS 4900 courses starting next year. These reflect the methodological differences in various sections of POLS 4900 while still assessing similar CT skills. 3. An additional 7 faculty members were trained in and taught POLS 4900 and POLS 3800 the two CTW 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?**

Assessment standards were tightened for POLS 4900. Despite higher expectations and standards assessment scores saw improvement in the 2011-2012 year. These seem to indicate that the action plan in place for the CT areas where we are seeking improvement is working. In POLS 3800 the area of concern (formulation of testable hypothesis/thesis) identified in previous years saw an increase in assessment scores as shown below Rubric Item Assessment Score 2010-2011 Assessment Score 2011-2012 Identification of Research Question 65.9% - Competent 69.0% - Competent 28.5% - Developing 33.2% - Developing Formulation of Testable Hypothesis 57.7% - Competent 62.6% - Competent 33.7% - Developing 34.3% - Developing In POLS 4900 two areas of concern in previous years were (a) Formulation of Hypothesis and (b) incorporating other perspectives. The comparable scores reflecting stricter standards yet showing improved scores were as follows. However the scores on Integration and synthesis show that more attention needs to be paid to this CT skill Rubric Item Assessment Score 2010-2011 Assessment Score 2011-2012 Formulation of testable hypothesis-thesis 44.1% - Sophisticated 18.3% - Sophisticated 47.1% - Competent 64.8% - Competent Integration and synthesis of other perspectives 33.8% - Sophisticated 26.6% - Sophisticated 54.4% - Competent 54.7% - Competent
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?

This year faculty teaching POLS 4900 will pay special attention to improving the CT skill of integrating and synthesis of other perspectives.

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 main change has been the development and adoption of a two alternative rubrics for POLS 4900 in addition to the rubric already in use. These are designed to measure the same CT skills as reflected in courses in political theory and non-quantitative courses. These rubrics will make assessment more accurate and reflective of CT skills that students show.

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?

Please see answer to the previous section

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 noted above several changes have been made to the course content of POLS 3800 and POLS 4900 to address areas showing room for improvement in CT skills. The department also increased the rigor in assessment of CT skills requiring higher levels of achievement to receive scores at the level of Sophisticated in POLS 4900 and Competent in POLS 3800. Even though all the goals on all elements of the rubrics were met areas with lower scores were targeted for special attention in class.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

See above

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

The department continues to meet its goals in the area of CT skills. No new findings have emerged and the department continues its efforts to improve performance on those areas where assessment shows room for improvement

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

See above

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Psychology
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
In addition to meeting the requirements of the University’s CTW policy, the proposed CTW courses are designed to address recommendations by the American Psychological Association (APA) related specifically to the development of critical thinking skills in undergraduate psychology majors. For this reason, we shall operationally define and assess critical thinking in terms outlined by the APA, such as students’ ability to "evaluate the quality of information, including differentiating empirical evidence from speculation," "use reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals," "demonstrate an attitude... of persistence, open-mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, and intellectual engagement," and "use scientific principles and evidence to resolve conflicting claims" (APA, 2007, p. 15).

Goals
G 1: Critical thinking skills in psychology (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)
Measures, Targets, and Findings

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

Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)
In the 2011 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. 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. *** In the 2011 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The median score for Organization and Logic was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 97% 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 99% 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 are 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 2011 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.

In the 2011 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. 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 3. Takes a consistent position on the issue and attempts to address some 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. However, claims and/or evidence could be presented more clearly and/or objectively. 5. Takes a clear and balanced position on the issue, thoroughly addressing relevant counterevidence and/or alternate points of view. 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 Position and Balance on this assignment.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The median score for Position and Balance was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 99% 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 are summarized in Figure 2.

**Target for O3: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4)**

In the 2011 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 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 reader's intentions are 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 Use of Evidence on this assignment. ***In the 2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Content and Development 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. No details. 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant. 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant. 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing. 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise. 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner. 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 Citation and Use of Sources on this assignment. ***In the 2011 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. 0. No details. 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant. 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant. 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing. 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise. 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner. 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 2011 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. 0. No details. 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant. 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant. 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing. 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise. 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner. 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 Citation and Use of Sources on this assignment.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

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 are summarized in Figure 3.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

**Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (APA 7.1)**

In the 2011 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 reader's intentions are clearly expressed. 1. The reader's intentions are somewhat clear, but the writing obscures the writer's intentions. 2. The writer's intentions are partially clear, but the writing obscures the reader's intentions. 3. The writer's intentions are clearly expressed. 4. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 5. The reader's intentions are 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 Grammar and Mechanics on this assignment. ***In the 2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Content and Development 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. No details. 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant. 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant. 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing. 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise. 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner. 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 Grammar and Mechanics on this assignment. ***In the 2011 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 reader's intentions are clearly expressed. 1. The reader's intentions are somewhat clear, but the writing obscures the writer's intentions. 2. The writer's intentions are partially clear, but the writing obscures the reader's intentions. 3. The writer's intentions are clearly expressed. 4. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 5. The reader's intentions are 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 Grammar and Mechanics on this assignment. ***In the 2011 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. 0. No details. 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant. 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant. 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing. 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise. 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner. 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 Citation and Use of Sources on this assignment.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 94% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development was 3, which is in the 'developing' range, and 99% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the 'developing' range) or higher. The median score for Citation and Use of Sources was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 96% 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 are summarized in Figure 4.

**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 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 led cattle 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. Note: We did not receive learning outcome assessment data and/or sample papers from two of the five PSYC 4800 instructors by the deadline for submitting the report.

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

Target for O1: Uses critical thinking effectively (APA 3.1)

In the 2011 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. 0. Ideas are arranged in a chaotic way, with no logical connection between them (i.e., within sentences and/or paragraphs). 1. Ideas are arranged in an associative, digressive, elliptical, or circular manner; the logical connections between ideas are consistently unclear. 2. Ideas are arranged in a way that makes sense to the author, but is inappropriate for the purpose or audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are frequently unclear. 3. Ideas are arranged with some consideration for the purpose and audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are sometimes unclear. 4. Ideas are arranged in a manner appropriate to the purpose and audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are almost always clear. 5. Ideas are thoughtfully and effectively arranged in a manner appropriate to the purpose and audience of the assignment; the logical connections between ideas are consistently clear. 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. *** In the 2011 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 unquessioning 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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Use of Evidence was 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 73% 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 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 73% 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 are 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 2011 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. 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 counterevidence and alternate points of view. 3. Takes a consistent position on the issue and attempts to address some 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. However, claims and/or evidence could be presented more clearly and/or objectively. 5. Takes a clear and balanced position on the issue, thoroughly addressing relevant counterevidence and/or alternate points of view. 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 Position and Balance on this assignment.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Position and Balance was 4, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 77% 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 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 73% 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 are summarized in Figure 2.

Target for O3: Approaches problems creatively and effectively (APA 3.2 & 3.4)

In the 2011 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 1. Does not take a consistent position on the issue 2. Takes a consistent position on the issue, but ignores relevant counterevidence and alternate points of view. 3. Takes a consistent position on the issue and attempts to address some 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. However, claims and/or evidence could be presented more clearly and/or objectively. 5. Takes a clear and balanced position on the issue, thoroughly addressing relevant counterevidence and/or alternate points of view. 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The median score for Use of Evidence was 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 73% 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 4.5, which is in the 'mastering' range, and 73% 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 are summarized in Figure 3.

Target for O4: Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (APA 7.1)

In the 2011 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 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 rare and generally not disruptive to the reader. 4. Errors are rare and inconsequential to the reader. 5. The writer’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. *** In the 2011 CTW Writing Assessment Rubric, instructors rate the student's submission for Content and Development 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. No details 1. Few details, and these are generally inaccurate or irrelevant 2. A variety of details, but some are inaccurate or irrelevant 3. A variety of relevant and accurate details, but some relevant details are missing 4. Thorough, relevant, and accurate details, but could be more concise 5. Complete, relevant, and accurate details in an appropriately concise manner 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 Content and Development on this assignment. *** In the 2011 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. 0. Has committed intentional plagiarism by copying and/or paraphrasing one or more sentences from a sources and not using quotation marks or a citation to indicate the ideas are not his/her own 1. Has committed unintentional plagiarism by inappropriately paraphrasing one or more sentences from a source (e.g., by changing some of the original words and/or the original word order), although a citation is provided 2. Quotes rather than paraphrases a cited source 3. Properly paraphrases all sources and provides citations for them, but has errors in citation mechanics 4. Properly paraphrases and cites all sources, but does not consistently or skillfully integrate the cited material with his/her own ideas 5. Properly paraphrases and cites all sources, while consistently and skillfully integrating the cited material with his/her own ideas 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 Citation and Use of Sources on this assignment.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

The median score for Grammar and Mechanics was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 46% 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 4.5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 60% 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 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 73% 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 are summarized in Figure 4.

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

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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Dr. Darnell conducted two workshops for new PSYC 3530 faculty prior to the Fall 2011 term. In addition, she and other veteran PSYC 3530 instructors gathered teaching materials on a GoogleDocs site that new instructors can easily reference and add to. Dr. Tusher is preparing a similar resource site for PSYC 4800 instructors. Drs. Darnell and Tusher will be leading a faculty orientation for all CTW instructors, new and experienced, before the Fall 2012 term.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassadors

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 inclusion of the University of Kentucky’s current policies and procedures, the policy will also include the following materials that faculty may use to teach and assess plagiarism, as well as a detailed flow chart describing what to do when they identify plagiarism in students’ work.

Established in Cycle:2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: As of Fall 2011, all Psychology instructors, including those who teach CTW courses, must include the official department policy on plagiarism and cheating in their syllabi. Also, PSYC 3530 instructors have a specific set of materials to teach and assess plagiarism, as well as a detailed flow chart describing what to do when they identify plagiarism in students’ work.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassadors and the UPC Plagiarism Subcommittee

Additional Resources: Psychology faculty who report cases of plagiarism need better support from administrators at the College and University levels. Anecdotally, we know that some faculty do not report all cases of plagiarism they observe, because of past experiences where they have filed a report with the College and the case was not upheld upon appeal by the student. Specifically, cases where the student has clearly violated instructions regarding use of quotations, copying and pasting from sources, appropriate paraphrasing, and use of citations according to APA style have been rejected as plagiarism by faculty in other disciplines where quoting, simple substitution of key words, and other strategies for incorporating the ideas of others in one’s work are more commonly permitted. For example, when a student copied sentences from a source and provided a citation, but did not put the sentences in quotation marks, he/she was reported for plagiarism by a Psychology instructor. On appeal, however, the instructor was told that this was not plagiarism but a “punctuation error,” because the student had simply not put quotation marks around the copied material;
the fact that a citation had been provided meant the student was not plagiarizing. As defined by our discipline and explained in the assignment instructions, however, such word-for-word use of other's ideas, whether or not a citation is provided, is considered plagiarism in the absence of quotation marks. To effectively teach scientific writing according to our discipline specific style (i.e., APA style), Psychology faculty need the support of College and University administrators when we hold students responsible for writing without plagiarism. Preparing and presenting a case of academic dishonesty is a time consuming process for faculty, and Psychology faculty need to integrate this process into their courses without becoming discouraged. It is disheartening to be second-guessed by administrators who are not familiar with APA style and its requirements. Moreover, the lack of administrative support that Psychology faculty perceive decreases the frequency with which they incorporate writing assignments in their curriculum and reduces their enthusiasm for teaching courses where writing assignments are required (e.g., CTW courses).

**Revise Rubric (Again)**

Although the CTW Ambassadors in Psychology have historically conceptualized the ability to write well in a discipline-appropriate style as manifestation of students’ ability to think critically, we continue to receive feedback that this view is not in keeping with the intentions of the CTW initiative. Instead, we have been encouraged to treat writing simply as the medium instructors use to assess students’ critical thinking. Given that a writing-related goal was the only one not fully met by our students in this year’s assessment and that the resources necessary to adequately address students’ shortcomings in this area lie far beyond the scope of what we can provide as a department, we have elected to discontinue reporting writing-related data for CTW. In conjunction with this change in reporting practice, we are removing measures from our CTW Assessment Rubric that do not directly map onto constructs of critical thinking as defined by the American Psychological Association (APA). Specifically, we are removing measures used to assess students’ ability to communicate effectively in writing (i.e., Grammar and Mechanics, Content and Development, and Citation and Use of Sources). In addition, we are rewording the measures on the rubric to make them measure the critical thinking constructs defined by the APA more directly. We hope that these changes will streamline the data collection process for CTW instructors and reduce the burden of learning outcome assessment for all of us.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** 4800 Final Paper  
**Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate effective writing skills in various formats and for various purposes (APA 7.1)

**Implementation Description:** The revised CTW rubric will be ready for use in Summer 2012 courses and will be used throughout the 2012-2013 academic year.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**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?**

In keeping with the action plan on “Plagiarism Materials and Policy” described in our 2011 report, the Undergraduate Program subcommittee on plagiarism (Dr. Marika Lamoreaux, Chair), including the CTW Ambassadors for Psychology, wrote an official departmental policy on plagiarism and its requirements. This policy now appears in the syllabi for all courses in the department. In addition, the subcommittee prepared a comprehensive set of materials to help faculty teach students about plagiarism (e.g., what it is, how to recognize it, and how to avoid it) and assess their understanding of the relevant concepts. These materials include a detailed PowerPoint presentation, an in-class activity, an online training and assessment of plagiarism concepts, a contract for students to avoid plagiarism, and a flow chart detailing the steps to be followed in the event that plagiarism is identified in a student’s work. All of these materials are regularly used in sections of PSYC 3530, the entry level CTW course. In keeping with the action plan on “CTW Instructor Workshops,” Dr. Darnell conducted two workshops for new PSYC 3530 faculty prior to the Fall 2011 term. In addition, she and other veteran PSYC 3530 instructors gathered teaching materials on a GoogleDocs site that new instructors can easily reference and add to. Dr. Tusher is preparing a similar resource site for PSYC 4800 instructors. Drs. Darnell and Tusher will be leading a faculty orientation for all CTW instructors, new and experienced, before the Fall 2012 term. Following up on an Action Plan 2010-2011 Action Plan 2010-2011 Action Plan, the subcommittee is now offering 12-14 sections of PSYC 3530 each semester. Given our very large number of majors (2300+) and the limited class size for CTW courses (25 students/section), we have an extensive backlog of students who need to take this course and our offerings do not yet meet student demand. However, we plan to add 2-4 more sections per term in 2012-2013 and continue to offer 14-16 sections a semester until enrollments stabilize. Dr. Tusher chaired the Undergraduate Program subcommittee on improving PSYC 3530, our entry level CTW course. The subcommittee prepared and administered a comprehensive online survey about the quantitative core courses in the undergraduate program, including PSYC 3530, to all regular faculty. Based on the feedback the subcommittee received through the survey, the CTW assignments for PSYC 3530 were changed from an APA style literature review to a series of smaller assignments that focus on summarizing, synthesizing, and critiquing peer-reviewed empirical research articles; other data from the survey are being used to inform curriculum modifications in the department. Undergraduate Program subcommittee on improving PSYC 3530, our entry level CTW 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?**

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 improve to some extent from 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 two measures (i.e., 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). Students' median scores on Grammar & Mechanics did not improve between the two courses and remained in the Developing range.

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

When plans for the CTW program were first announced at the University level, our program had approximately 1200 majors and 40+ regular faculty. Currently, we have almost the same number of majors (approximately 1000 majors) and about the same number of regular faculty. As such, implementing the program under the College of Arts and Sciences enrollment restriction of 25 students per section of a CTW course is effectively impossible if we adhere to original goals of staffing these courses exclusively with regular faculty. Although this might not seem to be the case if one looks at the numbers in a superficial way (i.e., to meet the basic demand of teaching 1/4 of our students per year, we would need to a minimum of 12 sections of an entry level course and 12 sections of an exit level course offered per semester, Fall and Spring), this does not take into account a number of factors: First, the backlog of Psychology students who need CTW courses in Academic Year 2010-2011 is enormous. As of Fall 2011, one third of our sophomores and over half of our seniors had not taken any CTW courses. If we add these students to the 300 juniors who should have been enrolling in our entry level CTW course this year, we needed to teach 42 sections of 3530 and 30 sections of 4800 during the 2011-2012 academic year just to catch up and be on track for Fall 2012. Even with the Chair compelling every available faculty member to teach at least one CTW course during the year, we were only able to offer 21 sections of 3530 -- including four hybrid sections, two of which were taught by visiting lecturer -- and 16 sections of 4800 -- 10 will be taught in Summer 2012, one of which is available for 10hp only if we use 10hp by a visiting lecturer. In short, we were able to address less than half of our student demand. We currently have 23 sections of 3530 and 11 sections of 4800 on the books for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. At this rate, our backlog will only increase as time goes by. Second, the increased demands on tenure track (TT) faculty to secure external grants, publish in top-tier journals, and teach and mentor larger numbers of graduate students, have reduced their availability to teach undergraduate courses in general and their interest in teaching CTW courses in particular. Third, new requirements for non-tenure track faculty (NTT) require that they must teach at least 11 sections of 4800 on the books for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Therefore, this solution goes against one of the goals of the CTW initiative, which was to increase students' critical thinking in the discipline, which is the main goal of the CTW initiative. These increased demands on faculty could be mediated by the presence of graduate student writing consultants, but our department does not even have a sufficient number of graduate students to serve as teaching assistants or lab instructors as it is, so we would be unable to fill any writing assistant positions that this change might create unless we staffed them with temporary faculty (i.e., Visiting Lecturers or Part-time Instructors), requesting additional TT and NTT faculty lines -- this requires approval of the Dean and the availability of resources that we have no control over designing hybrid versions of our entry level course that would allow us to offer two sections in one classroom per timeslot (e.g., one section meets in person on Tuesday and a different section meets in person on Thursday at a given time in a given room) -- we have offered four sections like this in Spring 2012 hiring Visiting Lecturers (VLs) to cover CTW courses -- we had 2 teaching CTW courses in Spring 2012, one of whom will also teach a CTW course in Summer 2012; we are actively seeking to hire large number of NTT faculty lines for 2013 to address the demand for the required courses at the 3000- and 4000-levels to CTW courses -- these courses currently have enrollments of 48-75 students per section, so this would result in our needing a larger number of faculty to teach the same number of students and would have the potential to place a disproportionate burden on faculty from specific programs (i.e., cognitive science) modifying the major requirements to include our exit level course 4800 as a viable substitute for current advanced courses in the major (Area F) -- this would increase the commitments that the Undergraduate Committee must make in order to secure space for the required courses, that we are allocated by the College, so it is a viable but non-immediate solution copying models that are working in other large departments (e.g., Biology) -- structural differences in the types of courses we offer (i.e., lab courses vs. lecture courses) and the availability of graduate students to cover classes that cannot be taught by faculty who are covering CTW courses (i.e., we don't have any) prevent us from adopting these alternate approaches permitting students who could find and were qualified to enroll in ext-level CTW courses in related programs (e.g., Sociology) to meet their requirement for Psychology by completing that course and preparing a report detailing how the course content connected with Psychology as a discipline (cf. an Honors project) -- we were told by the relevant college administrators that this option did not conform to the requirements of the Senate resolution regarding CTW that specifies CTW courses must be in the students' major and cannot be replaced with courses in other programs making all stand-alone Honors sections of courses compliant with CTW requirements -- this will only help Honors students meet the CTW requirement, but we hope it will reduce some of the demand on non-Honors CTW sections. Basically, to meet the goals of the CTW initiative as it is currently structured without further delaying our students' progress toward graduation, we need the College to give us huge amounts of money to hire VLs to fill the instructional gaps that our current regular faculty cannot fill and to approve fund 10 or more new regular faculty lines (TT and NTT) so that we can eventually discontinue the use of VLs as CTW instructors. Related to the challenges our program is facing in meeting student demand for CTW courses during the regular school year, we continue to struggle with whether or not to offer CTW courses during the summer term. As mentioned in our previous report, we struggled with the idea of offering a week summer term course this year. We understand that logistical problems in many cases because of the limited amount of time that students have to absorb and reflect on material and that faculty have to provide sufficient, meaningful feedback on critical thinking assignments. This is particularly true in the case of our entry level course, PSYC 3530, which the full faculty agrees should not be taught in the summer under any circumstances. However, because so many Psychology students are unable to register for the CTW courses that they need in order to meet graduation requirements and have complained about this up the administrative chain, the Chair has been told that the department must find a way to supply at least one section of CTW this summer. The only way that we can do so in the summer only increases the likelihood that Psychology majors will complete their CTW sequence without ever having had a regular faculty instructor. This solution goes against one of the goals of the CTW initiative, which was to increase students' classroom interaction with regular faculty in their major program. The good news is that this conflict can be avoided altogether if our department receives sufficient support from the College and University to implement one or more of the solutions listed above,
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 we strongly support the spirit and goals of the CTW initiative, our department's inability to field a sufficient number of CTW courses may be the number one force preventing Psychology majors from graduating in a timely fashion. Because the faculty want our students to progress through the major and graduate from GSU at a reasonable pace, addressing the problems raised by the CTW initiative has become one of the primary concerns of our undergraduate program. The Undergraduate Program Committee is actively trying to find workable solutions, but is not willing to compromise the program's academic standards in the process. As CTW Ambassadors, we continue to support our students and CTW faculty as much as possible. We have formal workshops to train faculty and regularly work on improving the materials and guidance we provide instructors to facilitate their success. Additionally, both ambassadors have an open-door policy that we hope encourages faculty to come to us anytime they have questions or concerns about CTW, including their courses specifically or the initiative more broadly. The department's Writing Center continues to offer one-on-one tutoring for Psychology students in CTW courses and the peer tutors have also started offering writing-related workshops that faculty schedule as part of the classroom experience. At an individual level, faculty report that they enjoy teaching CTW courses, particularly at the exit level. Even at the entry level, new instructors often comment that students are very responsive to the format and that they like working through the challenging topics in a smaller section. New faculty have had good success teaching CTW courses and two of our incoming faculty are already scheduled to teach the entry level course during their first semester on campus. Students enrolled often comment (in SEIs) that their critical thinking and scientific literacy skills are notably improved as a result of the CTW curriculum.
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Goals

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 2: Preparation of a research proposal (G: 3, 4)
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
Description of rubric. See repository.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

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: Finished
  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
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 "Evaluate assumptions, evidence, ideas, & 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 "Synthesize ideas & information."

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, and solutions."

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Rubric (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
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.
Target for **O1: Data Evaluation**
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: **Met** |
| Fall 2011 average: 2.50 Spring 2012 average: 2.69 |

Target for **O2: Analytical skills**
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: **Met** |
| Fall 2011 average: 2.25 Spring 2012 average: 2.38 |

Target for **O3: Evaluation of evidence**
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: **Met** |
| Fall 2011 average: 2.50 Spring 2012 average: 2.46 |

Target for **O4: Integration of materials**
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: **Met** |
| Fall 2011 average: 2.38 Spring 2012 average: 2.377 |

Target for **O5: Conclusions**
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: **Met** |
| Fall 2011 average: 2.63 Spring 2012 average: 2.54 |

Target for **O6: Communication**
Students in class achieve average score of 2.0 out of 3.0 on corresponding element of the rubric.

| Findings 2011-2012 - Target: **Met** |
| Fall 2011 average: 2.50 Spring 2012 average: 2.77 |

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Rubric
- Outcome/Objective: Analytical skills | Communication | Conclusions | Data Evaluation | Evaluation of evidence | Integration of materials

**Implementation Description:** Ambassador provided instructors with new targets agreed upon in faculty meeting. Instructors implemented and reported results to Ambassador in new format.

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Ambassador and then instructors.

**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.
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.

Train new instructor in CTW

The previous CTW instructor is leaving GSU, so the Ambassador will share all previous reports and assignments with the newly assigned instructor and provide assistance with implementing and evaluating CTW in the course.

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 instructor addressed this issue of clear communication by changing the structure of the class from a weekly case discussion led by the instructor to a weekly case discussion led by a student. All students were held responsible for reading the weekly case and participating in class discussions. An individual student was charged each week with preparing a PowerPoint presentation of the case and delivering a presentation to the class. A three (3) page written summary of the case was also submitted to the instructor. The faculty reviewed examples of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior reports and examine the student performance relative to the scores. The ambassador met with the instructor to communicate the faculty’s findings and recommendations. In response, the instructor changed the course delivery to increase students’ practice of communication outside of the revision and resubmit 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 level?

We believe this weekly exercise helped the students in completing the revise and resubmit case exercises.

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?

Changes in instructors requires supervision and training by the Ambassador and concern about consistency in standards and grading.

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 academic program has been the modification of assignments in one course. The primary impact of CTW on our students is a problem with scheduling required prerequisite courses to take the CTW capstone course to graduate. The primary impact on faculty has been additional work for development of assignments, tracking of grades on individual objectives, reporting, and training. The specification of the targets were changed to align with assessment plans for the BBA major program.
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. Since all upper-level Religious Studies courses require significant writing and since many of our majors go off to top graduate programs, the mission 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.

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)

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 analyzes a contemporary religious phenomenon in light of scholarly theories discussed in class. 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. These assignments will require students to analyze religious phenomena (thinking), write clearly and effectively (writing), and assess scholarly arguments (evaluation).

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Writing for CTW (O: 1)

Rels 3750: In a final paper, students will analyze a contemporary religious phenomenon in light of scholarly theories discussed in class. Students' 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 presentation of a clear thesis statement, 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 (measures goals in thinking and evaluation) 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 (measures goals in writing) 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 (measures goals in thinking and evaluation) 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 (measures goals in 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 analyze a contemporary religious phenomenon in light of scholarly theories discussed in class. 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
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Implement scoring via rubric of assignments and collection of final papers

As explained above, the key players in the CTW program within Religious Studies have met and developed a plan for 2010-2011. We will continue to use the series of progressively more advanced assignments developed in the departments' CTW offering during Spring 2010 (described in detail above), and we will implement the other aspects of the existing CTW plan. Specifically: (1) the CTW instructor will use the departmental CTW rubric to assess all CTW assignments in the course and will collect and preserve these scores; (2) the CTW instructor will collect and preserve 10 randomly selected final papers from each section taught; and (3) the department assessment committee in conjunction with the CTW Ambassador and CTW Instructors will assess the collected final papers based on the rubric and will use these assessments as the basis for a departmental discussion of student learning in CTW during the Spring 2011 semester.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: (1) The CTW instructor will use the departmental CTW rubric to assess all CTW assignments in the course and will collect and preserve these scores; (2) the CTW instructor will collect and preserve 10 randomly selected final papers from each section taught; and (3) the department assessment committee in conjunction with the CTW Ambassador and CTW Instructors will assess the collected final papers based on the rubric and will use these assessments as the basis for a departmental discussion of student learning in CTW during the Spring 2011 semester.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador, and CTW Instructors
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
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.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CTW ambassador for 2010-11 (McClymond), CTW ambassador for 2011-12 (Weiner), and CTW course instructor (Barzegar)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

For Rels 3750: In spring '12 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final papers written for the Rels 3750 class using the rubric. 50% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 80% 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 40% 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 able to organize their papers effectively. However, they have difficulty maintaining a focus for their papers, 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. It seemed that several of the students did not fully understand the nature of the assignment, which also may account for these results. 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. It also will be important for the Rels 3750 instructor to devote more class time to making sure the students understand the expectations for this final paper assignment. For 4750: In spring '12 the CTW ambassador reviewed 10 final response essays written for Rels 4750 using the rubric. 90% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for focus; 80% 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 40% of the papers received a score of 18 or higher for writing. The CTW ambassador also reviewed 10 final papers written for Rels 4750. 80% 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; 30% 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 mechanics. Based on these findings, it appears that students are able to craft a thesis statement and organize their papers effectively. However, they have difficulty demonstrating mastery of content and incorporating material from a primary or secondary source effectively. These results suggest that students’ writing has tended to improve from taking Rels 3750 to finishing Rels 4750. This past semester, the Rels 4750 instructor made changes to the syllabus to focus more on writing skills, and these changes appear to have proven effective, but perhaps to the point that content material was neglected. The Rels 4750 instructor will make changes to the syllabus to try to establish greater balance between these objectives.
### Strategy for improving Ideas/Content and Writing/Mechanics

As noted in the findings, students completing Rels 3750 (the introductory Religious Studies CTW course) continue not to 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. The Rels 3750 instructor will also be encouraged to spend more time making sure that students understand the nature of the assignment. Last year, the Rels 4750 instructor was encouraged to spend more time in class addressing these writing/mechanical issues. It appears that this strategy had some success, but to the detriment of ideas/content. The Rels 4750 instructor will be encouraged to maintain the focus on writing, but also revise syllabus to restore some time to content material.

- **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?
  - In Rels 4750, students demonstrated some progress in the areas of focus, organization, and writing -- both from 3750 to 4750, and from 2011 results in 4750 to 2012 results. Increased focus in Rels 4750 on writing, rather than content, seems to have achieved some degree of success. Last year's action plan specified that Rels 4750 instructor would revise syllabus to spend more time on writing. This appears to have been successfully implemented.

- **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?**
  - This was more difficult to assess, especially because this is the first year that I am serving in the position of CTW ambassador. I hope to be able to reflect more on improvement in future years. There was no discernible improvement in critical thinking in my findings this year. Students in both Rels 3750 and 4750 struggled to integrate course content into their final papers. While many were able to adequately summarize arguments and materials with which they had been presented, there was less evidence of critical thought or evaluation.

- **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 area for improvement that I saw was in students' ability to analyze/evaluate scholarly arguments and integrate this analysis into their final written papers. They could also work to develop more sophisticated thesis statements/arguments that reflect this higher level thinking and analysis. Perhaps the rubric could be revised to more adequately address some of these concerns. We could definitely benefit from increased communication among the CTW instructors and ambassador. I don't know if assistance is needed to make that happen. We probably just need to devote more 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?**
  - This is difficult to assess. Most of our upper-level course already involved high degrees of writing and analysis. I think the CTW program has made there appear to be greater continuity from the 3750 course to the 4750 capstone course, however. There is greater emphasis on tracking our students' progress from the introductory course for majors to the capstone. This is important. The department did a better job this year of implementing the grading rubric that had been established 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?

- **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 the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

n/a

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

n/a

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? 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
2011-2012 CTW Respiratory Therapy
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: NBRC (M: 1)
All students will: 1. 90% of students will pass the national certification exam on the first attempt offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care. 2. 90% of students will pass the written national registry exam on the first attempt offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care. 3. 90% of students will pass the clinical simulation national registry exam on the first attempt offered by the National Board for Respiratory Care.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: NBRC Results (O: 1)
The graduating class, May 2012 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 currently reported at 77%. Ninety-seven percent of the class passed the written registry on the first attempt. The national average for this exam is currently reported at 65%. Ninety-three percent of the class passed the clinical simulation exam on the first attempt. The national average for this exam is currently reported at 59%. 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 correct complete the course and to pass the national examinations. The goal will be to have a 90% 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: Planned
Priority: High

Respiratory Therapy CTW Action Plan
The Division of RT will continue to develop the critical thinking ability of our students to complete both CTW courses and to pass the national examinations. The goal will be to have a 90% 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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Continue CTW courses, making changes if needed.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All RT 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 highest overall percentage of students passed the national exams on the first try, compared to previous years. All students passed both national exams achieving the credential RRT.

**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 major goal of the respiratory therapy program is to train and graduate respiratory therapists. To do this each student must become a better critical thinker in order to pass the national exams. Since the inception of the CTW program we have had gains in first time pass rates on the national registry exam each year. As a department we feel confident that we have the correct faculty teaching students critical evaluation that we are pressuring ourselves to have a 100% first time pass rate next 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?

We are continuing to work on appropriate CTW exercises for RT 4085. Currently, we are working on a better assessment tool (rubric) that can be used for all writing assignments. The ambassador just returned from the Governor's Teaching Fellowship and will schedule a meeting with both CTW instructors to consider techniques learned as a Teaching Fellow may be integrated into courses. Plan will also be to meet with Center for Instructional Innovation to discuss ideas that may contribute strengthening our CTW offerings.

**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 CTW, we feel is in our students' ability to critically evaluate a patient. The work done in RT 3027 (Pulmonary Disease) sets the standard for students to critically and appropriately make decisions that can be life saving. The capstone course, RT 4085 finalizes students' critical evaluation. This course integrates writing across the curriculum with CTW in an effort not only to evaluate students’ critical thinking, but also to express themselves creatively. The main difference in this reporting year is the students were not getting previously. The hope also is that the change will make improvements to the CTW curriculum in respiratory therapy.

---

**Georgia State University**
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**2011-2012 CTW Risk Management**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 3: Goal 3 Demonstration of Thinking through Writing (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students should be able to conduct simple analysis of risk using facts and theories to make conclusions. Students were given three writing opportunities (mini-cases) where they were asked to write a 3 page paper. Students were assessed on form (grammar and spelling), citation skills, use of risk management and their willingness to make a conclusion. An exemplar case was based upon the launch of the space shuttle Challenger. The students did not know if as the Challenger (as it was disguised as a Nascar race). The students were given some engineering data, some weather data, a model to use, They were then asked questions about their decision. They had to justify their decision to race/launch. While the cases were designed for the critical thinking component of the class, we decided to make a push for organization and describing conclusions.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Goal 1 Risk Assessment Process (G: 1) (M: 1)**
A number (3) of mini cases are assigned throughout the semester. These mini cases will ask the students to make an assessment of one part of the risk management process. A final case will ask them to use the skills form the entire semester to identify and manage risks in a game simulation based on a real firm.

**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 90% students will be able to describe the risk management process appropriately for their case study firm.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

We used a new assignment again. This new assignment is a simulation of a tractor Manufacturer. The case questions sepically ask the students to undertake a risk management process. The students were then asked to describe what they did, explain their rationale, and make a conclusion. One the rubric question regarding the use of the risk management process. Some 95% of the students answered this question appropriately. Because the rubric is more complicated (than the one we employed in the past) we have changed our target to imply that 90 percent or more describe the risk management process appropriately for their case study firm.

#### 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 approximately 85% received a 8 out of 10 on the rubric. (updated June 2012)

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

90 percent received at least an 8 out of 10 on the rubric. I view the target as being met, but I know that we are so focused on getting the students to understand this particular issue, that it is almost like teaching to the test. I think it is time we expand this goal and what it means to be met.

#### M 3: Thinking through Writing (O: 3)

We used a standard rubric to assess students performance on writing over three mini-cases. The average rubric score was 81 (out of an adjusted 100 points) on exercise 1 and 91 (out of and adjusted 100) on exercise 3.

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

**Target for O3: Goal 3 Demonstration of Thinking through Writing**

Our target is to improve the initial rubric score over the course of the semester.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average rubric score was 81 (out of an adjusted 100 points) on exercise 1 and 91 (out of and adjusted 100) on exercise 3.

### 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 not 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

---
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**2011-2012 CTW Social Work**

*(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 viewpoints to reach well-reasoned solutions and conclusions. Undergraduate social work majors may demonstrate their critical thinking abilities by:

- raising important questions and problems, and articulating them concisely and precisely;
- gathering and assessing relevant information, and showing the ability to interpret it effectively;
- maintaining an open mind when considering alternative thinking/ideas, assessing and evaluating assumptions, implications and practical consequences;
- developing well-reasoned conclusions and solutions to problems, using relevant criteria and standards; and
- communicating effectively with others when articulating complex problems and possible solutions.


---

**Goals**

**G 1: SW3300: Use critical thinking skills applicable to human development**

Achieve a beginning to moderate level of using critical thinking skills to inform and communicate professional judgement on issues related to child and adolescent development within a social environment context. NOTE: The course numbering was changed from 3330 to 3300 beginning Fall, 2011.

**G 5: SW3600: Define and communicate social problems requiring legislative responses**

Develop skill sets to enhance public understanding about current social problems requiring public policy responses. NOTE: The course numbering was changed from 3930 to 3600 beginning Spring, 2012.

**G 3: SW3300: Recognize various forms of diversity in human development**

Acknowledge and communicate the effects of diversity in shaping experiences through the life span. NOTE: The course numbering was changed from 3330 to 3300 beginning Fall, 2011.

**G 4: SW3600: Demonstrate understanding of the legislative process**

Demonstrate an understanding of the legislative process while advocating for social change. NOTE: The course numbering was changed from 3930 to 3600 beginning Spring, 2012.

**G 6: Develop Advocacy Skills and Strategies**

As policy practitioners, students develop skills to actively advocate for legislative policy to promote the needs of various constituency groups.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: SW3300: Demonstrate proficiency in problem solving methods (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Define the biological, psychological and social aspects of human development relevant to client behavior and other outcomes.

**SLO 3: SW3300: Application of empirical research to social work practice (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Apply empirical studies on human development to guide social work intervention and practice behaviors.

**SLO 5: SW3600: Define social problem and its background (G: 4, 5) (M: 5)**
To become actively engaged in studying social problems through the use of multiple sources of public documents, peer-review articles, and conducting interviews with legislators and community stakeholders.

**SLO 6: SW3600: Synthesize legislative policy content (G: 5) (M: 5, 6)**

To communicate synthesized legislative content (including policy justification/intent, service benefit description, targeted recipients, and effect on Georgia residents) to defined community stakeholders.

**SLO 7: SW3600: Develop advocacy skills and strategies (M: 7)**

To inform targeted stakeholders about current legislative policies through the development of a legislative fact sheet.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: SW3300: Problem Assessment (O: 1)

A measured component of the Wes Moor Letter Response: Problem Assessment (Please see the Document Repository for full assignment description and rubric). In this section of the assignment, the student was evaluated on 3 criteria: 1. Identify a problem or event that occurred in the early developmental years potentially leading to his ultimate incarceration. 2. Describe how the problem or event affects a young person’s biological, psychological and/or social development; 3. Construct an ecomap visually depicting the interrelationship among multiple environmental systems. (An example of an ecomap is included in the document repository.

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

**Target for O1: SW3300: Demonstrate proficiency in problem solving methods**

The problem assessment section of the assignment is worth a total of 11/60 points. Sixty-five percent of the students enrolled in the course will achieve a sectional score of 8/11 points or higher. This represents a majority of the enrolled students achieving 70% of the assessed points on the the problem assessment section of the assignment.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

There was a total of 104 students enrolled in SW3300; complete data was available on 73 students(70%). Students completed two drafts of the assignment, supported by the writing consultants. Based on the rubric for the assignment, 56 students (76%) received a score of 8 or higher on the final submission of the assignment for the problem assessment section.

#### M 2: SW3300: Theoretical Perspectives

Two sections of the assignment relate to the application of one theoretical perspective (psychodynamic, cognitive, social learning) to explain Wes Moore's reaction to an identified problem or event. Three peer-reviewed articles were used to support the identified problem.

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

**Target for O3: SW3300: Application of empirical research to social work practice**

The problem intervention section of the assignment is worth a total of 10 points. A majority (70%) of the students enrolled in the course will achieve a final score of 7 or higher on the problem intervention section of the assignment.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Based on a total of 71 students, 45 students (63%) met the target of achieving 7 or higher on the intervention section of the assignment.

#### M 3: SW3300: Problem Intervention (O: 3)

. The third section of the Wes Moore Letter assignment requires students to select one article that might propose a solution to an identified problem. Students must interpret the information from the article and explain its application to the Wes Moore case.

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

**Target for O3: SW3300: Application of empirical research to social work practice**

The problem intervention section of the assignment is worth a total of 10 points. A majority (70%) of the students enrolled in the course will achieve a final score of 7 or higher on the problem intervention section of the assignment.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Based on a total of 71 students, 45 students (63%) met the target of achieving 7 or higher on the intervention section of the assignment.

#### M 4: SW3300: Recognition of diversity in practice applications

The final measured segment of the Wes Moore letter assignment relates to assessing how the proposed intervention effects, including ethical considerations involving he application of the intervention with diverse groups.

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

#### M 5: SW3600: Social Problem Statement and Justification (O: 5, 6)

In developing the legislative fact sheet, two measured sections of the document consisted of a description of the issue (Issue Statement) and the justification of the social problem needing public action. A maximum of 6 points was attributed to the measured sections of the legislative fact sheet.

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

**Target for O5: SW3600: Define social problem and its background**

Sixty-five percent of the students will achieve a rubric score of 4 or higher, out of 6 possible points on the two summed items comprising the evaluative items for the issue statement. This represents a majority of students achieving 70% of the assessed points.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

There were a total of 79 students completing the course; 44 students (56%) had complete data that comprised the present findings. A total of 38/44 (86%) students achieved a score of 4 or higher on the two summed measured sections on issue statement and background justification, meeting the expected target. The average score for the issue section is 5.5.
Target for O6: SW3600: Synthesize legislative policy content

Scoring for the measured items are based on categorical data, ranging from a high of 3 (yes, the student met the requirement), 2 (Maybe the student met the requirement), (1 No, the student did not meet the requirement)A maximum score of 6 points is attributed to the Issue Statement/Description and Issue Background. A majority (70%) of the students will achieve a score of 2 or higher on the problem description.

M 6: SW3600: Legislative Content (O: 6)
The legislative fact sheet contains three criteria consisting of policy identifiers (e.g., sponsors, bill title, bill content summary), specific policy details, and association between the social problem and the policy response. The maximum summed measure for these criteria was a total of 9 points based on the assignment rubric.

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

Target for O6: SW3600: Synthesize legislative policy content

A majority (65%) of the students completing the course will achieve a summed score of 6.3 or higher on the legislative content section of the fact sheet, representing 70% of the assessed points.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on the 44 students with complete data, 39 students (87%) achieved a summed score of 6.3 or higher on the policy content section of the assignment, meeting the targeted goal. The average score for the legislative content section of the assignment is 7.8.

M 7: SW3600: Advocacy Skills and Strategies (O: 7)

Measuring advocacy strategies is based on 5 components: action request (clear and specific request for public action on the defined public problem), action tools directed to the targeted audience (sponsor contact information, other public action information), objectivity (bias free presentation), overall professional presentation (clarity, organization, general appearance), readiness to take action as requested.

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

Target for O7: SW3600: Develop advocacy skills and strategies

A maximum score of 15 points is attributed to the advocacy section of the legislative fact sheet. A majority (70%) of the students will achieve a summed score of 11 or higher on the assessed advocacy section, representing 70% of the assessed score.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on the scores obtained from 44 students with complete data, 33 students (75%) met the target of achieving a score of 11 or higher on the advocacy section of the legislative fact sheet. The average score for the advocacy section of the assignment is 12.3.

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

Intervention

The intervention section of the paper required students to review the literature to identify an intervention scheme to address the needs of the fictional client. The plan of action stated under the theoretical section aligns with this assessment, as well. During the faculty orientation, discussions and an action plan will be conducted during the fall orientation in August and continue throughout the semester.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Literature Review Plan of Action II
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Social Work CTW Team

Literature Review

The finding of this section aligns with comments from the writing consultants about the necessity to provide necessary supports to help students how to conduct literature reviews. To address this issue, the school librarian serves on the CTW team for the School; the issue will be raised with her and faculty to determine what additional supports are required to help students enhance their skills to review and critique literature. Reading materials/reference guides will be explored as a possible resource provided to students. The process will begin in August, 2012 during the orientation session with the Schools CTW team.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: SW3300: Problem Intervention | Outcome/Objective: SW3300: Application of empirical research to social work practice
  Implementation Description: Develop specific course-based resources to assist students in conducting literature reviews.
  Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
  Responsible Person/Group: Social Work CTW Team

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?

In 2010-2011, decisions were made to modify the course offerings and CTW course assignments. Following several meetings with CTW faculty and consultation with CTW administrators, the following changes were implemented in the 2011-2012 academic year 1.
SW3340 - Human Behavior in the Social Environment was dropped as a CTW course requirement. This decision was made following faculty and student input specifying the burden of having students enroll in two CTW courses (SW3340 and 3930) during the spring semester. Course assignments and requirements in using the CTW writing consultants was not always distinct, creating confusion with students. It was also administratively difficult to acquire additional consultants to recruit and train for the additional course in the spring. As a result, SW3340 - Human Behavior and Social Environment II, was dropped, and 3930 (renumbered 3600) was maintained as a CTW course offering. During fall classes discussions about course assignments, there was much deliberation about how to design course assignments that highlighted certain critical thinking knowledge and writing skills, but also provide opportunities for students to be creative and innovative. Past efforts were to use the older version of a research term paper without many modifications. The assignments were too dense to serve as a critical thinking assignment. As such, the assignments in the two CTW courses (SW3300 and SW3600) were modified and implemented this academic year. ASSIGNMENT MODIFICATIONS SW3300 - Human Behavior and Social Environment is a course that reviews human development in a social context. The modified CTW assignment requires students to respond to the letter giving an assessment of his life challenges, the effect of those challenges on his life choices, and a potential intervention that has potential to influence negative outcomes. The assignment challenged students to synthesize a large amount of information, data, and articulate their perspective in a format understandable to a nonprofessional. Students were required to submit 2 drafts to the CTW writing consultants. The course instructors used one class session to hold independent consultations with students. In addition, there was one session APA formatting and forms of plagiarism prepared and presented by the writing assignments. As a result, there were 53 writing consultation sessions with students enrolled in the course. SW3600 - Social Welfare Policy is a course that requires students to track a bill through the state legislation session to their passions. This cohort, received a doctoral degree, the other faced difficult life challenges and was ultimately incarcerated with a life sentence. The assignment was based on a fictitious letter from Wes Moore held in prison who asks for explanations as to why his life turned out the way it did. Students had to respond to the letter giving an assessment of his life challenges, the effect of those challenges on his life choices, and a potential intervention that has potential to influence negative outcomes. The assignment challenged students to synthesize a large amount of information, data, and articulate their perspective in a format understandable to a nonprofessional. Students were required to submit 2 drafts to the CTW writing consultants. The course instructors used one class session to hold independent consultations with students. In addition, there was one session APA formatting and forms of plagiarism prepared and presented by the writing assignments. As a result, there were 53 writing consultation sessions with students enrolled in the course. Social work students recognize that social work practice involves critical thinking. It is not only in the CTW courses when critical thinking is introduced to them, but it is given much attention across the curriculum. The Council on Social Work Education embodies the need for critical thinking in the accreditation standards. Critical thinking is an essential component of the social work curriculum. In most courses, critical thinking is part of the criteria for evaluating student performance. Thus, any improvement in critical thinking cannot be attributed to the CTW courses only, but to the effects of the entire curriculum. There may be modifications in the implementation of the assignments, but the core content of the assignments will remain. Management of CTW:

Lead faculty had the general supervision of the CTW consultants. During the spring semester, the CTW coordinator taught the CTW policy course. General meetings were instituted on a monthly basis to review course assignments, address questions on student work, share information about assignment resources. The meetings were also attended by other faculty teaching the course. The meetings were especially helpful for part-time faculty assigned to teaching the course. Lead faculty for the course had the responsibility of keeping all faculty informed about course requirements and assignments. Despite these efforts, there were some missing pieces in working with faculty that continue to need monitoring by the CTW coordinator. For example, making certain that faculty, particularly part-time faculty, are reminded of required CTW data, how to perform data collection. A plan of action will be developed to address this issue.

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? Social work students recognize that social work practice involves critical thinking. It is not only in the CTW courses when critical thinking is introduced to them, but it is given much attention across the curriculum. The Council on Social Work Education embodies the need for critical thinking in the accreditation standards. Critical thinking is an essential component of the social work curriculum. In most courses, critical thinking is part of the criteria for evaluating student performance. Thus, any improvement in critical thinking cannot be attributed to the CTW courses only, but to the effects of the entire curriculum. There may be modifications in the implementation of the assignments, but the core content of the assignments will remain. Management of CTW:

Lead faculty had the general supervision of the CTW consultants. During the spring semester, the CTW coordinator taught the CTW policy course. General meetings were instituted on a monthly basis to review course assignments, address questions on student work, share information about assignment resources. The meetings were also attended by other faculty teaching the course. The meetings were especially helpful for part-time faculty assigned to teaching the course. Lead faculty for the course had the responsibility of keeping all faculty informed about course requirements and assignments. Despite these efforts, there were some missing pieces in working with faculty that continue to need monitoring by the CTW coordinator. For example, making certain that faculty, particularly part-time faculty, are reminded of required CTW data, how to perform data collection. A plan of action will be developed to address this issue.

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? Annual Survey At the end of each semester, faculty and writing consultants are asked to complete a survey inquiring about their needs, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement in the CTW courses. Neither faculty nor CTW instructors have pointed out any problematic problems that need immediate attention. Faculty are gaining comfort with the newly designed assignments; no new iterations are expected in the next academic year. The CTW writing consultants noted the need to have more resources to help students with specific writing needs, specifically for conducting literature reviews. The SW3300 assignment’s weakest areas involved using literature to justify the selection of a theoretical framework and intervention to address the needs of the fictional client. Development of a plan of action to enhance students’ skills to identify, assess and utilize literature effectively is a priority for the next academic year. The School’s CTW team will work to consider what resources are needed to help students with this issue. There is the need to provide additional support to part-time faculty who are assigned to teach CTW courses. Establishing greater communication mechanisms to ensure part-time faculty are capturing the essence of CTW and how it should be reflected in teaching course content and assignments. A goal for the next academic year is to increase the percent of complete data from students. Although there is a lead faculty for each course who has responsibility for monitoring any part-time faculty on course content, there is the need to ensure they are adhering to the requirements for CTW data collection. Comments from writing consultants on the survey included the need for more resources on APA formatting. As a suggestion, it may be helpful to create a resource sheet on the *Top
Ten APA Errors similar to the current resource document on "Top Ten Grammar Errors". Students have difficulty knowing how to search for correct information on APA for specialized documents, such as legal documents, legislation. They often become overwhelmed with the material in the hard copy APA edition, or knowing what to search on the APA website. Instructors in SW3300 and SW3600 used the social work librarian to provide instruction and consultation on conducting literature reviews, developing a bibliography, searching public documents; the writing consultant also prepared a presentation for students on APA formatting. But in spite of these support mechanisms, there is still a recognized need to give students other resources. CTW Writing Consultant Evaluation Survey The School now has a history of offering CTW courses, and students know what it means to enroll in a CTW course. Students have definite views on CTW consultants. However, there is no formal way to capture their perspectives and use it to inform the program. Periodically, students have commented how writing consultants have helped them organize their ideas and writing style, which they found to be very helpful. Other students have commented on how some consultants have not been helpful to them, or confused them. It has been suggested that it would be helpful to have students complete a satisfaction survey at the end of each semester on the writing consultants. This information may be used as part of an evaluation component to determine topics for orientation/training, supervision, or even to determine which consultants will be retained in subsequent semesters. There is a very strong sense with school leadership that writing consultants, with proper training, are to provide quality service to students. Efforts will be made by the school to provide the support and resources to ensure the writing consultants are able to provide effective service, with the input of student views.

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 process of redesigning CTW assignments has forced faculty to reassess the intent of their assignments as they align with the goals of CTW. Much effort and collaboration occurred when faculty created the assignments for SW3300 and SW3600. The process fostered open dialogue, exchange of ideas, clarification of CTW goals and objectives, and a discussion how CTW fits with our accreditation body’s professional standards under the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). As a result of the process, faculty have become more engaged with CTW and its intent than in previous semesters. This is partially attributed to the fact that faculty previously used standard assignments which did not align with CTW. The current assignments were specifically designed with CTW objectives in mind, fostering greater acceptance of CTW than in previous years.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 CTW Sociology
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

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 be able to articulate in writing their understanding of sociological work.

G 2: critical writing
Students will be able to write critically, analytically, and interpretively about sociological work.

G 3: original critical expansion
Students will be able 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)**

Four professors reported on students in five CTW courses taught during the spring semester: two sections of "Sociological Methods," one section of "Birth and Parenthood," and one section of "Activism, Protest, and Revolution." Data were submitted on 120 students. For examples of assignments, please see attachments. Professors assessed 24% of students as "Excellent" in terms of their demonstration of sociological understanding in their writing assignments across the semester; they assessed 36% as "Very Good"; 26% as "Good"; and 14% 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; 60% did. This is very similar to the results from last year. Last year's statistics showed a significant decline from the previous year -- when 78% were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in this measure. Last year, I suggested that the decline might be attributable to the fact that fewer students were assessed and fewer professors participated in assessment than in the previous year or that our students' higher level of success in past years may have been exaggerated. It could also be that the professors who are now participating are simply judging students differently. In any case, our target for this year was to have a higher proportion of students show strength in this area. We did not meet this target.

**M 2: writing (O: 2)**

Four professors reported on students in five CTW courses taught during the spring semester: two sections of "Sociological Methods," one section of "Birth and Parenthood," and one section of "Activism, Protest and Revolution." Data were submitted on 120 students. For examples of assignments, please see attachments. Professors assessed 22% 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 35% as "Very Good"; 28% as "Good"; and 15% 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; 57% did this year. Our target has been met, but we would like to see more students perform in these top categories in the future.

**M 3: expansion (O: 3)**

Four professors reported on students in five CTW courses taught during the spring semester: two sections of "Sociological Methods," one section of "Birth and Parenthood," and one section of "Activism, Protest and Revolution." Data were submitted on 120 students. For examples of assignments, please see attachments. Professors assessed 24% of students as "Excellent" in terms of their ability to use results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or to extend analyses in new directions in their written work over the course of the semester. They assessed 28% as "Very Good"; 33% as "Good"; and 15% 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; 52% did this year. This is similar to last year's results. Though we have met our target, we would like to see more students demonstrate positive skills in this area in the future.

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

**assessment tracking**

This academic year, faculty judged that 60% of students are either excellent or very good in terms of demonstrating an understanding, in their writing, of sociological work. Faculty judged that 57% 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 52% of students are either excellent or very good in terms of their ability to use results of their analyses to formulate new research questions and/or extend analyses in new directions. This is similar, albeit with a slight decline, to last year's results. Since the statistics are based on evaluations of about half as many students as last year, I do not think the slight declines are part of a pattern. We are getting similar results, and are achieving or close to achieving our target goals of having a majority of students assessed as excellent or very good in our rubric's measures for critical thinking.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: expansion | Outcome/Objective: expansion
- Measure: understanding | Outcome/Objective: understanding
- Measure: writing | Outcome/Objective: writing

Implementation Description: I will communicate regularly with professors teaching CTW courses to inform them of the assessment process and to get their feedback on it.

Responsible Person/Group: CTW Ambassador

**CTW assignment development**

Faculty teaching CTW courses will have the opportunity to meet with me to discuss assignment development.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: expansion | Outcome/Objective: expansion
- Measure: understanding | Outcome/Objective: understanding
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 offered new (and more) courses and varied our selection to give our students a diverse array of choices. This has always been a goal of our 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?
Our goal in all our courses is to help students gain critical writing skills. The data we collected show that most students make gains in critical thinking skills over the course of the semester.

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?
It has been challenging to offer enough courses to satisfy our majors' needs. We have had five retirements in the past academic year, so staffing is a general issue that also affects CTW. We need to hire.

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?
These courses are particular beneficial to students. Some faculty enjoy the smaller size, while others see it as too much work (because of the grading involved). We haven't changed anything in our CTW initiative 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?
No changes have been made since last year. It is possible that at some point we might consider making a fixed course our second CTW course, but so far, we have been able to carry out our plan of rotating the courses that are CTW. It causes some confusion with students, because technically they can register for a CTW course when they've already had that course as a regular course earlier (or vice versa). It would be great if the registration computer system could keep them from doing this.

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 do not intend to change our curriculum or courses because of anything in the CTW assessment findings. We are currently discussing making changes to our substantive areas in the graduate program, and this could affect the concentration areas in our UG program in future, which would have an impact on CTW courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle?
I basically did the same thing I did last year. No changes were made based on last year's data.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
We are pretty effective.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
My goal in the coming year is to achieve a smooth transition with the new CTW ambassador. The findings from this year are consistent with those of last year. We are satisfied with the findings and do not feel that our CTW program needs improvement or...
Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

We held steady, achieving similar assessment results to last year. We offered several new courses under our CTW program, continuing to give our students diverse opportunities.

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

Next year, a different faculty member will take over reporting, as my time as Ug director and CTW ambassador will end. So our challenge will be to transition to new ambassadorial leadership.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

N/A

Modifications in Measurement Methods—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

N/A

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).

N/A

Publications and Presentations—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

N/A

Academic Teaching Activities—If the staff participated in teaching (or assisted in the teaching of) academic courses as part of their responsibilities to the department, please note that here.

I did not teach any CTW courses this past year, but did teach in the department.

International Activities—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

N/A

Contributions to Student Retention—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

CTW indirectly contributes to retention because it offers students a smaller, more intimate learning experience, in which they really get to know their professor. This sort of engagement is a disincentive to attrition.

Service to the External Community—Note here any initiatives or activities of your department that impact the external community (e.g., providing assistance to needy populations).

Some of our courses include a service learning component, though this is not required for CTW. Research assignments in these courses often involve examination and analysis of power arrangements, such as wealth and poverty, and various forms of oppression and discrimination. They do not typically involve hands on assistance to needy populations though. Our internship program -- and course -- which I also oversee, do provide assistance to needy populations, both directly and indirectly.

---
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Mission / Purpose
Following lengthy discussions among the faculty in our section, we decided on the following definition, which allows each instructor some room for customization: The writing assignments in our CTW courses will enable students to gain a better understanding of (choose one or more from the following options: commercial, financial, economic, literary, linguistic, cultural, social, historical, etc.) trends in the Spanish-speaking world, and equip students with the tools necessary to query their intellectual and personal positions with respect to the long and complex tradition of Hispanic cultural production, which at times intersects with other traditions with which students may be familiar, and at times diverges from them. Ultimately, students in our CTW courses will be able to comprehend Hispanic ________________ (see previous blank) within their cultural, intellectual, (commercial) and historical contexts, and engage these ________________ (texts? as above) in ways that are both intellectually rigorous and personally meaningful.

Goals
G 1: CTW courses in the Spanish section will prepare students to engage fully with Hispanic societies and ideas.

a. Linguistic proficiency: students will demonstrate proficiency in written and spoken Spanish.
b. Contextual analysis: students will
demonstrate an ability to identify and analyze cultural and historical traditions related to Hispanic culture. c. Textual analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to understand Hispanic literary texts and to analyze them with respect to basic literary concepts. d. Scholarly analysis: students will demonstrate an ability to analyze scholarly arguments related to Hispanic culture and literary traditions. e. 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, 2)

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, 2)

SPAN 3307 Introduction to the Study of Literary Texts -In another possible informal assignment, students would be asked to imagine writing in 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.

#### SLO 3: Reading Comprehension (G: 1) (M: 3)

Through the use of brief diagnostic questionnaires, instructors will assess students’ reading comprehension for both lexical and contextual precision.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Assessment Rubric (O: 1, 2)

Score of 6 – Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view. Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event. Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. Makes ethical judgments. Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas and is often nuanced and elegant. Errors are minimal to non-existent. Score of 5 – Does most of the following: Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. (Thinks through issues by) Identifying relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Offers analysis and evaluation of obvious alternative points of view. Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event. Justifies (by using) some results or procedures, explains reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons leads. Language clearly communicates ideas. Errors are minimal. Score of 4 – Does most of the following: Describes events, people, and places with some supporting details from the source. Makes connections to sources, either personal or analytic. Demonstrates a basic ability to analyze, interpret, and formulate inferences. States or briefly includes more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences, and points of view of others. Takes some risks by occasionally questioning sources, or stating interpretations and predictions. Demonstrates little evidence of rethinking or refinement of one’s own perspective. Style is appropriate to genre of work. Score of 3 – Does most or many of the following: Responds by retelling or graphically showing events or facts. Makes personal connections or identifies connections within or between sources in a limited way. Is beginning to use appropriate evidence to back ideas. Discusses literature, experiences, and points of view of others in terms of own experience. Responds to sources at factual or literal level. Includes little or no evidence of refinement of initial response or shift in dualistic thinking. Demonstrates difficulty with organization and thinking is uneven. In general, language does not interfere with communication. Errors in grammar and syntax are not frequent; there may be some problems of style. Score of 2 – Does most or many of the following: Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest and/or preconceptions. In many places language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax or other errors are distracting with little evidence of proofreading. Score of 1 – Consistently does all or almost all of the following: Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Does not justify results or procedures, nor explains reasons. Exhibits closed-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

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

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

This year the Spanish section will begin reporting separately on its two CTW courses (SPAN 3307 and SPAN 3310). Because it has been a CTW course from the inception of the program, historical records are much more thorough for 3307. Now that 3310 has formally been made the CTW capstone course, the section will start assessing this course separately from 3307. 3307: 73% of students scored at least 4/6 on this assignment: 12% scored 6/6, 29% scored 5/6, 32% scored 4/6 = 73%. 15% scored 3/6, 7% scored 2/6, 5% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6. 3310: No Data this cycle

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

SPAN 3307 72% of students scored a minimum of 4/6 on this writing assignment: 10% scored 6/6, 24% scored 5/6, 38% scored 4/6 = 72% attainment. 22% scored 3/6, 6% scored 2/6, 2% scored 1/6, 0% scored 0/6 = 28% no attainment. SPAN 3310 Not reported this cycle
M2: Student Survey (O: 1, 2)

At the end of the spring semester 2012, I designed and distributed -- for purposes internal to the Spanish section -- a CTW exit student survey (please see attachment "CTW End of Semester Survey"). Beginning in the fall of 2012 I intend to distribute this survey both at the start and conclusion of the semester. Although this survey constitutes an "indirect measure," I think it will prove a valuable tool in assessing student perceptions of CTW both in terms of the Spanish section and within the broader university community, and in reinforcing and furthering the general aims of the CTW mandate. I received survey results from two SPAN 3307 classes and one SPAN 3310 class. SPAN 3307 section "A" To the statement "I understand the university's CTW initiative" with #1 indicating strong agreement at one extreme and #5 indicating strong disagreement at the other extreme, 5 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 4 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I understand how this particular course fits in within the university's CTW initiative", 5 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 1 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 7 students replied #1, 1 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 4 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I am interested in improving my critical thinking skills" 12 students replied #1, 2 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "This course improved my critical thinking skills" 12 students replied #1, 2 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 12 students replied #1, 2 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 1 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I am interested in improving my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 4 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 0 students replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 11 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 1 students replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 12 students replied #1, 3 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 student replied #4, and 1 students replied #5. To the statement "This course improved my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. Additional student comments: "Writing the required papers did not improve my writing or critical thinking skills, it simply made the class more stressful & did not change the way I expressed my critical thinking in class."

"*Appropriate # of assignments: CTW help [sic] students to develop [theis [sic] knowledge" *I think that the tests need to be more specific* "This course could have improved my critical thinking skills" SPAN 3307 section "B" To the statement "I understand the university's CTW initiative" with #1 indicating strong agreement at one extreme and #5 indicating strong disagreement at the other extreme, 4 students replied #1, 7 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 3 students replied #4, and 2 student replied #5. To the statement "I understand how this particular course fits in within the university's CTW initiative", 10 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 12 students replied #1, 3 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 1 students replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 2 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I am interested in improving my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 4 students replied #2, 3 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 0 students replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 11 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 1 students replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 12 students replied #1, 3 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 student replied #4, and 1 students replied #5. To the statement "This course improved my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. Additional student comments: "A good selection of readings" *I am not clear on what exactly the university’s CTW initiative is, but I do feel that this class did improve my abilities to critically analyze poetry & literature. At first when I began the class, I was not exactly clear what was expected of me & I did not do very well on the assignments once I realized what was expected of me, improved" *I feel that this course allowed us to think outside the box and inspired innovative thoughts. My reading and writing in Spanish have improved since the first day of class" *This class was exactly what I expected & I got from it what I expected. I enjoyed the class discussion, through which we gained not only further critical thinking, reading & writing skills, but also speaking & discussion skills & which created a communal atmosphere*[1] *I enjoyed the writing assignments more than the tests in this course. It gives one the opportunity to express oneself [sic] outside of right or wrong answers" *I really enjoyed this class. My ability to interpret literature definitely improved. Also, I learned how to write more clearly in Spanish. It was a lot of fun, I will definitely attest having had a bit of a ‘reality check’ with one particular essay in this course. I knew that I grasped the story, and what point I wished to proved -- but I was pushed to observe my method of writing. Upon the revision, it was very clear to me that I had not been conveying exactly what I meant to and I explored other options of doing so. As such, I felt this course was highly beneficial, and I included enough oral communication to not leave me feeling like I was drowning" *The short answers we would have to write in response to a question presented in class was very helpful in thinking outside the box of the course. It helped me to learn to write a concise short answer and answer in the time given and at the same time it wasn’t very heavy in the sense that the questions were pertinent to us and weren’t very ‘abstract and philosophically’* "I really enjoyed this class. I’ve been exposed to hispanic literature. I really understand the richness of hispanic literature and I loved the poems!" Conclusions about the two 3307 courses: It is clear that while both courses were 3307 CTW courses and a plurality of students reported generally favorable outlooks toward the courses and CTW, there are also striking differences between sections in terms of awareness of CTW and its impact. SPAN 3310 devoted the first day of class to a discussion of the statement "I understand the university’s CTW initiative" with #1 indicating strong agreement at one extreme and #5 indicating strong disagreement at the other extreme, 8 students replied #1, 2 students replied #2, 4 students replied #3, 3 students replied #4, and 2 student replied #5. To the statement "I understand how this particular course fits in within the university’s CTW initiative", 6 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 4 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I knew within the first few weeks of the term that this course is a CTW course", 11 students replied #1, 1 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I am interested in improving my critical thinking skills" 7 students replied #1, 6 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, 1 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 7 students replied #1, 6 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 6 students replied #1, 6 students replied #2, 4 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "This course improved my critical thinking skills" 6 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 4 students replied #3, 2 students replied #4, and 1 student replied #5. To the statement "This course required me to write in order to engage my critical thinking skills" 11 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I am interested in improving my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "I believe writing can enhance my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. To the statement "This course improved my critical thinking skills" 10 students replied #1, 5 students replied #2, 2 students replied #3, and 2 students replied #5. Additional student comments: "The professor has not only improved my critical thinking skills but also my writing skills and I feel that I understand the process of writing much better" "This class did a great job of presenting the facts and not using methods of persuasion. I like the essayfolios because it required us to read, but the question also required us to think critically about the material we were presented" "I think that this course was a good way to develop critical thinking skills because we were able to think for ourselves, making logical conclusions for ourselves without judgment put with positive reinforcers" "I think CTW courses are helpful to prepare for grad school & GRE exam"
**Target for O3: Reading Comprehension**

75% of students will score at least 80% on brief diagnostics given at regular intervals that determine successful reading comprehension.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Data for this measure will be collected starting 2012-13.

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Assessment Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Active reading skills
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW Ambassador/Spanish section (currently Rudyard Alcocer)
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Assessment Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Historical analysis
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CTW ambassador / Spanish section (currently Rudyard Alcocer)
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** 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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rudyard Alcocer
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Assessment Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Historical analysis
- **Implementation Description:** 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.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Rudyard Alcocer
- **Additional Resources:** n/a
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Active reading skills

Implementation Description: The Spanish ambassador will notify participating faculty at the semester midpoint that they are to emphasize to students the existence of the 75% attainment goal.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Rudyard Alcocer

Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Reporting for SPAN 3310

Now that SPAN 3310 has become the CTW capstone course, the section will begin gathering data for this course.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Active reading skills

Implementation Description: Same procedure as SPAN 3307 data collection.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Rudyard Alcocer and SPAN 3310 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?

There were two major CTW accomplishments in our program this academic year: 1) The creation and implementation of a student survey for in-house purposes. This survey will help the Spanish section both to ascertain student perceptions on their progress in the CTW initiative while fostering awareness of said initiative among students. 2) The addition of SPAN 3310 as a category for targets and findings.

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 the addition of SPAN 3310 as a category for targets and findings, it should become possible to address the second half of this question. Currently, based on the rubrics in place, there has been slight statistical improvement (of about 2%); student essays in SPAN 3307, it must be said, tend to show consistent improvement during the course of evaluated semesters, a trend that suggests improvement in student critical thinking.

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 SPAN 3310 course (our capstone course) as a category for assessment requires further development.

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 is that both students and faculty in the Spanish section now recognize critical thinking as not just a skill, but as a skill that requires focused attention (especially through writing) for development. Because of this, faculty who teach CTW courses in the section have -- over the past several semesters -- been modifying their curricula so as to develop critical thinking skills among our students. Lastly, students are becoming increasingly aware and enthusiastic about developing their critical thinking skills.
**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: Analytical Reaction Essays (G: 1) (M: 1)**  
Students wrote several analytical reaction essays which required them to relate a specific concept from the day’s material to materials the instructor provided (articles, handouts, or videos). Five 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. The assignment details (and CTW Rubric) 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 Revised (O: 3)**  
This rubric focuses on defining the concept (scored 1-5), explaining the situation surrounding the concept (scored 1-5), and clearly connecting the concept to the situation (scored 1-5). Although these scores were components of the grade on each assignment, these scores did not constitute the entire grade; an additional 5 points focused on other academic issues not related to critical thinking and are thus, not reported here. See attached sheet “Assessed Analytical Essay Assignment and CTW Rubric Persuasion 2012.”

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

**Target for O3: Analytical Reaction Essays**  
scores of 4/5 by the majority of the students on each rubric item

**Findings 2011-2012** - **Target: Partially Met**
Slightly less than 1/3 of the students (7 out of 22 students) scored a 4 or higher on the first rubric item, explaining the concept. More students, though still not a majority (10 out of 22 students) scored a 4 or higher on the second rubric item, explaining the situation. Finally, a majority of the students (12 out of 22 students) did score 4 or higher on the third rubric item, connecting the concept and the situation. Interestingly, this suggests that the students did not clearly or adequately define the basics (the concept and the situation) but were more effective in explaining how the two were connected.

**M 2: Critical Thinking Rubric 2 (O: 4)**

This rubric assessed the student's ability to adapt a message to a particular audience, requiring students to understand the cultural context and to be able to evaluate supporting materials and conclusions effectively. 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 the 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. The rubric assessed their ability to do this using a 5point Likert Type Scale. Please see attached sheet "Competent Adaptation to Audience Rubric."

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

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Of the 19 students sampled, only 8 of these students achieved 4/5 across all 6 rubric items. Since so many students failed to meet the target achievement level, the 6 items were examined individually to provide further insight. Although most students (16/19 scored 4 or higher) identified an appropriate health topic for their groups, fewer explained their health topic well (10/19 scored 4 or higher). Most students (14/19) identified a format for their health message, but fewer students articulated how/why that format was appropriate (9/19 scored 4 or higher) and even fewer explained the format well (8/19 scored 4 or higher). Overall for this sample, the majority of students determined and explained an appropriate health topic, and although most identified a format for their message, very few students actually selected an appropriate format for their group and/or explained that format effectively.

**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. Written in 2012: The faculty briefly discussed the rubrics and revised the rubric for SPCH 3050 Persuasion modestly. The faculty also discussed whether or not the definition for critical thinking needed to be altered, more specifically to be less complex. Those discussions will continue this fall, and if the definition changes, then the rubrics will be changed accordingly.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Topic to be on agenda for fall 2012 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
**Implementation Description:** This topic will be on the agenda for a fall 2012 speech faculty meeting. At that time, faculty who have taught these courses in the past year will present their assignments to colleagues, and a method for storing these options will be discussed.
**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:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Topic to be on agenda for fall 2012 speech faculty meeting
**Responsible Person/Group:** Entire speech faculty
**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 past assessment indicates that these have been effective (ie, our achievement targets have been met both fall and spring semesters, 2010-2011). We thought we would 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). In 2011-2012 faculty kept the assignment focused on description, and this past year, the students did not meet the target achievement levels. This could be due to the one section sample size; perhaps students in other sections did manage to complete the assignment more effectively. The detailed analysis revealed that students did select an appropriate health topic, explained that topic, and selected a format for the health message; the students did not, however, explain the format in detail or why it was appropriate for their particular target audience, their group. This "targeted health message" is the very last component of a 4-paper "capstone portfolio" assignment, and it is possible that some level of fatigue factored into their ability to complete this portion of the assignment. This is also the only piece of the portfolio that has no draft reviewed; it may be essential for student advancement to provide feedback on a draft of this particular piece of the assignment.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking Rubric 2  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Targeted Health Message

**Implementation Description:** Instructors for SPCH 4800 will need to alter the final assignment in the course. In 2011-2012, faculty did not alter the assignment. This will be discussed at a fall speech area faculty meeting to determine two things: 1- do faculty wish to have students "create" or merely "describe" this targeted health message, and 2 - if the faculty members choose "create" then how should the rubric be revised?  

**Responsible Person/Group:** 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.

**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 assessment assigned). 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 conceptual research 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. Written in 2012: As indicated, the focus shifted toward making sure students could articulate a connection between a concept and the situation, and this was the only rubric item for which students met the achievement target. This may be an "overcorrection" on our part, and thus, we now need to be sure students can articulate clearly the basics (ie, the concept and the situation) before then making the connections between the two.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking Rubric 1 Revised  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Reaction Essays

**Implementation Description:** Instructors for SPCH 3250 will need to alter the final assignment in the course. In 2011-2012, faculty did not alter the assignment. This small group meetings were impossible to schedule with the various lecturers/TT faculty assigned to the courses, and one-on-one meetings continued. This fall, training will be implemented during a speech area faculty meeting.  

**Responsible Person/Group:** 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.

**Assessment Sample**

This past year is the first academic year to involve such small samples for assessment purposes (one section per course). This small sample may be partially responsible for the lack of target achievement scores being met, but more importantly, it may also limit what actions need to be implemented in the upcoming academic year. New CTW faculty simply did not respond to repeated requests for assessment data, and this lack of response will be discussed at the departmental fall faculty meeting, as well as the speech area faculty meeting.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Critical Thinking Rubric 1 Revised  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Reaction Essays

**Implementation Description:** Of the four sections of each course offered annually, at least two sections of each course will be included in the assessment sample.  

**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty teaching CTW courses and Jaye Atkinson as CTW Ambassador
### 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 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. 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 become strong writers; they will be able to think critically and organize material, understand and evaluate evidence and theorize new and interesting research questions.

**G 2: Demonstration of knowledge**

Students will be able to demonstrate both their knowledge of the field(s) and ability to use feminist/womanist perspectives in their work.

**G 3: Critical thinking through reading**

Students will demonstrate their ability to critically interpret texts, including finding main points and outlining arguments.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Identify main points and arguments (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)**

In 3010, Students will identify and analyze main points and theoretical arguments in their readings for class, as shown in their written work.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 2: Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical perspectives (G: 2) (M: 1)**

In 3010, students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate feminist and womanist theoretical perspectives, as demonstrated by writing assignments.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 3: Writing skills (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)**

In 3010, students will demonstrate writing skills through their ability to organize material, provide sufficient evidence, and articulate a coherent thesis in their final papers.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 4: Demonstrate writing skills (G: 1) (M: 3, 4)**

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.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 5: Theoretical Perspectives (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)**

In 4920/4950, students will demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use appropriate feminist/womanist perspectives.

**Standard Associations**

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

**SLO 6: Apply skills (G: 1, 2) (M: 3, 4)**

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

SLO 7: Connect to lived experiences (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)
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.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: In 3010, Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3)
Your final paper will be a 5-7 page paper in which you both revise and expand 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. This paper should combine clear readings of in-class texts to provide evidence for a solid thesis which demonstrates both an innovative take on a theoretical issue and thoughtful consideration of existing work on the topic.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
We found that 80% of students received at least a 3, and 40% of students received at least a 4. One interesting result we found here is that students who did well on this aspect of the measure excelled; usually, we find students barely meet our expectations -- in this instance, students either did not meet them or surpassed our expectations. This finding suggests to us that students come into the class with either excellent reading skills and those who do not have trouble developing these skills.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Here, we found that 100% of students received at least a 3, and 60% of students received at least a 4. While this result comes close to our target, it does not quite meet it. It is interesting to consider these results in light of the previous finding; it seems that students are doing somewhat better in terms of demonstrating their knowledge in general than they are in showing their ability to read well and outline main points and supporting arguments of specific texts. Since these skills seem related, it seems that the previous action plan would also be useful here.

Target for O3: writing skills
Again, on each item of the rubric associated with writing skills, our target is for 75% of students to achieve a 4 or 5, and for all students to receive a 3.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
This year, we assessed the papers on two separate rubrics: one focused on organization and evidence, and the second emphasized the thesis statement. In terms of organization/evidence, 80% received at least a 3, and 60% received a 4 or 5. In terms of thesis statements, only 60% received at least a 3, and 40% received a 4 or 5. The low score on thesis statements suggests that we either need to rework our instructions for the paper, or we need to cut this out of our assessment as not relevant to this particular assignment.

M 2: In 3010, Short Papers (O: 1, 3)
Students will write two 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We have no samples of these papers for this academic year as they were all returned to students; we hope to have some next year.

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.
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. This paper must go through a revision process to qualify it for CTW.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Here, we found that 70% received at least a 3, and only 10% received a 4. If we split them up by draft and revision, the results are not that much stronger (For the revision, we found that 80% scored at least a 3, and 20% scored at least a 4). Clearly, we need to strengthen our commitment to working on student writing.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Here, we found that 90% received at least a 3, and 70% received at least a 4, so we were close to our target, though we did not quite reach it. If we look at the revised papers, we found that 100% received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4 or 5, so we did reach our target for the revised papers.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Here, we found that 90% received at least a 3, and 70% received at least a 4, so we were close to our target, though we did not quite reach it. If we look at the revised papers, we found that 100% received at least a 3, and 80% received a 4 or 5, so we did reach our target for the revised papers. Interestingly, these results were the same as for the previous, which shows that either students are performing similarly on the demonstrating knowledge and applying skills, or else we are evaluating them similarly on these particular rubrics.

**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.

**M 4: Internship Paper (O: 4, 5, 6, 7)**

For the internship, 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

On this rubric, we found that 62% scored at least a 3, and 23% scored a 4 or 5. If we focus only on the revised papers, we found that 75% scored at least a 3, and 50% scored a 4 or 5, showing that while the revised papers take us closer to reaching the target, we still have our work cut out for us in terms of improving general writing skills.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

On this rubric, we found that 86% of our students achieved at least a 3, and that 71% achieved a 4 or 5, which is close to the target. In terms of the revised papers, 100% received at least a 4, so that does meet our target, and it also indicates that requiring the revision process is particularly useful in terms of this outcome.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Explore ramifications and digest the information**

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. Update: This year, we noticed more difficulty with these particular aspects than we previously have. We are noticing a pattern: students are (laudably!) choosing to address complex theoretical questions, but in the course of doing so, they seem to run out of time at the end in order to adequately digest the material. They get to the point where they know what they want to do with their research, but then they do not have the time/intellectual energy to actually do it. As a result, they do a good time on the literature review, etc., but they shortchange the "new contribution" they are actually working on.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** In 4920 Final Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply skills
  - **Theoretical Perspectives**
  - **Measure:** Internship Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply skills
  - **Connect to lived experiences | Theoretical Perspectives**

  **Implementation Description:** Basically, we need to continue to insist on earlier deadlines, so that we can increase the amount of early intervention.

  **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:** In-Progress
- **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. See the document repository for our peer review guideline sheet. In the analysis section, we have considered whether or not these increased standards are proving useful.

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** In 3010, Final Paper | **Outcome/Objective:** writing skills

  **Responsible Person/Group:** Julie Kubala, Megan Sinnott, 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
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 WST 3010, one improvement that we have made is that we have developed a more formal set of instructions for the peer review process, since revision is such a central component of our Critical Thinking through Writing Initiative (see the document repository). Since our evaluation of our own process is mixed, I am keeping the entire evaluation of the peer review in Question 3, overall reflection. In 3010, we also emphasized the development of critical reading skills, which show overall improvement in comparison to the past two years. Assigning short papers in which students are required to outline the main points and supporting evidence in the texts they read has proved useful in terms of students being able to articulate feminist theorists’ and writers’ points and arguments. The goal here is for students to be able to transfer these skills to their own writing; if they can evaluate the chain of reasoning in another texts, it will hopefully strengthen their ability to formulate a clear and coherent chain of reasoning in their own. In terms of the capstone courses, in this assessment process, we split up the internship and the senior research papers, which I think will be beneficial in terms of providing more specific and focused feedback on the assignments. This year, we focused intensively on exploring the ramifications of student work in terms of connecting theoretical knowledge to lived experience. Students did quite well on this aspect of their papers; they surpassed previous years in terms of connecting theoretical perspectives to experiential knowledge. Much of the strength is documented through our assessment of their thesis statements, which showed significant signs of improvement and were quite interesting. Now, we need to work on the area of thinking through and fully digesting the implications of their provocative thesis statements.

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 again, as I have noted previously, our assessment of students’ knowledge of theoretical perspectives (generally speaking) suggests that students are doing reasonably well in terms of this goal. In general, by the time students are in the capstone classes, they are fairly knowledgeable of feminist perspectives, and they are able to apply these skills and connect them to their experiences fairly successfully. We continue to struggle, however, with the writing aspects of our courses. When we began CTW, we decided that we would mainly focus on the revision aspect of writing, so that we can work with students on an individual basis on their writing. While we are still committed to this process, we are realizing that we need to continue to work on refining the process and keeping student focus on the continual process of writing throughout all their classes. This year, I would have to say that we have not noticed as much significant improvement as we would like to see. Part of the reason, honestly, is that we did not have particularly
strong writers in the capstone classes this year. Also, when we have more students in the Internship class than the Senior Research, we tend to have lower scores in the writing aspects of our goals, since students who focus more intensively on writing are more likely to enroll in Senior Research. As I have stated previously, students who spend more time revising are more likely to do well, in terms of both our assessment and in terms of their grades. We therefore plan to continue working on the revision component of this class, as well as incorporating revision and/or proposals more directly into additional upper-level courses. That said, we have noticed that some students are doing extremely well in terms of their writing. It seems that there is a developing split between students who did well in 3010 and are maintaining these skills throughout their undergraduate career, and those that do not take the peer review and writing process seriously in 3010 and so continue to have some of the same writing difficulties. Again, I think this relates to the peer review process, which I address in some detail in the next 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?

In terms of the capstone classes, we still need to work on enforcing sufficient time for revision. For instance, one of the assessment committee noted that one student did not actually revise her paper at all, despite extensive comments by the instructor. At this time, we are not willing to fail students who do not revise their papers, but perhaps there can be some more stringent repercussions for students who are unwilling to do so. Perhaps incorporating the writing more heavily into the grading (although it is 50% of the grade, even for the internship) would help, or perhaps this is will remain a persistent challenge. As I have mentioned previously, we are still working on strengthening the peer review process in WSI 3010. Here are the instructor’s comments: Rationale: The reasoning for the revision assignment is to give students a chance to switch roles from student-producer to evaluator. By reading other student work they can focus on the structure and construction of the essay, and apply insights from this role to their own work. Specifically, they have an opportunity to see both models of well-crafted and successful essays and essays that are not as successful. Both types of papers are analyzed by the students giving them a chance to critically explore the techniques and strategies for writing effectively. At its best, peer review can transform the experience of writing that most students have had in which the student writes for a teacher and the teacher judges and grades the student work. Peer review allows for students to understand writing as a tool of communication rather than just a means for the student to be evaluated and graded by a teacher. However, for this dynamic to be transformed students must be willing to step outside of the role of the student as a graded and evaluated subject and see themselves as an equal participant in an exchange of ideas. Evaluation: The overall assignment had mixed results. The assignment required that students have a working draft prepared one month before the end of the semester and this required that they begin working on the paper early in the semester. This deadline helped avoid the problem of last minute paper writing in the last week of class. The students continued to revise their papers after they turned them in for peer review since they already had a working draft. However, the actual peer review process had limited success. As always, many of the drafts were not polished enough to adequately review. The students were told to make constructive comments to help improve the papers, and therefore “yes” or “no” answers to the questions on the peer review sheet were not useful. They were also instructed to write comments on the paper itself. I noticed that many of the peer review sheets had minimal comments and students did in fact respond with “yes” or “no” responses. A few of the students took the assignment seriously and gave extensive comments on the papers they had to review, but felt that their fellow students did not adequately review their papers. The students who turned in very rough and unfinished drafts usually did a poor job in reviewing other student papers. A solution may be for me to actually grade the drafts and only allow passing drafts to be submitted for peer review. There also needs to be a way to make students accountable for the effort they put into reviewing other student papers. I have given this assignment a more or less pass/fail grade in the past (either the students do it or they don’t) but I may have to institute a full grading procedure for the reviews.

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?

As we have noted before, it is quite difficult to evaluate the impact of CTW on our department in particular because our field requires such a strong commitment to critical thinking and writing. Perhaps the main contribution of CTW is formalizing our discussions of the effectiveness of various pedagogical techniques in terms of increasing students ability to write clearly and correctly. 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, especially the revision process, in order to strengthen what we have always been our goals: getting students to read thoughtfully, write well, and think critically. We have made some minor changes, though. For instance, we have begun to separate our assessment of the two capstone classes: Senior Research and Internship. We hope that this separation allows us to see how the different areas of focus in the two classes contribute to the development of specific skills in each course. We have also added some specific action plans to more specifically target particular challenges we face in the process. For instance, in 3010, we are thinking about grading some of the low-stakes writing assignments, especially those that serve as the rough drafts for peer review. In other upper-level courses, we want to increase either the amount of full-scale revision, or at least have students submit more detailed proposals for their seminar papers. In this way, we hope to convince students to take seriously the revision process, through having it emphasized frequently and at all levels.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Dual Concentration in CIS/HA MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The purpose of the MBA concentration in Health Informatics is to provide students with specialized skills to improve healthcare services enabled by information technology. Such improvements focus on the information-intensive nature of healthcare institutions and processes to increase the quality and reduce the cost of healthcare services.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 3: Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the comprising resources (M: 3)
Articulate and apply the theoretical basis and the practical issues in the healthcare delivery system and the resources that comprise it. This includes the overall planning, organization, management, evaluation, quality, and major healthpolicy 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No MBA ISHA students took CIS 8080 during 2010-2011.

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

There were no MBA ISHA students in CIS 8070 during 2011-2012.

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.
**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Only one student in this program took this HA 8160 during 2011-2012. 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. 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. Students were not able to accurately identify considerations in the analysis, design, selection, implementation, operation, and review of health information systems.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No MBA HAIS students took HA 8670 during 2011-2012.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Early Childhood Education MAT**

(as of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission and purpose of the Master of Arts in Teaching in Early Childhood Education program is to develop a cadre of teachers who will become change agents who will positively affect their classrooms, their schools, their communities, and their school districts as well as the national conversation about educational issues and change. Specifically, the program is designed for teachers in urban school settings who will remain in and be informed by their classrooms while assuming leadership roles in their schools, their communities, and within the larger context of the political structures that shape educative opportunities for all children. Both experience in urban schools and urban research studies suggest that urban communities face unique challenges that must be addressed by teachers in those schools. In order to accomplish this mission, the program is designed to support beginning teachers of record who have not completed a traditional teacher preparation baccalaureate but who are working in their own classrooms. Coursework has been carefully constructed in order to support them as they work in urban high needs schools in the metro Atlanta area. This will help ensure that those teachers working in high needs schools without previous coursework in education are adequately prepared to meet both the needs of their students and the challenges of teaching in urban schools.

**Goals**

**G 1: G1: Content Knowledge**

The teacher candidate will have the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum he or she teaches.

**G 2: G2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills**

The teacher candidate will possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to be able to plan and teach effectively.

**G 3: G3: Student Learning**

The teacher candidate will use varied instructional strategies, assessment techniques and critical reflection to document children's development and learning.

**G 4: G4: Diversity**

The teacher candidate will work collaboratively with diverse professionals to meet the cultural, linguistic, learning, and behavioral needs of all learners.

**G 5: G5: Clinical Teaching Practice**

This key assessment evaluates candidates pedagogical and content knowledge application in the context of classroom based observations by university coaches.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: SLO1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Teacher candidates understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content and curricula he or she teaches. 1. Candidates are made aware that they must take and pass the GACE Early Childhood Education I and II before being recommendation for certification. 2. Candidates' content knowledge will be evaluated through their scores on the GACE Early
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 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

Strategic Plan Associations

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
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: SLO2: Plans effectively for instruction (G: 2) (M: 2)

Teacher candidates plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Relevant Associations:

The Assessment- Directions for the Responsive Planning Project

This project will demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in your classroom context. Through this project, you will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student’s interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Specifically you will utilize planning and instructional artifacts to demonstrate your development as an increasingly responsive educator across your two years of engagement in the MAT.

Specifically, you will need to attend to the following questions:

- How has your planning and instruction changed as you have gained a more complex understanding of your students, the community, and the subject matter?
- Looking back at the first unit that you planned for your class/students, how would you characterize those plans in relation to your current understandings and practices related to curriculum design and implementation?

These questions will be the basis of your self-analysis and narration of your growth in your planning and instructional practices over your two years of teaching. Through the examination of the instructional plans you have created and the type of engagements and learning opportunities you have crafted with/for students throughout the years you will use various media to demonstrate your increasing understanding and incorporation of the following key components of responsive planning and instruction:

(a) holding high expectations for excellence;
(b) valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum;
(c) recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners;
(d) enacting broader curriculum to develop a reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors;
(e) informing planning and instruction through knowledge of students, content, curriculum, learning environments, assessment, and self reflexive processes;
(f) facilitating productive learning tasks;
(g) engaging in self reflexive practice informing planning and pedagogy.

*Please see evaluative rubric for more information about each of these categories.

Description of how it is used in the program:

"Planning (pedagogical knowledge and skills)" will be assessed through the "RESPONSIVE PLANNING PROJECT," which will be submitted by candidates for evaluation at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition. This project will serve to demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in classroom contexts. Through this project, candidates will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and
curriculum goals across subject areas with student’s interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. At the Clinical Practice/Program Exit transitions, candidates will analyze and evaluate their instructional practices over the two years of teaching, examining the first unit plans they created and the type of engagements and learning opportunities crafted with/for students throughout the years. Specifically, candidates will attend to the following questions: How has your planning and instruction changed as you have gained a more complex understanding of your students, the community, and the subject matter? Looking back at the first unit that you planned for your class/students, how would you characterize those plans in relation to your current understandings and practices related to curriculum design and implementation?

**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.

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

**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: SLO3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 3)**

Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. For example, candidates may provide evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formal and informal, formative and summative assessments (such as the Developmental Reading Assessment-DRA- or other literacy assessment tools, math assessments based on the common core curriculum, or benchmark/anchor papers for writing assessment). Through this project, candidates will describe the gains made by their students and demonstrate such claims by including specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth.

Relevant Associations:

**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

**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.

3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.

3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

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 4: SLO 4: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 4)**

Teacher candidates are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals and stakeholders 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.
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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 5: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice (G: 5) (M: 5)**

Teacher candidates use their knowledge of academic disciplines, child development, 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 to and supportive of all students. They use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and evidence of deep understandings performed idiosyncratically and meaningfully. Teacher candidates use their understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create learning environments that encourage positive social interactions, 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 stakeholders and 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 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

**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.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: M1: GACE I and II Exam scores (O: 1)**

Licensure exam scores will be analyzed for progress toward content knowledge development of MAT candidates.

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

**Target for O1: SLO1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

Target: 95% of our students will obtain a passing score on the GACE I and II as determined by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. A passing score on these tests is required for teacher certification/licensure in Early Childhood Education.

**M 2: M2: Responsive Planning Project (O: 2)**

Responsive Planning Project Directions for the Responsive Planning Project This project will demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in your classroom context. Through this project, you will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student’s interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Specifically you will utilize planning and instructional artifacts to demonstrate your development as an increasingly responsive educator across your two years of engagement in the MAT. Specifically, you will need to attend to the following questions: How has your planning and instruction changed as you have gained a more complex understanding of your students, the community, and the subject matter? Looking back at the first unit that you planned for your class/students, how would you characterize those plans in relation to your current understandings and practices related to curriculum design and implementation? These questions will be the basis of your self-analysis and narration of your growth in your
planning and instructional practices over your two years of teaching. Through the examination of the instructional plans you have created and the type of engagements and learning opportunities you have crafted with/for students throughout the years you will use various media to demonstrate your increasing understanding and incorporation of the following key components of responsive planning and instruction: (a) holding high expectations for excellence; (b) valuing and privileging the lives, histories, and inquiries of pupils through meaningful and intentional decisions about curriculum; (c) recognizing and utilizing resources and partnerships on behalf of learners; (d) enacting broader curriculum to develop a reciprocity between teaching and learning, learners and instructors; (e) informing planning and instruction knowledge of students, content, curriculum, learning environments, assessment, and self reflective processes; (f) facilitating productive learning tasks; (g) engaging in self reflective practice informing planning and pedagogy. *Please see evaluative rubric for more information about each of these categories. Description of how it is used in the program: "Planning (pedagogical knowledge and skills)" will be assessed through the "RESPONSIVE PLANNING PROJECT," which will be submitted by candidates for evaluation at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition. This project will serve to demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in classroom contexts. Through this project, candidates will provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student's interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Through this two year longitudinal self study of planning and instruction, candidates utilize planning and instruction artifacts to demonstrate development of responsive educators across the two years of engagement in the program. Due to this commitment, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "standard met," or 4, "standard exceeded" on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings will work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a "standard met" rating. In the case that candidates do not achieve this rating, they will not be recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric by the end of the program: Level 3 or 4=95%, Levels 2, 1, and 0=5% or less.

**Target for O2: SLO2: Plans effectively for instruction**

A critical priority of the ECE MAT is to ensure that beginning teachers of record demonstrate increased pedagogical knowledge and skills through documenting and demonstrating the evolution of instructional planning and implementation of responsive pedagogical strategies in their classroom contexts. Through this project, candidates provide evidence of responsive instructional planning on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals across subject areas with student's interests, funds of knowledge, and development in mind. Throughout this two year longitudinal self study of planning and instruction, candidates utilize planning and instruction artifacts to demonstrate development of responsive educators across the two years of engagement in the program. Due to this commitment, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "standard met," or 4, "standard exceeded" on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings will work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a "standard met" rating. In the case that candidates do not achieve this rating, they will not be recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric by the end of the program: Level 3 or 4=95%, Levels 2, 1, and 0=5% or less.

**M 3: M3: Impact on Student Learning Project (O: 3)**

**IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT** Directions for the Impact on Student Learning Project This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices across two years. You will identify six focal students and describe the ways that a range of holistic data drove instruction to support the growth trajectory of each student. The six focal students, determined through pre-assessment data, should include one student from each year who began the year as a struggling learner, one student from each year who began the year as a middle level student, and one student from each year who began the year as a high achieving student. Assignment Includes: Evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formal and informal, formative and summative assessments (such as the Developmental Reading Assessment-DRA- or other literacy assessment tools, math assessments based on the common core curriculum, or benchmark/anchor papers for writing assessment). A narrative description of the gains made by the students and support for these claims which includes specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth. Reflection demonstrating the development and improvement of instructional practice through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. Description of how it is used in the program: Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. For example, candidates may provide evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formative and informal, formative and summative assessments (such as the Developmental Reading Assessment-DRA- or other assessment tools, math assessments based on the common core curriculum, or benchmark/anchor papers for writing assessment). Through this project, candidates will describe the gains made by their students and demonstrate such claims by including specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: SLO3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

As beginning teachers of record, MAT candidates are already in classrooms and responsible for student learning and development. Therefore, attention to learning of pupils is given primacy throughout the program. Effects on P-12 Student Learning will be assessed at the Clinical Exit/Program Exit transition through the submission and evaluation of the IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PROJECT. This project will be a demonstration of student learning and growth as well as teacher development and improvement through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data based on formative and summative assessment practices. For example, candidates may provide evidence for student growth through the documentation and analysis of formal and informal, formative and summative assessments. Through this project, candidates will describe the gains made by their students and demonstrate such claims by including specific examples and artifacts of student learning and growth. The rubric used to assess this project is aligned with PSC domains, the PCE rules for ECE 505-3-.16 and the Conceptual Framework Standards of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) of Georgia State University. Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "standard met," or 4, "standard exceeded," on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (standard met). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0=5%.

**M 4: M4: Dispositions (O: 4)**

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
Target for O4: SLO 4: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions

As beginning teachers of record in urban schools, MAT candidates must demonstrate dispositions toward diversity and professionalism that will serve students in historically underserved contexts. Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, “acceptable,” or 4, “exemplary,” on the 1-4 point Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (an “acceptable” rating). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Levels 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

M 5: M 5: Clinical Teaching Practice (O: 5)

Teacher candidates in the ECE MAT program are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills/performances and dispositions that are essential for high quality early childhood education for all student in grades prekindergarten through fifth grade. These competencies must be demonstrated in field settings with children, parents, and colleagues, as well as in university coursework. Teacher candidates in the ECE MAT have supported field based coursework throughout two academic years in the program and are full time teachers of record throughout that time. The Clinical teaching Practice Project completed at the midpoint and endpoint of the program is completed by the university coach at the end of each academic year. The evaluation is a comprehensive review of the candidate’s competencies and the rubric is aligned to the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure as well as the Georgia Framework for Teaching, the PSC Rules for Early Childhood Education. The rubric used to assess this project is also aligned with PSC domains, the PCE rules for ECE 505-3-.16 and the Conceptual Framework Standards of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) of Georgia State University. The university coach (supervisor) rates the candidate based on his/her teaching performance, assignments, and projects. The rubric is aligned to the DISPOSITIONS rubric used in the Clinical teaching Practice Project Assessment. The 0-4 point rubric included: 4 (standard exceeded), 3 (standard met), 2 (approaching standard), 1 (standard minimally evidenced), and 0 (not observed). The teacher candidate is expected to receive at least ratings of 3 (standard met) on all indicators in order to complete ECE 7585 and to be recommended for certification. If a teacher candidate receives a rating lower than 3, the university supervisor works with the candidate to develop an action plan and an additional opportunity to demonstrate competency. A grade of “B” or better is required to pass all field based coursework and to continue with the program in good standing. This rubric is used at the midpoint and endpoint of the program to ensure candidate progress and success. If a candidate does not meet the minimum target for teaching performance, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4=70%; Level 3=25%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O5: SLO 5: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Since the ECE MAT leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, “standard met,” or 4, “standard exceeded,” on the 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of need with the goal of reaching a score of 3 (a rating of “standard met”). In cases where candidates do not achieve this target, they are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Levels 3 or 4=95%; Levels 2, 1, 0= 5%.

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 ECE MAT program was initiated in 2011-12 along with newly crafted key assessments for beginning teachers of record, we have no complete data, however we have begun the process of conducting key assessments through the use of the LiveText management system and will be continuously assessing progress of students and monitor and maintain this data for program analysis and development.

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. Content knowledge. Content Area courses in mathematics and literacy have been closely examined to ensure that these courses have met the needs of MAT candidates. Since the literacy coursework is based on new courses, faculty have been particularly attentive to the learning goals and understandings evidenced in these courses. Candidate participants in the design team have offered focused feedback which informs our future design of these courses in ways that are responsive to students and support their learning needs. Syllabi and course assignments, as well as key readings are being evaluated and considered in order to reflect identified areas of content expertise that could be strengthened in candidates. Data is being collected on student GPA, content area GPA (math and literacy), and the Early Childhood Education GACE Assessments as this first cohort continues with their program. Formal evaluation and assessment of Content Knowledge occurs at the endpoint of the program. This first cohort will be at program endpoint in Spring 2013 and formal consideration of content knowledge will occur at that point. 2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Dispositional rubrics and Clinical Teaching Practice rubrics (collected at the midpoint and endpoint transitions), and the Responsive Planning Project (an ongoing process throughout the 5 semester MAT) will help faculty determine aspects of professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions that could be more significantly emphasized in programmatic engagements. Throughout this academic year, faculty have iteratively and constantly reflected upon candidate’s growing expertise in these areas, not at times of program review, but also in a constant and self-reflexive manner in order to ensure that each cohort is provided with opportunities for maximum growth and support. Additionally, we collaborate with a design team of candidates who represent their colleagues in the program in order to receive formative feedback as we consistently revisit our practices and the ways that they are aligned (and could become ever increasingly congruent and enacting) our goals. Analysis of candidate’s midpoint Clinical Practice Project rubric scores of individuals who began the MAT in Fall 2011 indicates that candidates struggle with aspects of planning and instruction, specifically (5.2, 5.3, 5.4). The course Integrative and Iterative Curriculum Design, ECE 6576, is offered to candidates after their first year of teaching (and therefore after the midpoint Clinical Practice Project Assessment). This course is designed to support beginning teachers of record as they strive to be successful and critically reflective teachers of culturally and
linguistically diverse students in urban classrooms. The focus of this course is to consider means for education for democratic purposes and engagement in meaningful and critical curriculum design and implementation. Novice teachers will explore (a) strategies to support reading comprehension and vocabulary development during the elementary years, (b) science and social studies content and methods of inquiry, (c) strategies for integrating the curriculum around science and social studies content; (d) curriculum design that incorporates student interests and queries around critical and important themes and topics, (e) personally relevant and learner centered teaching strategies, and (f) ways that teachers can build on students' culture and prior knowledge to best meet the needs of students in diverse classrooms. This is a field-based course in which beginning teachers will connect theory to practice as they develop and implement an integrative and iterative curriculum with pupils. This course specifically will support candidates with curriculum design and instruction, encouraging them and providing them with tools to: (a) implement multiple instructional strategies to guide content development, provide meaningful practice, and ensure student learning (5.2); (b) engage students in learning opportunities that promote problem solving and critical thinking using balanced lesson delivery formats (i.e., ST & SS formats including but not limited to direct instruction, lab, role play, cooperative learning) (5.3); and (c) teach using an appropriate plan and adjust strategies as needed to support student engagement and learning (5.4). Additionally this course is focused on supporting candidates as they plan and adapt instruction to be sensitive to students' diverse backgrounds, cultures, or linguistic needs (2.3); and create learning environments (3) that use effective management strategies to engage and motivate students in purposeful learning activities (3.2) and incorporate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to support learning-based interactions in the classroom or to increase student achievement (3.5) while involving learners in self-assessment and personal goal setting to increase student achievement (4.3). This course specifically attends to areas of the Clinical Practice Project rubric where candidates were less successful during the 2011-12 academic year. Through ECE 7575 and 7585, Induction Teachers as Change Agents I and II (the field based courses for the second year of the MAT), coaches will continue to support candidates in their planning and instruction, focusing specifically on these characteristics for targeted development and support. Analysis of the midpoint Dispositional Rubric scores of candidates who began the program in Fall 2011 indicates that while most candidates have positive views of themselves and others, a meaningful sense of purpose and vision, and demonstrate empathy for others and authenticity, several candidates need additional support to develop the types of dispositions needed to teach for justice in urban school contexts. While most of the candidates who scored consistently low on the dispositional rubric have been discontinued from our program or have determined that they are not interested in teaching as a vocation, those who remain will be supported by faculty throughout the second year of our program as they work to develop dispositions more attuned to the needs of their students and responsive to the communities they serve. 3. Student learning Impact on student learning is a significant and ongoing emphasis of our work. Since candidates in our program are beginning teachers of record, the ways in which they support student learning and achievement are paramount. Attention to learning trajectories of candidate’s classrooms (and of individual students in those classrooms) is a critical aspect of each of our courses. As we obtain data related to candidate impact on student learning, we continue to develop specific support structures, interventions, and teacher study groups that focus specifically on the needs of individual teachers related to P-S student learning. While official midpoint data on Effects on Student Learning is not collected, the embeddedness of this practice in courses and focused support sessions and workshops supporting candidates as they analyze their pupils’ growth and development at the midpoint of the program provide faculty with information that will inform our collaborations with individual candidates through the second year.
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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 have dispositions and skills to meet the cultural, linguistic, learning and behavioral needs of all learners.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 2, 4, 5)**  
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 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. Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
2. Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
3. Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
4. Enhance a research culture.
5. Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 2: Plans effectively for instruction (G: 2) (M: 2)**

Teacher candidates plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**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.

9. 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. Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.
2. Implement an Undergraduate Signature Experience.
3. Other efforts in support of Goal 1 (Undergraduate Education).
4. Enhance a research culture.
5. 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: 2)**

Teacher candidates apply content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice. (i.e. knowledge of academic disciplines; understanding of child development and individual differences; use of differentiated instruction; use of multiple instructional strategies; development of critical thinking and problem solving; understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior; creator of positive learning environments; use of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques; reflective practitioner; collaborative partner with students, parents and community).

**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 understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

3. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

4. 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. 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: 1, 2)**
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: 2, 3, 5)**
Teacher candidates value and display professional and ethical dispositions to meet the needs of all learners. 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. 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)

**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.
4.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM) Rubric (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 for the PTLM highlights use to assess the candidate against the INTASC national standards for initial teacher licensure. A 100 point rubric is used to rate/score the candidate’s project on four components: planning, implementing, assessing, and reflecting. Ratings include: 5 ("proficiently met"), 4 ("adequately met"), 3 ("partially met"), 2 ("minimally met"), and 1 ("not met"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive a rating of at least 4 ("adequately met") on the assessing components in order to demonstrate competency is using assessment methods to document student learning (outcome 4). If the teacher candidate does not demonstrate that she/he has met these performance standards with ratings of at least 4 for each assessing component, an action plan is developed. The university supervisor monitors the teacher candidate’s progress in meeting goals outlined in the action plan prior to the completion of student teaching. (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
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "adequately met," or 4, "proficient", on the revised 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching an adequate rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Planning, Teaching, and Learning Module for 2011-2012 reveals the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional and Dual Program candidates show a 96% or 149/156 pass rate for having an impact on student learning on the Planning, Teaching, and Learning Module, Assessment Component (i.e., Proficiently Met-Level 4 = 72% or 113/156; Adequately Met-Level 3 = 23% or 36/156; Partially Met-Level 2 = 3% or 4/156; Minimally Met-Level 1 = 1% or 1/156, and Did Not Meet-Level 0 = 2% or 2/156). The mean scores for overall impact on student learning by program are as follows: Traditional Program – 3.57 and Dual Program – 3.82 on a (0-4) scale. Six candidates who fell below target were required to revise their narrative summary to include a more detailed explanation or were initially missing a component. One candidate who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will repeat the Student Teaching course and the PTLM assessment prior to graduation and recommendation for certification. Additionally, 2 Traditional Program candidates (1-fall and 1-spring) and 1 Dual Program candidate withdrew from Student Teaching prior to the midpoint. The fall 2011 candidate successfully repeated and completed the experience spring 2012. The two spring candidates are required to repeat the experience fall 2012 and forward. Disaggregate scores for Traditional and Dual Program candidates indicate that the Dual Program candidates scored 6% higher on this assessment than the Traditional Program candidates. Of the Traditional Program candidates, 94% or 116/123 met the assessment target of level 3 or higher (i.e., Proficiently Met-Level 3 = 70% or 86/123; Adequately Met-Level 3 = 24% or 30/123), while 3% or 4/123 Partially Met standards- Level 2, 1% or 1/123 Minimally Met standards-Level 1 and 2% or 2/123 Did Not Meet standards- Level 0. Of the Dual Program candidates, 100% (33/33) met the assessment target of level 3 or higher (i.e., Proficiently Met- Level 4 = 82% or 27/33; Adequately Met-Level 3 = 18% or 6/33).

### M 2: 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 candidate based on her/his teaching performance, assignments and professionalism as demonstrated during student teaching, clinical practice. The 5 point rubric includes: 5 ("outstanding"), 4 ("very good"), 3 ("satisfactory"), 2 ("needs improvement") and 1 ("unsatisfactory"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive at least ratings of 3 ("satisfactory") on all indicators in order to complete student teaching, ECE 4661, and be recommended for certification. If a teacher candidate receives a rating lower than 3, the university supervisor works with the candidate to develop an action plan and an additional opportunity to demonstrate competency. A grade of "C" or better in ECE 4661 is required in order to pass student teaching. This is an end of program evaluation. Note: The rubric scale was revised as follows: 4 ("outstanding"), 3 ("very good"), 2 ("satisfactory"), 1 ("needs improvement") and 0 ("unsatisfactory"). The teacher candidate is expected to receive at least ratings of 3 ("satisfactory") on all indicators in order to complete student teaching, ECE 4661, and be recommended for certification. We have raised the target to level 3 ("very good") in evaluating the program. If a teacher candidate receives a rating lower than 2, the university supervisor works with the candidate to develop an action plan and an additional opportunity to demonstrate competency. A grade of "C" or better in ECE 4661 is required in order to pass student teaching. This is an end of program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%,
will achieve at least a rating of 3, "very good", or 4, "outstanding", on the revised 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching a "very good" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2011-2012 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 95% or 145/153 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation (i.e., 81% or 124/153 exceeded expectations with scores Outstanding- Level 4, 14% or 21/153 met expectations with scores Very Good-Level 3. Candidates scoring below target include 3% or 5/153 at the Satisfactory-Level 2, 0% at the Needs Improvement-Level 1, and 2% or 3/153 at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Eight candidates fell below target with five at the Satisfactory-Level 2 and three at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Eight candidates fell below target with five at the Satisfactory-Level 2 and three at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Following Action Plans for continued growth and development, five candidates (4 Traditional and 1 Dual) showed evidence of increased performance during Role Reversal of Student Teaching to meet program requirements. Two spring 2012 Traditional candidates who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will be required to repeat ECE 4662: Student Teaching and one Traditional candidate who withdrew prior to the midpoint will also repeat the experience. The fall 2011 Traditional candidate, who withdrew prior to the midpoint, successfully repeated and completed the experience spring 2012. Finally, one Dual candidate withdrew prior to the midpoint and will be required to repeat the experience. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show that the Dual candidates scored 3% higher on this assessment than the Traditional candidates. Of the Traditional candidates 94% or 114/121 met or exceeded the assessment target of level 3, while 97% or 31/32 of Dual candidates met or exceeded the assessment target. For Dual Program – Special Education concentration candidates, the score of 97% meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment is higher in comparison to their 94% score across 2007-2011. The mean scores based upon the overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.67 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.79 on a (0-4) scale. Outcome 1: Demonstrates content knowledge was indicative of high mean scores for both programs.

**Target for O2: Plans effectively for instruction**

Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "very good", or 4, "outstanding", on the revised 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching a "very good" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2011-2012 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 95% or 145/153 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation (i.e., 81% or 124/153 exceeded expectations with scores Outstanding- Level 4, 14% or 21/153 met expectations with scores Very Good-Level 3. Candidates scoring below target include 3% or 5/153 at the Satisfactory-Level 2, 0% at the Needs Improvement-Level 1, and 2% or 3/153 at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Eight candidates fell below target with five at the Satisfactory-Level 2 and three at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Following Action Plans for continued growth and development, five candidates (4 Traditional and 1 Dual) showed evidence of increased performance during Role Reversal of Student Teaching to meet program requirements. Two spring 2012 Traditional candidates who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will be required to repeat ECE 4662: Student Teaching and one Traditional candidate who withdrew prior to the midpoint will also repeat the experience. Two spring 2012 Traditional candidates who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will be required to repeat ECE 4662: Student Teaching and one Traditional candidate who withdrew prior to the midpoint will also repeat the experience. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate that the Dual candidates scored 3% higher on this assessment than the Traditional candidates. Of the Traditional candidates 94% or 114/121 met or exceeded the assessment target of level 3, while 97% or 31/32 of Dual candidates met or exceeded the assessment target. For Dual Program – Special Education concentration candidates, the score of 97% meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment is higher in comparison to their 94% score across 2007-2011. The mean scores based upon the overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.67 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.79 on a (0-4) scale. Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction was the lowest rated outcome at 3.62 for the Traditional candidates.

**Target for O3: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice**

Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "very good", or 4, "outstanding", on the revised 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching a "very good" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2011-2012 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 95% or 145/153 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation (i.e., 81% or 124/153 exceeded expectations with scores Outstanding- Level 4, 14% or 21/153 met expectations with scores Very Good-Level 3. Candidates scoring below target include 3% or 5/153 at the Satisfactory-Level 2, 0% at the Needs Improvement-Level 1, and 2% or 3/153 at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Eight candidates fell below target with five at the Satisfactory-Level 2 and three at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Following Action Plans for continued growth and development, five candidates (4 Traditional and 1 Dual) showed evidence of increased performance during Role Reversal of Student Teaching to meet program requirements. Two spring 2012 Traditional candidates who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will be required to repeat ECE 4662: Student Teaching and one Traditional candidate who withdrew prior to the midpoint will also repeat the experience. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate that the Dual candidates scored 3% higher on this assessment than the Traditional candidates. Of the Traditional candidates 94% or 114/121 met or exceeded the assessment target of level 3, while 97% or 31/32 of Dual candidates met or exceeded the assessment target. For Dual Program – Special Education concentration candidates, the score of 97% meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment is higher in comparison to their 94% score across 2007-2011. The mean scores based upon the overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation by program are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.67 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.79 on a (0-4) scale. Outcome 2: Plans effectively for instruction was the lowest rated outcome at 3.62 for the Traditional candidates.
indicate that the Dual candidates scored 3% higher on this assessment than the Traditional candidates. Of the Traditional candidates 94% or 114/121 met or exceeded the assessment target of level 3, while 97% or 31/32 of Dual candidates met or exceeded the assessment target. For Dual Program – Special Education concentration candidates, the score of 97% meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment is higher in comparison to their 94% score across 2007-2011. The mean scores based on the overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation scores for both programs are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.67 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.79 on a (0-4) scale. Outcome 3: Applies content & pedagogy for successful clinical practice was indicative of high mean scores for both programs.

Target for O4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "very good", or 4, "outstanding", on the revised 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings with faculty to develop an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching a "very good" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2011-2012 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 95% or 145/153 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation (i.e., 81% or 124/153 exceeded expectations with scores Outstanding- Level 4, 14% or 21/153 met expectations with scores Very Good-Level 3. Candidates scoring below target include 3% or 5/153 at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Eight candidates fell below target with five at the Satisfactory-Level 2 and three at the Ununsatisfactory-Level 0 and three withdrew. Following Action Plans for continued growth and development, five candidates (4 Traditional and 1 Dual) showed evidence of increased performance during Role Reversal of Student Teaching to meet program requirements. Two spring 2012 Traditional candidates who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will be required to repeat ECE 4662: Student Teaching and one Traditional candidate who withdrew prior to the midpoint will also repeat the experience. The fall 2011 Traditional candidate, who withdrew prior to the midpoint, successfully repeated and completed the experience spring 2012. Finally, one Dual candidate withdrew prior to the midpoint and will be required to repeat the experience. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate that the Dual candidates scored 3% higher on this assessment than the Traditional candidates. Of the Traditional candidates 94% or 114/121 met or exceeded the assessment target of level 3, while 97% or 31/32 of Dual candidates met or exceeded the assessment target. For Dual Program – Special Education concentration candidates, the score of 97% meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment is higher in comparison to their 94% score across 2007-2011. The mean scores based on the overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation scores for both programs are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.67 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.79 on a (0-4) scale. Outcome 4: Uses assessment methods to document student learning was one of the lowest outcomes rated at 3.62 for the Dual and 3.69 for the Traditional candidates.

Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "very good", or 4, "outstanding", on the revised 0-4 point rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings with faculty to develop an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching a "very good" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Review of the overall performance scores obtained from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation instrument for 2011-2012 reveal the following: Aggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates show a 95% or 145/153 pass rate on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation (i.e., 81% or 124/153 exceeded expectations with scores Outstanding- Level 4, 14% or 21/153 met expectations with scores Very Good-Level 3. Candidates scoring below target include 3% or 5/153 at the Unsatisfactory-Level 0. Eight candidates fell below target with five at the Satisfactory-Level 2 and three at the Ununsatisfactory-Level 0 and three withdrew. Following Action Plans for continued growth and development, five candidates (4 Traditional and 1 Dual) showed evidence of increased performance during Role Reversal of Student Teaching to meet program requirements. Two spring 2012 Traditional candidates who did not meet standards due to issues with performance and professionalism will be required to repeat ECE 4662: Student Teaching and one Traditional candidate who withdrew prior to the midpoint will also repeat the experience. The fall 2011 Traditional candidate, who withdrew prior to the midpoint, successfully repeated and completed the experience spring 2012. Finally, one Dual candidate withdrew prior to the midpoint and will be required to repeat the experience. Disaggregate scores for Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration candidates indicate that the Dual candidates scored 3% higher on this assessment than the Traditional candidates. Of the Traditional candidates 94% or 114/121 met or exceeded the assessment target of level 3, while 97% or 31/32 of Dual candidates met or exceeded the assessment target. For Dual Program – Special Education concentration candidates, the score of 97% meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment is higher in comparison to their 94% score across 2007-2011. The mean scores based on the overall Final Student Teaching Evaluation scores for both programs are as follows: Traditional ESOL concentration – 3.67 and Dual – Special Education concentration – 3.79 on a (0-4) scale. Outcome 5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions was the highest rated outcome for both programs at 3.81 Traditional and 3.89 Dual.

M 3: Five Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals Rubric (O: 5)
The new Dispositions Survey (implemented fall 2010 and forward) called Five Dispositions of Effective Education 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. The rubric levels are as follows: Level 4 (Strength or Exceptional), Level 3 (Developing or Acceptable), Level 2 (Emerging or Marginal) and Level 1 (Unsure or Unacceptable).
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "acceptable", or 4, "exemplary", on the 1-4 point Five Dispositions of Effective Educational
Professionals rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address areas of deficiency with the goal of reaching an "acceptable" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2 or 1 = 5%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2011-2012 data indicate an overall aggregate pass rate of 97% or 150/154 total program candidates (Traditional and Dual) meeting or exceeding the target of Level 3 "acceptable" or Level 4 "exemplary" on the Five Effective Dispositions Assessment compared to 94% (136/144) of the 2010-2011 completers. Disaggregate scores from 2011-2012 data show ratings for Traditional Program teacher candidates at 97% (117/121) as compared to 100% (33/33) for Dual Program candidates meeting or exceeding the target on this assessment. Of the four Traditional ESOL candidates who received marginal ratings on this assessment, they were monitored during Student Teaching. Three students passed with a "C" in ECE 4662: Student Teaching, while one is required to repeat the course. All Newton External Delivery program candidates passed this assessment.

M 4: GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood & Special Education (O: 1)

Passing scores on the GACE Content Assessments are required for teacher certification. The following GACE Assessments are required by program: Early Childhood Education (ECE) Traditional Program: Test 001 (Language Arts, Social Studies); Test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education) Early Childhood Education and Special Education, General Curriculum (ECE SPE) Dual Certification Program: Test 001 (Language Arts, Social Studies); Test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education); Test 081 and 082 (Special Education)

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

Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge
A passing score determined by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission on initial teacher certification is required for teacher certification/licensure in Early Childhood and Special Education.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All program candidates recommended for teacher certification received passing scores on the GACE. Score reports are not available for the repository for the current year. Score reports for 2009 and 2010-2011 are now available and located in the repository. Scores for these two years are as follows: For 2009 - 2010 - Test 001 (Reading, English Language Arts, Social Studies): 163 candidates or 100% passed; Test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education and the Arts) = 163 or 100% passed. For 2010-2011 - Test 001 (Reading, English Language Arts, Social Studies) = 157 candidates or 94% passed; Test 002 (Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education and the Arts) = 157 or 96% passed. Beginning fall 2010, we received approval of a program change which indicated that passing scores on the GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood Education would no longer be a requirement for graduation but would remain a requirement for recommendation for clear renewable certification in Early Childhood Education. Teacher candidates are strongly advised to take the GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood Education prior to graduation but not before they have completed junior level course work. GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood Education are not used for admission to Teacher Education or to Student Teaching. In the year, 2010-2011, following the change in requirement, we observed a lower percentage of candidates who passed tests 001 and 002. This data allows us to see more clearly areas for program improvement in these content areas. Analyses of our 2010-2011 sub-indicator percentages show that our scores are equal to or above the state in all areas. There was one indicator on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics that were the lowest for the state and for our candidates. In response to this outcome the program will implement supplemental instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics, including structure (GUMS) beginning, fall 2012 for candidates who have been identified as needing further instruction in this area. Additionally, the program will continue to implement the Writing Mentor Program developed fall 2010 to provide one on one tutoring for candidates who need further development in writing as identified by program faculty and university supervisors. Finally, our scores on test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. We expect to see improvement in this area due to course changes in ISCI 2001 fall 2011; such as, increased emphasis on content development in earth and life sciences and collaboration between College of Arts & Sciences and College of Education faculty who implement co-teaching models of delivery.

M 5: Observation Field Performance Assessment Rubric (O: 1, 5)
The Observation Field Performance in ECE Rubric is used to assess pre-service teachers during practicum (three field experiences prior to student teaching) and student teaching (clinical practice). The instrument is based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The assessor will enter observation ratings in LiveText, the electronic assessment management system, across all indicators and domains for the final teacher candidate observation in each of the field experiences; that is, Practicum I, Practicum II, Practicum III, and Student Teaching. Pre-service teachers are placed in the following grade levels for each experience: Practicum I: Pre-kindergarten (5 weeks) and Kindergarten (8 weeks) Practicum II: 1st grade (7 weeks) and 2nd/3rd grade (6 weeks) - Midpoint Evaluation Practicum III: 4th/5th grade (13 weeks) Student Teaching: 15 weeks (K-5; a selected grade level). Student Teaching observation performance ratings will be reviewed end program. Rubric levels are as follows: Level 4 (Proficient), Level 3 (Achieving), Level 2 (Developing), Level 1 (Emerging, Level 0 (Beginning). Ratings of "Developing" or higher are needed for recommendation for certification and to pass student teaching, although the program target has been identified at level 3 "Achieving" or higher across all six performance domains.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge
Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "achieving", or 4, "proficient", on the 0-4 point rubric in the area of Content and Curriculum on the Observation Field Performance Rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address the area of deficiency with the goal of reaching an "achieving" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%, Level 3 = 25%, Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Of the 2011-2012 Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration completers 153/157 or ninety-seven percent (97%) met or exceeded the target with only three (3) completers and one (1) non-completer, or 3% falling below target on the overall domain ratings on the Observation Field Performance Assessment at the end of their program. The three completers
demonstrated competency during Student Teaching on other evaluations in order to meet program requirements. In the area of Content and Curriculum, one of the completers met Action Plan requirements to pass this assessment during Student Teaching; however, the other candidate, the non-completer, did not meet requirements and will be required to repeat the Student Teaching experience successfully prior to graduation and recommendation for certification. One hundred percent (100%) or 21/21 Traditional ESOL Newton sub-group candidates passed this assessment.

Target for O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions

Since the ECE BSED Program leads to teacher certification/licensure at the endpoint, it is expected that most candidates, 95%, will achieve at least a rating of 3, "achieving", or 4, "proficient", on the 0-4 point rubric in the area of Knowledge of Students on the Observation Field Performance Rubric. Candidates who do not achieve these ratings work with faculty to create an action plan specifically designed to address the area of deficiency with the goal of reaching an "achieving" rating. In few cases, 5% or less, candidates who do not achieve their goals are not recommended for teacher certification. The following targets have been set regarding the percentage of candidates scoring at each level of the rubric: Level 4 = 70%; Level 3 = 25%; Levels 2, 1, 0 = 5%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Of the 2011-2012 Traditional ESOL and Dual – Special Education concentration completers 153/157 or ninety-seven percent (97%) met or exceeded the target with only three (3) completers and one (1) non-completer, or 3% falling below target on the overall domain ratings on the Observation Field Performance Assessment at the end of their program. The three completers demonstrated competency during Student Teaching on other evaluations in order to meet program requirements. In the area of O5: Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions, one of the Dual Program completers met Action Plan requirements to pass this assessment during Student Teaching; however, the Traditional Program non-completer, did not meet requirements and will be required to repeat the Student Teaching experience successfully prior to graduation and recommendation for certification. One hundred percent (100%) or 21/21 Traditional ESOL Newton sub-group candidates passed this assessment.

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

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. After a review of 2011-2012 data, the Dual concentration candidate pass rate in this area increased significantly from 88% (2010-2011) to 100% or 33/33 candidates meeting or exceeding the target.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals Rubric</td>
<td>Values and displays professional and ethical dispositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

Responsible Person/Group: BSE Faculty

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. After a review of 2011-2012 data, 96% of candidates met or exceeded the target on the assessment component. While scores are close, we have noted that assessment continues to be one of the areas that pre-service teachers have difficulty. We have identified action plans that are "in progress" to address this area.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Teaching, Learning Module (PTLM) Rubric</td>
<td>Uses assessment methods to document student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: BSE 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.

Planning and Assessment; ELL & Special Education Focus

2010-2011 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. 2011-2012 data show similar results as planning and assessment are still rated the lowest areas on this assessment as follows: For planning, 3.62 Traditional Program and 3.89 Dual Program and for assessment, 3.69 Traditional Program and 3.62 Dual Program. Dual Program results for planning and assessment show a slight increase from 2010-2011 while Traditional Program results are slightly lower than the previous year’s scores. Overall scores on this evaluation for programs combined show and increase in 4% from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. We will continue to monitor these areas and will consider the following interventions: revision of two mid-program assignments, the Guided Reading Planning Assessment and the Planning, Teaching, Learning Sample, and to see if intentional instruction mid-program increases scores by end program. Both of these assignments require our students to plan three sequential lessons and to analyze and reflect on student performance/data during and following each lesson in order to make revisions prior to teaching the next lesson. Finally, we will continue to provide ESOL and Special Education supplemental course inputs to build students’ confidence in planning and assessing students with special/linguistic needs. We will ask students to complete a survey at the end of each semester next year and note any changes in their confidence levels.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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. Revise mid program key assessments in planning and assessment, Guided Reading and Planning, Teaching, Learning Sample.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: BSE faculty and/or part time instructors
Additional Resources: None
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 on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation for Outcome 3; specifically, Standard 6C: Communication Skills - Demonstrates competency in using technology to support student learning. After one year of interventions, the data reveal the following: For 2010-2011 Traditional and Dual Program candidates’ mean and modal scores for Outcome 3, Standard 6C are a 3.81 and a modal score of 4 (121/122 Traditional candidates meeting target) and 3.48 mean and a modal score of 3 (25/25 Dual candidates meeting target). For 2011-2012 Traditional and Dual Program candidates’ mean and modal scores for Outcome 3, Standard 6C are a 3.66 mean and 4 mode (123/126 Traditional candidates meeting target) and 3.76 mean and 4 mode (33/33 Dual candidates meeting target). We have also reviewed data from the Observation Field Performance Assessment, Domain 3: Learning Environments, sub-indicator 3.5 (incorporate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to support learning-based interactions in the classroom or to increase student achievement) for a second measure. The data are reported for Traditional and Dual candidates combined and show, for 2011-2012, 156/157 candidates meeting target with a mean of 3.85 and a modal score of 4 as compared to 2010-2011 with 142/145 candidates meeting target with a mean of 3.81 and a modal score of 4. We will continue with the interventions in monitoring this area.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) | Outcome/Objective: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Implementation Description: In order to help pre-service teachers develop a student-centered approach, the BSED faculty have looked closely at the ISTE’s NETS for teachers and for students. P-12 students need to use technology in the service of high level thinking and knowledge production, including the making of digital media. The BSED faculty have created a technology project bank aligning the NETS to technology projects across course and field work. Additionally, faculty have added a two day Digital Literacy Seminar.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: BSE Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Classroom Management Strategies Focus
Data from the Final Student Teaching Evaluation sub-indicator 5A: Learning Environments and the Observations Field Performance assessment sub-indicators suggest that some of our candidates scored lower in using management strategies to engage and motivate learners. Since classroom management is an area that pre-service teachers typically need improvement in as noted in our data, we have restructured two of our classroom management courses, the first and third, for a stronger focus on “Responsive Classroom” and individual behavior management strategies. Additionally, we will begin restructuring the second management course to continue to include a study of theorists but also to increase emphasis on classroom management strategies and building community.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (Appendix E) | Outcome/Objective: Applies content and pedagogy for successful clinical practice

Implementation Description: Course changes: Classroom Management I, II, and III for more emphasis on "Responsive Classroom" strategies

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: BSED Faculty
GUMS & Writing Mentor Program & ISCI 2001 Course Changes

Analysis of our 2010-2011 GACE Content Assessment sub-indicator percentages show that our scores are equal or above the state in all areas, except the lowest area on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics was equivalent with the state score. In response to this outcome the program will implement supplemental instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics, including structure (GUMS) beginning, fall 2012 for candidates who have been identified as needing further instruction in this area. Additionally, the Writing Mentor BSED Program has been developed to help students improve creative and procedural writing skills. Finally, our scores on test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. We expect to see improvement in this area due to course changes in ISCI 2001 fall 2011; such as, increased emphasis on content development in earth and life sciences and collaboration between College of Arts & Sciences and College of Education faculty who implement co-teaching models of delivery. (2011-2012 ISCI 2001 Course Changes included in report)

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood & Special Education
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates content knowledge

Implementation Description: Current BSED faculty co-teaching in ISCI 2001 will monitor course changes. GACE scores will be reviewed in May 2013. One load has been assigned to BSED faculty to implement the GUMS supplemental instruction as well as the Writing Mentor BSED Program.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: BSED 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 ECE BSED Program will continue to use the LiveText course management system to document, collect, analyze, and report program data. We revised our targets and data reports this year to include disaggregated data across all levels of the key assessment rubrics. In doing so, we clearly identified the percentage of teacher candidates exceeding, meeting, and not meeting standards. As a result of obtaining this information, we identified specific areas of program focus needed (described in Academic Question 2) to improve candidate performance and program effectiveness.

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.

ECE BSED Program changes are based on many factors including key assessment data, university and state policy, standards from professional organizations, and research. Decisions for program changes and improvements for the Early Childhood Bachelor of Science in Education consider all of these factors. 1. Content knowledge: A review of the GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood Education (001, 002) scores and sub scores from all program candidates indicate that our candidates continue to be qualified in content area knowledge in Reading and English Language Arts, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, Health, Physical Education and the Arts. The data continue to indicate that the Early Childhood Program of Study, course content and instruction, assignments, and field experiences effectively prepare our candidates to perform well on the state licensing tests. The Department of Early Childhood Education will continue to monitor and revise curriculum maps and multiple curriculum assessment data sources to continue alignment with GACE Content Assessment objectives, course objectives and content standards. Beginning fall 2010, we received approval of a program change which indicated that passing scores on the GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood Education would no longer be a graduation requirement but would remain a requirement for recommendation for clear renewable certification in Early Childhood Education. The lower percentage points in the 2010-2011 data are evident due to this program change and now reflect all students who took the test. This program change allows us to see more clearly areas for program improvement. Additionally, GACE Content Assessments in Early Childhood Education are not a requirement for admission to Teacher Education or to Student Teaching. Analysis of our 2010-2011 sub-indicator percentages show that our scores are equal or above the state in all areas, the lowest area on test 001: understand the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics was equivalent with the state score. In response to this outcome the program will implement supplemental instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics, including structure (GUMS) beginning, fall 2012 for candidates who have been identified as needing further instruction in this area. Finally, our scores on test 002 are higher than the state except for one area, again the lowest state rated outcome: understand concepts and principles of earth science. We expect to see improvement in this area due to course changes in ISCI 2001 fall 2011; such as, increased emphasis on content development in earth and life sciences and collaboration between College of Arts & Sciences and College of Education faculty who implement co-teaching models of delivery. (2011-2012 ISCI 2001 Course Changes) Finally, with the inclusion of a new Unit Level assessment data source, the Observation Field Performance, we noted that ECE program faculty and supervisors rated our candidates on Domain 1: Content and Curriculum as one of the highest scored domains. This additional measure to assess content knowledge as observed in field experiences and clinical practice is a performance-based assessment and is used to evaluate teacher candidates across all PEF Conceptual Framework indicators and is aligned to the Georgia Framework for Teaching. 2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions: In review of the following key assessments, the Final Student Teaching Evaluation - Appendix E, the Observation Field Performance, and the Five Effective Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals assessments, the department faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers are pleased with the growth and development of the candidates across the four semester program. These key assessments have been administered across two academic cycles (3 year years of data each cycle) and results from data on these assessments show that our candidates have the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed in becoming teachers. With the advancement to a new electronic course management and assessment system, LiveText, we are able to more effectively use rubrics and a deeper and deeper in evaluation of each candidate’s area of strength and area of needed improvement for a more comprehensive evaluation. Data from the Observations Field Performance assessment sub-indicators suggest that some of our candidates scored lower in using management strategies to engage and motivate learners. Since classroom management is an area that pre-service teachers typically need improvement in as noted in our data, we have restructured two of our classroom management courses, the
first and third, for a stronger focus on “Responsive Classroom” and individual behavior management strategies. Additionally, we will begin restructuring the second management course to continue to include a study of theorists but also to increase emphasis on classroom management strategies and building community. 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. 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. In 2010-11, faculty collected preliminary data on pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward technology use in elementary classrooms Prek – 5th and findings were presented at the International Society for Technology in Education. We learned that while pre-service teachers are avid users of technology in their personal lives, they will need scaffolding to make connections for student use of technology in their future classrooms. This study led to the renaming and design of one literacy course in the BSED Program to emphasize technology and digital literacy: that is, ECE 3602: Digital Composing as Literacy Learning. Additionally, the ECE BSED Program created two full day seminars for pre-service teachers focused on Digital Composition. The program faculty collaborated with The Alliance Theatre and Young Audiences to introduce pre-service teachers to concepts and techniques for digital storytelling and composition. This initiative included working with film and sound editing software leading to a final project where pre-service teachers created and presented original multi-media projects. ECE BSED faculty also worked with the Center for Instructional Innovation at Georgia State University to develop a hybrid course version of ECE 3602 which was implemented spring 2012. The new hybrid course immersed pre-service teachers more fully in the use of technology, combining face to face meetings with online learning environments and practices. Program faculty and supervisors have also identified a need to provide additional support for teacher candidates in the area of professional writing. A pilot program, BSE Writing Mentor Support, developed by Early Childhood Education BSE faculty was studied in the 2010-2011 academic year. The BSE Program will continue to implement the Writing Mentor Program developed fall 2010 to provide one on one tutoring for candidates who need further development in writing as identified by program faculty and university supervisors. 3. Effects on Student learning: The Planning, Teaching, Learning Module, an individual project implemented during clinical practice (i.e., Student Teaching) provided evidence that our candidates accurately included specific data that identified student learning gains (or losses) for each student in their class as a result of their teaching. Additionally, candidates provided both a narrative and a graphic summary of student learning data, an analysis of the data, an explanation of the outcomes, and an appropriate plan for additional instruction based on the analysis of their results. When candidates failed to meet some of the requirements for this assessment, they typically needed to add a more detailed narrative summary or a missing component. Candidates have an opportunity to prepare for this assessment during Practicum III, prior to clinical practice, by developing a Planning, Teaching, Learning Sample, a similar, collaborative integrated project assigned in ECE 3605: Social Studies Methods in ECE and ECE 3360: Assessment of Classroom Learning in Early Childhood Education. Course instructors will continue to provide additional scaffolding in these courses in order to address these areas for improvement. With the addition of the assessment course to the Program of Study in Area G, our candidates are no longer failing in the Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory range of the Final Student Teaching Evaluation on INTASC 8 Assessment of Student Learning; however, results from 2011-2012 data from this assessment and the Observation Field Performance assessment reveal that it is still an area that pre-service teachers struggle with and is typically rated the lowest. The Observation Field Performance assessment shows assessment as one of the lowest scored for a few candidates, particularly in involving learners in self-assessment. Supervisors typically rate candidates as “not observed” or “does not involve learners in self-assessment”. The role of instructional assessment as it relates to teaching and learning is a major focus of this Assessment course, ECE 3360, as well as methods for documenting student learning. Candidates examine various teacher-constructed and standardized instruments used to assess student learning and learn strategies for selecting and using assessment methods. A focus on pupil self-assessment will be added to course instruction. Finally, based on feedback from this data and University Supervisors’ ratings, course instructors have become more intentional in incorporating methods of assessment across specific content area course work. In order to continue to be responsive to the climate of accountability for P-5 student learning and to improve our candidates’ competencies in assessing P-5 student learning, this is a continued focus in the content area course work. The BSE program has been revised beginning fall 2010 to require the ESOL Endorsement for all “Traditional – non Dual Certification” Program students. This decision was made in an effort to address the changing demographics and pupil needs in metro Atlanta as noted in the ECE strategic plan and to improve preparation of pre-service teachers in the areas of planning for differentiated instruction and assessment. Faculty will continue to closely monitor these areas and note any differences in data upon the implementation of this program change.
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Mission / Purpose

The mission of Birth Through Five (B-5) is to provide an exemplary, interdisciplinary teacher preparation program for early care and education professionals, in order to positively impact the quality of programs for very young children in the urban metropolitan Atlanta region. The program prepares new teachers, current teachers or career changers for employment in varied settings with very young children (birth through Kindergarten) both typically developing and those with special education needs. Graduates of the program are well prepared for jobs as certified teachers, administrators, or early education specialists in the Birth Through Five and Preschool Special Education fields. Our program is committed to principles and practices that are respectful of the unique characteristics of the children, families, and teacher candidates with whom we work.

The B-5 program 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 September, 2012 sixty-six (69) students have declared the B-5 major, with 24 graduates during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Plans effectively for development and learning (G: 2) (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 12 program graduates (100%) received ratings of &quot;meets standard&quot; or &quot;exceeds standard&quot; on the evaluation of field performance, an assessment that demonstrates content knowledge. 41% (5 candidates) received ratings of &quot;exceed&quot; and 7 candidates received ratings of &quot;meets.&quot; The mean overall rating was 2.42 out of 3.0. Candidates received their highest ratings (2.92) on indicators such as, &quot;uses knowledge of child development to promote children's learning,&quot; and &quot;connects with children and families for meaningful teaching and learning.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 2: IEP/IFSP Project (O: 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen B-5 students completed the IEP project in order to demonstrate their ability to plan effectively for children with special educational needs. 11/15 (73%) of students received ratings of at least developing &quot;developing&quot; for the eight dimensions rated in this project. However, four students (26%) received ratings of &quot;beginning&quot; on one dimension of the rubric, &quot;Transition Planning.&quot; The mean scores ranged from 3.0 - 4.0, with an overall mean score of 3.66 for the eight project dimensions. The highest mean score (4.0) was for the &quot;Statement of student's strengths and needs,&quot; which is the most significant planning skill addressed in the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) (O: 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

**Target for O3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

85% of teaching 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

92% of candidates (11/12) received ratings of "satisfactory" or "exceeds expectations" on the Documentation of Learning Project. This project is embedded in the B-5 professional portfolio and is rated under the indicator, "Impact on Student Learning." Seven (7) candidates received ratings of "exceeds expectations" with scores between 93-100 points. Four (4) candidates received ratings of "satisfactory" with scores ranging between 73 - 92. The overall project mean score was 4.6 / 5.0 Candidate demonstrated strong scores on "Assessment rationale and tools" (4.0), which is a key skill of the project. One candidate received a rating of "unsatisfactory." (72/100) as she did not upload all DOL project components into LiveText by the end of the semester deadline. The candidate did complete the components in a paper-based format.

**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

**Target for O4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions**

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All twelve (12) candidates met the target ratings and no candidate received any ratings of "unacceptable." The mean scores on the nine (9) dimensions of professional dispositions ranged from 3.50 – 3.83/4.0 points, with an overall mean of 3.66/4.0. Eleven of the 12 candidates were rated in the exceptional or acceptable range on all dimensions. One student was rated as marginal in two dimensions ("empathy," and "authenticity.")

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

**Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards**

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating professional and ethical practices in this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards**

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in family and community relations this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) | **Outcome/Objective:** Plans effectively for development and learning
- **Implementation Description:** Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
- **Responsible Person/Group:** B-5 Program Coordinator
- **Additional Resources:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in 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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) | Outcome/Objective: Uses assessment methods to document student learning

Implementation Description: Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2011
Responsible Person/Group: B-5 Coordinator
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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).

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

Implementation Description: Redesign assignment materials and extend opportunities to work on the assessment over two courses.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EXC 4530, EXC 4520 Course Instructor
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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).

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

Implementation Description: The instructor will revise the assessment template and students will have the opportunity to document their performance in developing an individualized educational plan for a young child with special learning needs over two semesters, rather than just one.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EXC 4530 instructor
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Rubric revised to clarify minimum level of performance

Going forward from fall, 2012, the IEP/IFSP rubric will be revised to reflect clearer levels of proficiency and passing scores: Mastery (29-32 points); Accomplished (25-28 points); Developing (24 points); Beginning (23 points or fewer). If a student receives 23 points or fewer, they will need to redo and resubmit the assignment until a passing score is obtained.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: IEP/IFSP Project | Outcome/Objective: Plans effectively for development and learning

Implementation Description: EXC 4530 and EXC 4520 will revise syllabi according to the new assessment standard and scores.

Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Course instructors revise syllabi; Program coordinator revises LiveText Rubric and Weave Measure
Additional Resources: None
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?

The student learning outcomes, assessment measures and achievement targets generally work well, however, several minor revisions to the assessments have been made as follows: Planning: IEPI/IFSP Project The assessment/measure for planning is the IEPI/IFSP project. This mid-program assessment evaluates the candidate's ability to plan for the special educational needs of the early childhood educator. Graduates of the program standards to be reached are detailed for the Preschool Curriculum Endorsement (3-5). Therefore, it is essential that our candidates have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to support special education services in the B-5 setting. Candidates have two opportunities to use the planning rubric, once for the IEP/IFSP project during fall semester (with a child below age three) and during spring semester for the IEP project (with a child age 3-5). Data is collected through LiveText for both projects. However, only the IEP Project in EXC 4530 Methods for Preschool/PreK/Exchange Children with Disabilities is used for the key assessment. Data for the 15-student cohort in EXC 4530 in the spring 2012 showed an overall mean score for the project of 3.6/4. This is a strong performance for candidates overall. The range of mean scores was 3.0 - 3.874/4 on eight dimensions of planning. The dimensions with the lowest means of 3.0 were: writing outcomes, goals and objectives; and transition planning. The dimension with the highest mean score (4.0) was: statement of student's strengths and needs, which is a core planning skill for this project. However, to reach "target" on this measure, candidates should receive ratings of "developing" or above. On five of the planning dimensions, at least one or more students received a lower rating of "beginning." The course instructor determined that these "beginning" ratings were due to incomplete/missing entries and a lack of following the assignment rubric closely, rather than skill deficiencies. This is the second year the instructor has provided more guidance in following the project rubric. Going forward from fall, 2012, the IEPI/IFSP rubric will be revised to reflect clearer levels of proficiency and passing scores: Mastery (29-32 points); Accomplished (25-28 points); Developing (24 points); Beginning (23 points or fewer). If a student receives 23 points or fewer, she/he will need to redo and resubmit the assignment until a passing score is obtained. Summary of proposed changes to improve candidate performance in LiveText: The project instructor will remind candidates that their candidate and/or program's professional dispositions was developed. The candidate did receive a positive rating at the end of student teaching in the area of "professional dispositions." The university supervisor's rating is uploaded in LiveText as the key assessment. The data for the 12 completers in 2011-2012 show five (54.1%) received an overall rating of "meets standard" (15 or more of 19 indicators rated as exceeds). Seven (7/58%) candidates received an overall rating of "meets standard" (14 or fewer of 19 indicators rated as exceeds and no ratings of not met). No candidates received a rating of "does not meet standard." Candidates who do not meet standards are provided with a professional action plan that may include additional support (e.g. extra office hours, conferences, etc.). The program coordinator will examine the individual checklists to see if there is a pattern of lower ratings on specific indicators. If no trend is noted, program faculty and university supervisors can provide additional focus on these performance indicators. Another finding is that for the three indicators that specify "working with families," the rating of "No opportunity to observe" (i.e. the student was not selected by the mentor teacher and supervisor (a rating of N/A does not affect the candidate's score). Student teaching should afford candidates many opportunities to interact with families, especially in early care and education settings (daily conversations during drop off/pick up, parent conferences, family nights, newsletters, etc.). This family and community connection is not happening in all placements. The B-5 Advisory Committee, along with the instructor for BRFV 4400, will design specific strategies/assignments for the candidate to use to support family and community connections during student teaching. Candidates will also be required to include these family-centered strategies/assignments as artifacts in their professional portfolios which is reviewed for the third and final time during clinical practice. Professional Dispositions: Survey Candidates are rated at two transition points on professional dispositions (midpoint and endpoint). The data table shows 12 candidates rated at endpoint (student teaching semester) on a 9-dimension survey of professional dispositions. All candidates met the target ratings and no candidate received any ratings of unacceptable. The mean scores on the nine professional dispositions dimensions ranged from 3.50 – 3.83/4 points. Eleven of the 12 candidates were rated in the exceptional or acceptable range on all dimensions. One student was rated as marginal in two dimensions ("empathy," and "authenticity."). These ratings were largely due to dispositions displayed in college classes with peers or instructors, and not with students, parents, or mentor teachers in field experiences or clinical practice. The candidate met with the course instructor and program coordinator for a Notification & Documentation conference. An action plan for improvement in the relevant professionalism dispositions was developed. The candidate did receive a positive rating at the end of student teaching in the area of "professionalism" on the evaluation of field performance. Summary of proposed changes to improve candidate and/or program performance: The program coordinator will continue to monitor mid-point dispositions ratings. Any candidates receiving ratings of "marginal" or "unacceptable" will be scheduled for a Notification & Documentation conference and a professional action plan. The program coordinator will review the end-point dispositions ratings for improvement or further action plans. Impact on Student Learning: DOL Project The Documentation of Learning (DOL) project was added to the Professional Portfolio as a more refined measure of candidates' efforts on student teaching. The project documents the candidate's ability to plan, teach and assess very young children's learning and development during a 10-day thematic unit during student teaching. Candidates upload artifacts in LiveText and present them during a face-to-face benchmark conference at the end of student teaching. The "evidence" of child learning is presented through developmentally appropriate formats, such as child portfolios, photo documentation boards, child interviews, and KWHL charts (captures the learning process through children's input). For the infant through Kindergarten age group, these pre-post assessment formats are more appropriate than pre-post testing. The DOL project was rated by the candidate at the 100 point grading sheet. The DOL is then rated as part of the professional portfolio in LiveText as the dimension labeled "Impact on Student Learning." Data for the 12 completers in 2011-2012 show scores ranging from 72-100/100 points with an average score of 91. The assessment target of 80/100 was met by all but one candidate. Rubric ratings show that seven candidates were rated as "meets expectations," four were rated as "satisfactory," and one student received an "unsatisfactory" rating due to incomplete or missing components in LiveText. Summary: To improve candidate and/or program performance for the DOL project is an effective measure of candidate's effects on student learning. No changes in the assessment will be made at this time. However, the program coordinator and university supervisors working with the candidates will need to insure that all candidates upload artifacts into LiveText in order to meet the target standard.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Birth Through Five program is still relatively new (2009) with only two assessment cycles completed. While the process has
identified several areas to ‘tweak’ in the assessment system, data have not revealed areas where significant revisions to curriculum, courses, or course sequence is needed. However, one observation that will be further studied concerns the lower scores on the measure, Evaluation of Field Performance (End of Program). We have noticed that student teaching interns do not consistently score as well on indices of working collaboratively with families, or incorporating family and community into the curriculum or learning process. Either student teachers are not having the opportunity to work as closely with families/community as we had hoped during student teaching or they are not able to maximize these opportunities. After discussing this issue at our B-5 Advisory Committee meetings, the course instructor for BRFV 4400 Family and Community Relations has agreed to design several assignments that could be more helpful to student teachers in building connections with families/communities.
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Mission / Purpose

Normal 0 false false false The Educational Specialist major in Early Childhood Education is a degree program planned to develop classroom teachers through collaborative inquiry and action research. This applied program's primary purpose is to extend the academic and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers to foster application of these skills in their classrooms and schools. As a cohort, participants collaborate with university faculty and each other to do work inside and outside their schools and classrooms. Successful completion of the program leads to an Ed.S. degree and a Teacher Support Specialist (T.S.S.) endorsement. Successful graduates may also apply 18 credit hours toward the Ph.D. program in Early Childhood Education after admission to the doctoral program. The Teacher Support Specialist (TSS) Endorsement program in Early Childhood Education is one of five endorsements offered through the Department of Early Childhood Education (ECE). Revised in 2007, the Ed.S.TSS program concentrates on training teachers to become teacher researchers who use data to inform their policies, procedures, and practices. The TSS program maintains the elements reported by ECE Ed.S. graduates as essential including a commitment to a cohort model, constructivist theory, and the exploration of classroom and school-based research as a way for teachers to observe and study the effects of teaching and learning changes made in their classrooms. Program assessment and evaluation components are refined and guided by the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBTPS) and Georgia State University (GSU) Professional Education Faculty (PEF) Conceptual Framework.

Philosophy

The educational specialist 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, the program is designed around academic givens so that content areas have blurred edges, and participants partner with faculty to shape the paths by which content is learned. Certain beliefs characterize this program:

All teachers can lead and contribute to accomplishing the work of the school.

- All teachers can lead and contribute to accomplishing the work of the school.
- Constructivism is the primary basis of learning for children, adults, and organizations.
- Learning is facilitated by student choice.
- Instructors use instructional methods that are linked to and that model the way students learn.
- Instructors’ roles facilitate learning.
- Multiple continuous assessment procedures are necessary.
- The university involves faculty and students in developing the teacher education program based on the needs of the students and the professional judgment of the faculty.
- Learning and teacher education curriculum must be fundamentally connected to the community, families, school and classroom.
- Teachers/educators promote classroom/school research as a way for teachers to explore the effects of changes made in their classrooms/schools.
- Patterns of relationships form the primary bases for human growth and development.
- Schools should be organized to foster shared responsibility for school governance, for professional growth, and for achievement of agreed upon goals.
- Teachers have the potential to be change agents who challenge the systems that that limit the access, opportunities and development of young children and their families.

With these beliefs as the core, this program provides opportunities for teachers to explore classroom and school-based research as a way for teachers to observe and study the efforts of teaching and learning changes made in their classrooms. Their primary professional responsibilities are to become change agents, researchers and leaders who use data to inform their policies, practices, procedures, and epistemologies.

The vision of the ECE Ed.S program is aligned with the vision of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF) to provide international leadership in educational research and to create and implement exemplary educational programs in metropolitan areas. The PEF envisions a world that embraces diversity; where social justice, democratic ideals, and equal opportunity can be increasingly enacted; and where technology is used to enhance opportunities for human development. The PEF believes that all people should be lifelong learners. Three themes permeate the ECE TSS program that meet this vision: Teacher as Researcher, Teacher as Professional Learner, and Teacher as Learner Centered Practitioner.

Mission:

The mission of the Ed.S. 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 Ed.S. program in Early Childhood Education 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: Teachers as Researchers**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Successful candidates in the Ed.S. program are 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 Candidates in the ECE Ed.S. program are learner-centered practitioners who build on the knowledge and experience of the learner and have 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 in the Ed.S program are 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. Candidates in the Ed.S. program are able to 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 MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Candidates in the Ed.S. program will be able to adjust their practice according to learners’ individual differences based on their understanding of how learners develop. Candidates will be able to use this knowledge to make decisions about how to teach and 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 MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Candidates will be able to appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organized and linked to other disciplines. Candidates will be able to use their specialized knowledge about how to convey content to learners and 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 MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Candidates will be able to call on multiple methods to meet clearly defined goals. Candidates will be able to orchestrate learning in different groupings and settings while placing a premium on learners’ engagement and maintaining regular assessment of their learners’ progress.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #3; PSC Standard Domain: Clinical Practice

**SLO 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience (M: 3, 4, 5)**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Educators are models for life-long learning, exemplifying the ideals they seek to inspire in others. Educators seek advice from others and draw on educational research and scholarship to improve their practice and make principled judgments.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #4; PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Content Knowledge

**SLO 5: Participates in professional learning communities (M: 1, 3, 4)**
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Candidates will be able to collaborate with other professionals to make schools more effective. Candidates will be able to find ways to work collaboratively with parents and caregivers engaging them in the work of the school in multiple ways and through creative avenues. Candidates will be able to take advantage of a school’s surrounding community as a resource for learning.

Relevant Associations: NAEYC; NBPTS #5; PSC Standard Domain: Planning, Clinical Practice

**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.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Findings (2011-2012) (data table attached) The majority of EDS program completers were rated at acceptable or Exceptional on all five dispositions at the midpoint assessment in Fall 2011. No unacceptable ratings were reported. At midpoint assessment, some students were rated as marginal on Positive View of Self and Meaningful Purpose and Vision. At the midpoint, candidates are often required to critically analyze their teaching methods and philosophy. Hence it is expected that they would be rated as they were. Throughout the program, candidates become increasingly confident about their teaching while developing a more meaningful purpose and vision for the work they do. All program completers met the standards set for the EDS-TSS program degree and endorsement.

Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development

An overall Likert score of 4.0 or better is expected for all supervisors.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

On average, student interns rated the EdS teachers who served as their supervisor on average 5 out of 5; ratings represent placements and supervision during the Fall 2011 semester. 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

Target for O4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The academic performance of all students is evaluated toward the end of the fall semester when the summative report is due.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

All TSS program completers met endorsement standards 1 through 6 as evidenced by a grade of B or better (50 out of 60 points required) on the supervision summative report. As the program has moved to the adoption of Livetext for the assessment data warehouse we have adjusted the rubric for this key assessment to be more sensitive to the recommended 4 point scale and aligned with the new COE conceptual framework. This new rubric went into effect Fall 2011 and totals 60 points across 4-point scale from proficient (4) to beginning (1) with a "not met" option.

Target for O5: Shows commitment to learning and development

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The capstone experience is designed by faculty and participants to provide final reflection and documentation of an individual's work and accomplishments toward program objectives. As the culminating experience, it incorporates: self- and peer- assessment, reflection, and presentation of action research project to an outside audience.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Of the 17 students who completed the program and the Capstone Project in Summer 2012, 100% met the target and completed their projects satisfactorily. The EDS program goal was met for the Capstone project of at least 80% of students receiving a S or better. Using a final grade of S/U, based on the rubric points, the Ed.S. faculty have determined that the measure is more descriptive and useful than the letter grades that were used previously.
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 conducts an action research project in the classroom or school thereby bridging theory and practice. The project enables candidates to solve an educational problem as well as encourages the role of reflective practitioner. The project begins during the first semester and is carried out throughout the Ed.S. program. During spring term Ed.S. participants share the action research with an educational community. Final research reports are due in summer 2.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Applies expertise for learning and development**

Students are assessed using a rubric that details quality performance across categories required in the project. A total of 100 points are given. Target is B or better on the project (B3+). Program target is that 80% of participants will achieve this target.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target was met for this assessment. 94 percent of students received a B or higher on the final assessment rubric for the Action Research Project. Measures for assessing students’ performance on the first two parts of the action research project indicate that this is a good measure. The instructions, rubric and extensive clarification and feedback help students to achieve the targets set for them. All students met the goal for the Literature Review and one student did not meet the target for the Action Research Proposal. This student was offered additional support throughout the summer 4 semester. Of the 17 students who completed the program in Summer 2012, 94% met the target criterion and made a B or better on their Action Research Project.

**M 6: Content GPA (O: 1, 2)**

Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 The content knowledge GPA is computed every semester with the expectation that the student maintain 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 8800) and provides evidence of meeting TSS standards. This GPA is determined for the current cohort at the midpoint in the program and after completion of the two TSS specific courses each fall term. The second content GPA is calculated using the content program courses (ECE 8100, ECE 8200, ECE 8400, ECE 8410, and ECE 8920), the internship (ECE 8800), 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All program completers met content standards as evidenced by a GPA of 3.0 or better.

### 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 measures (have included these in this report). Currently, the disposition survey is housed using livetext. In addition, the disposition item 2.1, program completers did not meet achievement target: Only 73% of the program completers (summer 2009) met the achievement target for item 2.1 on the disposition survey. The current group was assessed on this same item in fall 2009 and all met the target. Program faculty need to discuss and analyze this item and to other disciplines and possible explanations for the differences in the two groups in response to program and curriculum changes made.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Disposition Survey (NBPTS) | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to learning and development

Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EdS Program Coordinator

Composite Assessment Plan
Program faculty will explore how to integrate key assessments to provide better data with fewer instruments. Content GPA will be reconsidered in review of the overall assessment plan.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Content GPA | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to learning and development

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator - Rhina Williams

Improving Empathy Disposition
Based on the assessment data for this year, we intend to implement the following changes to improve the Ed.S. Program. 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 well matched for having students explore and develop their dispositions. An additional change is that Funds of knowledge is now included as a component of ECE 8680.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Disposition Survey (NBPTS) | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to learning and development

Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
Use of Intern Ratings
Program faculty discussed the benefits of the intern ratings of Ed.S. supervisors. Need to explore how to use the ratings for curricular improvements.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
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: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator - Rhina Williams

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 were made for the 2011-2012 cohort based on a survey of students as well as their general progress and performance throughout the program: 1. At the start of the Fall semester, 2011, each student was given a copy of the NBPTS Dispositions Survey. Each Ed.S. faculty member considering ways in which the NBPTS Dispositions could be addressed and developed throughout the courses. The instructor for ECE 8100 and ECE 8200 had students explore and develop their dispositions as needed during the courses. 2. The due date for the literature review was changed to a later date early in the spring instead of the Fall (semester 2) which was not conducive to giving them options about the topics in which they were interested. 3. ECE 8920 was moved to the fall semester and ECE 8410, was moved to the summer 1 semester to allow students to explore areas of interest and existing research prior to choosing a topic on which to focus as their area of study. 4. All Ed.S. candidates were paired with a Block 1 BSE student intern to streamline the process as all interns in Block 1 had similar assignments and schedules which were then easier for Ed.S. candidates to understand and follow. 5. Continue to use Funds of Knowledge in ECE 8400 so that the Ed.S. supervisor could learn more about the BSE student intern from a cultural perspective.

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 Ed.S. program was put on hold for the academic year 2012-2013 and students were admitted separately for a TSS Endorsement only. The findings from the assessments indicate that all targets for the Ed.S. program were met. Should the program continue, the following changes, based on student surveys, will be implemented to improve the program: 1. 1. An additional whole group meeting will be added at the end of the ECE 8800 Capstone course in which students would share their completed projects and reflections with each other to create opportunities for sharing ideas and resources. 2. Although all targets were met on the Dispositions Survey, the program faculty determined that Ed.S. candidates needed to take ownership of the development of these dispositions. In the future, this work could be approached more intentionally through the Book Groups in ECE 8410 as well as in ECE 8200. 3. Continue to align supervisor expectations with BSE student interns and build more support for Ed.S. candidates by offering them more time with veteran supervisors.
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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: Students will become empowered
Students will become empowered as instructional decision makers.

G 2: Students will advocate for their classroom students’ instructional needs
Students will advocate for instruction that addresses the needs of their classroom students.
G 3: Students will advocate for educational justice
Students will advocate for educational justice for all students.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Educators manage and monitor student learning. (M: 3)**
The Teacher Development Rubric assesses the students content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, planning, and effects on student learning through their performance on two program activities that focus directly on the teacher's in-classroom practice: faculty classroom visits and teacher video clubs.
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. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Impact of Program Rubric I Benchmark Mid-program The candidates were assessed twice: mid-program with the Impact of Program Rubric I Benchmark and end-of-program with the Impact of Program Rubric II Capstone. 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. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) Mid-program Analysis: Fourteen candidates were assessed with the Mid-program Impact of Program Rubric I Benchmark. For the six dimensions evaluated, the 14 candidates scored in either the Novice/Independent, Intermediate, Advanced. As such, all candidates met target. For items 1 (critically analyzes program
The “Impact of Program Rubric II Capstone” 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).

**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 sample of their students’ work. All are included to demonstrate the educator's growth while in the CMP program. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Findings will be completed at the end of Summer Semester 2012 once the candidates turn in their Capstones. Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Fourteen candidates were assessed with the End-program Impact of Program Rubric II Capstone. For the six dimensions evaluated, the 14 candidates scored in either the Intermediate or Advanced categories. As such, all candidates met target. For items 1 (critically analyzes program experiences), 2 (reflects critically), and 4 (uses knowledge students' cultures) candidates scored in either Intermediate or Advanced Categories. For items 3 (professional literature) and 6 (uses technology), all candidates scored in the Intermediate category. For item 5 (includes required components) all students scored in the Advanced category. (See attached Item Analysis table.) Based on these results all of the candidates demonstrated in the areas assessed that they were impacted by the experiences in the program. Specifically, they met target as a consequence of their participation in a variety of program activities that promote reflection, in-class discussions about democratic practice, and in designing learner-centered experiences.

**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 sample of their students’ work. All are included to demonstrate the educator's growth while in the CMP program. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Findings will be completed at the end of Summer Semester 2012 once the candidates turn in their Capstones. Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The Impact of Program Rubric II Capstone assesses the candidate's perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment for the end of program occurs 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). The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Based on these results all of the candidates demonstrated in the areas assessed that they were impacted by the experiences in the program. Specifically, they met target as a consequence of their participation in a variety of program activities that promote reflection, in-class discussions about democratic practice, and in designing learner-centered experiences.

**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 sample of their students’ work. All are included to demonstrate the educator's growth while in the CMP program. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Impact of Program Rubric II Capstone assesses the candidate's perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment for the end of program occurs 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). The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Based on these results all of the candidates demonstrated in the areas assessed that they were impacted by the experiences in the program. Specifically, they met target as a consequence of their participation in a variety of program activities that promote reflection, in-class discussions about democratic practice, and in designing learner-centered experiences.
The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent, Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Target: 3 (1-4 scale) Findings will be completed at end of Summer Semester 2012 when the candidates turn in their Capstones.

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. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

The Impact of Program Rubric II Capstone assesses the candidate’s perception of how the CMP program impacted his/her views of teaching and learning. Assessment for the end of program occurs 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). The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. Educators who have a total score 3.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

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 after the visit, the educator submits a written reflection. After 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.

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

Target for O1: Educators manage and monitor student learning.

The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. For the mid-program assessment cycle, educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Candiates were assessed twice using the Teacher Development Rubric: Mid-program and end of program. The group of candidates was divided into two groups. The analysis combines the data from both tables. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. For the mid-program assessment cycle, educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

Target for O2: Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.

The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4, with 4 representing the Advanced category. For the mid-program assessment cycle, educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid Program Target: 2 (1-4 scale)

End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale)

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Candiates were assessed twice using the Teacher Development Rubric: Mid-program and end of program. The group of candidates was divided into two groups. The analysis combines the data from both tables. The rubric has the following four proficiency categories: Not Demonstrated, Novice/Independent; Intermediate, and Advanced. Scores were assigned on a 1-4,
with 4 representing the Advanced category. For the mid-program assessment cycle, educators who have a total score between 2.0 – 4.0 are considered to have met the target performance. Mid-program Target: 2 (1-4 scale) Mid-program analysis: Fourteen candidates were assessed. Fourteen out of 14 candidates scored between 2.0 -4.0 for every item on the ten item survey. Therefore 100% of the candidates met target. The attached table shows the scores for each item. The scores fell in two categories Novice or Intermediate. Seven items: (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3) the scores fell into Novice or Intermediate. For six items more candidates scored in the Intermediate category than the Novice; the seventh item, (3.2) was split equally between Novice and Intermediate. For the remaining three items (1.4, 2.1, 2.3) all candidates scored in the Intermediate category. Based on these data the candidates are performing on target and are poised to continue their improvement as they participate in the variety of teacher development activities. End of Program Target: 3 (1-4 scale) End of Program Analysis Fourteen candidates were assessed. Fourteen out of 14 candidates scored between 2.0 -4.0 for every item on the ten item survey. Therefore 100% of the candidates met target. The attached table shows the scores for each item. The scores fell in three categories Novice, Intermediate, and Advanced. The scores for one item (1.3) ranged across the three categories. For eight items: (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3) the scores fell into Intermediate or Advanced. For one item (1.4) the scores fell into two categories Novice and Intermediate. Based on these data the candidates are performing on target. As demonstrated by the attached table, scores moved into higher categories suggesting the candidates advanced in each of the areas assessed.

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.

<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>Students will be given their first reading related to the achievement gap at the first glue class in August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>The two program directors will be responsible for selecting readings and for leading the discussions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, or community lesson.

<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>Introduce video clubs to students at first glue class in August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>we submitted a proposal requesting technology funds to purchase cameras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<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>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<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>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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):**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Educators demonstrate subject matter knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase focus on Professional Writing**

Action Plan: The following action plans have been identified to ensure that more students score at least at the 80% mark. An analysis of the Benchmark 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, 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. 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 session.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** 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. The Benchmark assignment will be used to focus on reflective writing. Again a Writing Workshop structure will be used in class to included mini less

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Directors

**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?

More in-depth rubrics were created for the students to use to guide the development of their Capstones. The rubric addressed areas identified as needing improvement. An analysis of the 2010-2011 Benchmarks revealed two areas that needed improvement. These were: writing using the professional literature and writing to illustrate reflective thinking. To address these areas of need, we intensified the program's focus on writing. Specifically, the literacy course included a more intensive focus on writing. A literature review was assigned during the summer. To help with organization, the students were provided a template for organizing a literature review. Also a Writing Workshop structure was used in class to included mini lessons and in-class revision sessions. The Benchmark assignment will be made during the 2012-2013 year to increase the students' self-assessment. Students will be asked to turn in mid-course grade justifications. Now they only create grade justifications at the end of each 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.

After the Program Directors reflected on the Video Clubs, they decided to make changes to ensure the students maximized the reflective potential of the Video Clubs. The two changes implemented during the 2011-2012 year will be expanded on this year to enhance the students' ability to reflect on their practice. One, the students and the Program Directors reviewed the protocol and then used it to evaluate a teaching clip. Two, the Program Directors increased the number of video clubs they attended from one to two. This way only one meeting during each semester was without the presence of one of the Program Directors. The 2012-2013 year we will continue the changes made to the video clubs but add more in-class reviews of clips of the students' teaching. We also plan to use eluminate to bring small groups of students together to discuss their uploaded clips of their teaching. A review of the Capstones and the assessment data reveal more emphasis is needed on how to use knowledge of children's culture as the candidates plan their classroom instruction. The literacy and mathematics and critical issues courses will add additional readings related to cultural influences on children's learning. Also because technology is a tool useful in differentiating instruction and meeting the diverse needs of students, the literacy course will increase the use of technology to augment the presentation of course content.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Thoughtful writers and speakers (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates write and speak clearly. They provide demonstrate appropriate genre and audience awareness in their scholarly work. They are able to write and speak about research-related topics in ways that are accessible yet demonstrate deep knowledge about the field of early childhood and elementary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards</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>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Active seeker of knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates demonstrate active seeking of knowledge and remain current on theory and research. They are able to critique, synthesize and implement these ideas in their practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards</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>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Ethical researcher (M: 1, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will conduct quality, valid, and socially responsible inquiry related to early childhood education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards</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>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Enhance supporting infrastructure for the conduct of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Knowledgeable teachers (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will be knowledgeable teachers who are capable of challenging their students’ thinking and constructing knowledge relative to early childhood and elementary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations: NAEYC graduate standards</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>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Comprehensive examination (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The comprehensive exam involves three main parts: Part A: Written essays (2-3) that provide opportunity for synthesis of research about early childhood and elementary education. Part B: Written analysis of a research article OR comprehensive course syllabus planning document. Part C: Oral defense of parts A and B. Comprehensive examinations are evaluated based on: (1) thoroughness of research synthesis; (2) validity/credibility of research methods; (3) clarity of writing; (4) convergence of theoretical and methodological approaches; and (5) social responsibility and/or critique. Each of the five items combine to provide a holistic evaluation of the comprehensive examinations and result in a pass/fail decision by the exam committee. In other words, a student who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
writes clearly but does not fulfill the other areas will fail the exams.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% will pass their comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) on the first attempt; all will pass by the second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of eligible students passed comprehensive exams on the first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of eligible students will pass comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) in first attempt; all within second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of eligible students passed comprehensive exams on the first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Ethical researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of eligible students will pass comprehensive exams (Parts A, B, and C) in first attempt; all within second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of eligible students passed comprehensive exams on the first attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Teaching apprenticeship (O: 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of all eligible students completed their teaching apprenticeships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Knowledgeable teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All eligible students will successfully complete a university teaching apprenticeship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of eligible students completed their teaching apprenticeships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Dissertation presentation (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student presents a research project including reviewing the literature, analyzing data, and writing a final report for publication. The rigor of the research presentation is evaluated based on the: (1) thoroughness of the research review and application of research findings in the field; (2) convergence of theories and methodologies; (3) quality of analysis and findings; and (4) clarity of writing and speaking. These elements are evaluated holistically by committee members and other members of the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Thoughtful writers and speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We want 100% of our eligible PHD students to have rigorous dissertations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% (2 of 2) students successfully completed their dissertation defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Active seeker of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PHD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% (2 of 2) of students successfully defended their dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Ethical researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One (out of 1) or 100% of our eligible PHD students successfully defended a rigorous dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% (2 of 2) successfully defended their dissertation.
## Comprehensive exams revised

While we met our goal, we have revised our comprehensive exams (based on feedback from earlier years). The first students electing to use the revised comps format will do so summer 2009. It will be required of those entering fall 09. We plan to monitor the process and products associated with the revised comprehensive exams.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** Comprehensive examination | Thoughtful writers and speakers
- **Implementation Description:** Beginning summer 2009, continuing...
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PHD Advisory Committee

## Quality of dissertations

While we want to ensure our students are graduating in a timely manner, we also want to ensure quality in their dissertations. This year we plan to develop an instrument to document levels of quality for students' presentation of their dissertation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** Dissertation presentation | Thoughtful writers and speakers
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PHD Advisory Committee

## Summary of Professional Growth

Develop a checklist for mentors to assess students during teaching apprenticeship.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** Teaching apprenticeship | Knowledgeable teachers
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program advisory committee

## Summary of research skills form

Continue to research and develop a checklist of communication and research skills to use in evaluating the presentation of the dissertation.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** Dissertation presentation | Ethical researcher
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** PHD Advisory Committee

## Monitoring of comp exam process

We will continue to monitor "process" for comp. exams. The timeframe could be problematic for students who also work full-time.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**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 505-3-6). These objectives are consistent with the GSU-PED 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 (Q: 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). Instructed 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 problem solving; 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 goal of learning mathematics but also a major means of doing so. Students should have frequent opportunities to formulate, 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 P-5 focusing on developing 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 (from GPS or NCTM Standards); 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
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 different kinds of knowledge about the mathematical knowledge, content, process, and products of instruction; deep, flexible knowledge about curriculum goals and about the important ideas that are central to their grade level; knowledge about the challenges 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 understanding 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 10 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 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 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 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, 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 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: Partitive division, Measurement Division, Rate, and Price. 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 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 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 report that lists the problem you posed, identifies the problem type from the CGI framework (e.g., G/P-PD 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, and 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 base ten concepts. The types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, and the range of numbers with which the child was familiar. 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 base ten concepts. The types of problems the child successfully solved and struggled with, and the range of numbers with which the child was familiar.
ten. Identify the CGI problem type and justify your choice of next problem based on the CGI research. For this assignment during the Algebra Course (2 Interviews): Interview #4: Children's Understanding of Equality 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 + 1) 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 and the symbolic representation of addition and subtraction. Justify your choice of next problem based on the research on children's understanding of equality. b. Form a worthwhile, interesting, researchable problem 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. 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 data 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 shape) 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 means of a major mode, median, and mean; and interpret the data by comparing and contrasting the data by comparing and contrasting the data. e. Relate the interpretations of the data back to the real-world situation by making statements and claims about the real-world situation rather than just the representations of the data. f. Prepare and present (a) a poster presentation to convey your question, methods, and findings to your peers. This assessment is graded using the Data Project and Presentation Grading Rubric.

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

Target for O3: Assesses Student Learning and Program Effectiveness
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Across six uses of this measure during 2011-2012, 100% of candidates scored Meets Expectations / High Quality or better, with a mean rating of 4.92 out of 5 or 98.4% compared to the target of 80%.

Target for O4: Demonstrates Knowledge of Student Learning
Rubric average score of Meets Expectations / High Quality (80%).

M 3: Data Project and Presentation Assessment (Q: 1)
The Data Project and Presentation Assessment is graded during the data analysis and probability content/pedagogy course in the program (ECCE 7396). Instructions to candidates for this assessment are as follows: Data Project and Presentation This assignment 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 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 designed? 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: a. 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 aspect 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 shape) 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 means of a major mode, median, and mean; and interpret the data by comparing and contrasting the data by comparing and contrasting the data. e. Relate the interpretations of the data back to the real-world situation by making statements and claims about the real-world situation rather than just the representations of the data. f. Prepare and present (a) a poster presentation to convey your question, methods, and findings to your peers. This assessment is graded using the Data Project and Presentation Grading Rubric.

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

### Source of Evidence:

- **Portfolio, showing skill development or best work**

### Findings

#### M 4: Professional Portfolio Project (O: 2)

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 plus other artifacts that illustrate your effective implementation of mathematics content lessons that positively impact 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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Nine out of 10 Advanced Program students (90%) enrolled in ECE 7740 during 2011-2012 completed the course with a portfolio rating of Satisfactory / Meets Expectations. One candidate has not yet completed the course pending satisfactory completion of the portfolio. One of two candidates (50%) receiving an incomplete during a previous period (Spring 2011) satisfactorily completed the portfolio; the other candidate did not satisfactorily complete the portfolio, but completed the Advanced Program by satisfying the total hours requirement using an alternate course.

#### 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 Operation in the Elementary Classroom ECE 7394: Geometry and Measurement 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

Target for O1: Demonstrates Knowledge of Content and Curriculum

GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The aggregate GPA for the four elementary mathematics content courses during 2011-2012 was 3.90 (A). All candidates achieved a GPA for those courses of 3.00 or better.

Target for O2: Demonstrates Pedagogical Content Knowledge

GPA of 3.00 or better for all candidates in the specified courses.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The aggregate GPA for the four elementary mathematics content courses during 2011-2012 was 3.90 (A). All candidates achieved a GPA for those courses of 3.00 or better.
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:** Finished  
**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?

We have not made any changes in the assessment process for the degree program since last year's assessment report. The current assessment process is working very well and continues to provide the data needed for ongoing program 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.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance 1. Content knowledge Evidence of content knowledge from the findings of multiple key assessments indicate that candidates are developing the content knowledge intended by the PSC standards through participation in the program. No changes are suggested by this evidence. 2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions Evidence of pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, primarily from the findings of the Professional Portfolio Project indicates that student-centered pedagogy needs somewhat greater emphasis during the Number and Operations content/pedagogy course (ECE 7393). This will be an ongoing effort to provide sufficient emphasis on student-centered pedagogy in this course. 3. Student learning Evidence of student learning from the findings of multiple key assessments indicate that all candidates satisfactorily completing ECE 7740: Internship are able to achieve the K-5 student learning intended by the PSC standards. The findings from the Professional Portfolio Project have been particularly helpful in making this determination.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2011-2012 Economics Assessment of Core**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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: social science (area E) goal  
Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

G 2: BOR II: global perspectives goal  
Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1: social science (area E) goal - econ (G: 1) (M: 1)  
Students will demonstrate knowledge about how economists think about human behavior and the interactions between humans as they make choices.

**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**

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: BOR II: global perspectives goal - econ (G: 2) (M: 2)**
Students demonstrate understanding of global and cultural differences across the globe and how they apply to the field of economics.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
8.0 Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe.

**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).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Multiple Choice Questions on Exams (O: 1)**
Five multiple choice questions which can be used to assess the new social science learning outcome were embedded on the final exams of selected sections of economics courses in the core (ECON 2100 – The Global Economy; ECON 2105 – Principles of Macroeconomics; ECON 2106 – Principles of Microeconomics). In past assessment cycles, 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. In this cycle, we attempted for the first time to have the same set of questions in each section of the 3 different courses (different questions were used for each course, but the same questions were used across all sections of the same course). One question for the micro (ECON 2106) course was changed from fall 2011 to spring 2012. See the attached file for the actual questions used.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: social science (area E) goal - econ**
We are reporting the data this year in the new way we started last year. Like last year, we include a table with the exact questions used and the number of students (as well as the percentage of students) that answered each question correctly. We then report the average of the percentage of correct answers across all questions for each of the three separate courses (2100, 2105, and 2106) assessed. (See the attached document in the measures and findings sections for the actual questions used.) We would like to see the average of the percentage of correct answers across all questions for each course to be at least 75%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
This year, we tried to use the same questions for all sections of the same course. Like last year, we include a table with the exact questions used and the % of students who answered each question correctly. We also report the average of those percentages for each course. See the attached document for the results.

---

**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: BOR II: global perspectives goal - econ**
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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
This year, we tried to use the same questions for all sections of the same course. Like last year, we include a table with the exact questions used and the % of students who answered each question correctly. We also report the average of those percentages for each course. See the attached document for the results.

---

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

**increase number of students assessed**
Each year, the Department of Economics asks instructors of the economics courses in the core curriculum to volunteer to participate in assessment of the contemporary issues general education learning outcomes. In the future, we hope to get more instructors involved in the assessment, and therefore, increase the number of students assessed. Starting in Fall 2012, all instructors of ECON 2100, 2105, and 2106 will be required to participate in assessment efforts.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
update core assessment questions and reporting method
When we sent the email to the faculty teaching ECON 2100, 2105, and 2106 the list of questions we wanted them to include on their exams, many instructors responded by saying that they did not like some of our questions. As a result, we did not get many instructors to include all the questions on their exams. Some did not participate at all in the assessment data collection; some only used a subset of the questions. However, we are not too frustrated by this outcome, because we took that as an opportunity to get more faculty involved in crafting the instruments we use for assessment of the core courses. Our plan is to use a subset of the questions we use on our tracking exam (a measure we use for assessment of our BA, BBA, BS program in our ECON 4999 capstone course) for the set of questions we use for ECON 2105 and ECON 2106. As a result of this first attempt to get the same questions used in all sections of each course, we are revising the entire list of tracking exam questions, including the ones used for core assessment. We also developed a new method for gathering the data from instructors, which will be much more efficient. Effective Fall 2012, all instructors of ECON 2100, 2105, and 2106 will be required to include the selected questions on their exams, so getting buy-in from those instructors is very important.

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 met to discuss the questions we are using for our measures. We have already revised the questions once and we are working on revising it again. We decided to do this based on the discussions the ECON Undergraduate Program Committee had about the reliability and validity of the questions we had been using. We have a larger number of faculty involved in the assessment process now, and we consider that a good thing. We have developed a new way to gather the assessment data from the instructors of the core courses - using an online form - which we think will greatly increase the efficiency of the process and will lead to more instructors participating in the 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 not made major changes to our program based on assessment data. Most of our changes have been to the assessment process itself. We are reviewing and revising the questions we use and expect to have more meaningful results in the future - which may prompt us to make changes to the courses or program, depending on what we find out from the assessment data in the future.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Economics BA,BBA,BS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Economics is the study of how best to allocate scarce resources. Economics is an academic discipline that is central to the offerings of all major universities. As at most universities, economics plays an essential role in the general education required of all undergraduates, extending well beyond our undergraduate majors to essential courses in the core curriculum required of all GSU students, especially those majoring in business. At the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University, it is the fundamental mission of the Department of Economics to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in our discipline, to share that knowledge with our students, and to disseminate that knowledge with policymakers and leaders in the public, nonprofit, and business communities, here and abroad. The Department of Economics is committed to the broad goals of Georgia State University and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The University Strategic Plan 2000 states the “[t]he overarching goal of the Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premiere research universities located in an urban setting”. As stated in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Strategic Plan 2002-2007, the School “intends to be the highest rated policy school in the South and one of the highest ranked in the nation by 2007”. The Department of Economics shares both of these goals. We intend to contribute to these goals by continuing our efforts to better serve the needs of our undergraduate majors, our graduate students, and GSU students more broadly, by engaging in such activities as improving our curricula, introducing innovative course features, and creating new degree programs. Finally, we will continue to expand our service and outreach activities, to the profession, to the local business, nonprofit, and public sectors, to the State of Georgia, and to foreign countries and international agencies.

Goals
G 1: goals
The goals of the Department of Economics's undergraduate program include teaching students the "economic way of thinking", and helping them appreciate and understand the global economy in which we live today. We wish to send out students that are prepared for the competitive job market with skills that are valued by employers.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Economics Basic Theories (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**

To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.

**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: Apply to specific fields (G: 1) (M: 1)**

To be able to apply theories, concepts, and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.

**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: Benefits and costs (G: 1)**

To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.

**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 4: Communication (G: 1) (M: 2)**

To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories, concepts, analytical methods, and policy choices.

**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: 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 in the findings section 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided (called econ tracking exam results 2012 report). While the percentage correct of a few questions is below the target, the average across all questions is above the target. Last year, we directly compared the results to the previous year, but that is not possible this year because we changed some of the questions since last year (that was part of our action plan). Our target 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided (called econ tracking exam results 2012 report). While the percentage correct of many questions is above the target, the average across all questions is just below the target. Last year, we directly compared the results to the previous year, but that is not possible this year because we changed some of the questions since last year (that was part of our action plan). Our target was partially 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

**Target for O4: Communication**

We would like to see groups earn an average score of 7 or more out of 10 on the communication measure of the group project.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided (called econ 4999 group project results 2012 report). The average score in the communication category, as well as the overall average score are both above our target of 7 (the average score for communication was 8.25 and the average overall score was 8.6). We are pleased to see that our target is met.

**M 3: Individual Book Review in ECON 4999 (O: 1)**

The individual book review will require the student to explore topics in economics that he or she is interested in and choose a book to read and thoroughly review. The review should be done in 5-6 pages (using one-inch margins, Times New Roman 12 font). The instructor will approve of the book before the first test is scheduled. In addition, an outline for the book review will be due one week before the first test. The individual book review will count for 15% of the course grade. See the attached rubric for the book review.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Economics Basic Theories**

The book review was broken down into different skills and students were assessed separately on each one. See the attached rubric (in the measures section) for more details. We hope to see the majority of students earn a rating of 2 or more, and many of them should earn an even higher rating on the “economics concepts” measure.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Note to review committee: See the table in the link provided (called econ 4999 book review results 2012 report). The book report is also a CTW assignment (in the ECON4999 CTW course), so the table includes results from both a first and second draft as well as the final paper. A majority of students earned a rating of 2 or higher on the first draft, and a score of 3 or higher on the second draft and final paper. In fact, 98% earned a rating of 3 or higher on the final paper. We are pleased to see that our target is met.

**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 ECON4999 for that instead.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Tracking Examination | Outcome/Objective: Apply to specific fields | Economics Basic Theories

Implementation Description: We made changes to the questions since last year, but we are still re-visiting them and considering more changes.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
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 have met to discuss the questions on our tracking exam, which is one of our measures. We have already revised the exam once and we are working on revising it again. We decided to do this based on the discussions the ECON Undergraduate Program Committee had about the reliability and validity of the questions we had been using. We have a larger number of faculty involved in the assessment process now, and we consider that a good thing.

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 or curriculum based on the assessment data. We are generally meeting our targets, so we don't feel the need to change our program or curriculum. We do add courses from time to time - largely because of the increased demand for our upper level courses, and we want to offer our majors more courses to take. We have added an internship course, and a career planning course - both on an experimental basis last year - and are in the process of adding them permanently to our list of offerings; we hope these courses will help our students be better equipped on the job market. We also added a course cross-listed with the Philosophy department, and we are working on developing a concentration in Philosophy for ECON majors (PHIL will offer a concentration in ECON for PHIL majors). This was a joint effort between the PHIL and ECON departments because we believe this is a great interdisciplinary collaboration between our departments.
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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 microeconomics, macroeconomics and econometrics, the three required courses in their programs. Each exam will be graded on a discrete scale (e.g., A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F). Questions on the examinations will be classified by type (e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on), so that graders of the examination will be able to report more exactly the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
There was a substantial increase on the number of students compared to last year because of an increase in enrollment due to a special program that brought 15 Indonesian students to our MA program. In the 2011-2012 cycle, 36 students took the microeconomics exam. There were improvements in almost all the categories with respect to the previous year. For example in Math and Analytics the scores were 4.0 and 4.30 compared to 3.92 and 4.30 in 2010-2011. We had already noted improvement in these two categories last year and are pleased the improvement has continued. In econometrics, 41 students took the exam. There were declines in some of the categories like Analytics (from 4.26 to 4.10), and Applications (from 4.38 to 4.15). These declines may perhaps be attributed to the large group of students from the Indonesian program in this cohort. The econometrics background they had received in their country was perhaps not as strong as the average of our usual cohorts.

Target for O3: Analytical Skills.
Target not set in this cycle.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
There was a substantial increase on the number of students compared to last year because of an increase in enrollment due to a special program that brought 15 Indonesian students to our MA program. In the 2011-2012 cycle, 36 students took the microeconomics exam. There were improvements in almost all the categories with respect to the previous year. For example in Math and Analytics the scores were 4.0 and 4.30 compared to 3.92 and 4.30 in 2010-2011. We had already noted improvement in these two categories last year and are pleased the improvement has continued. In econometrics, 41 students took the exam. There were declines in some of the categories like Analytics (from 4.26 to 4.10), and Applications (from 4.38 to 4.15). These declines may perhaps be attributed to the large group of students from the Indonesian program in this cohort. The econometrics background they had received in their country was perhaps not as strong as the average of our usual cohorts.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Eight essays were submitted in this cycle. Applying economic models were judged by the following two categories: Ability to Covey the Research Question and by Economic Analysis. The average for both of these categories was 3.8, while somewhat below last year's average, it is still under the criteria of meeting expectations. Nevertheless, more attention will be devoted to improving the essays in this and other categories.
**Target for O2: Economic Disciplines.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

This category was measured by Comprehension of the Literature. The average grade was 4.17 which meets our target in this category.

**Target for O3: Analytical Skills.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

This category was measured by the Theoretical Skills and Overall Contribution rankings. The average score in Overall Contribution was 3.58 which meets targets, but we would like to raise. The average score in Theoretical Skills was 3.89 which improved on last year’s score of 3.5.

**Target for O4: Economic Data.**

Target not set in this cycle.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

This category was evaluated by Data Collection, Measurement and Computation. The average score was 4.25, which is higher than last year’s and 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

This year we also 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 a perfect 5.0. For two years running now graduates have felt 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 4.6 which is higher than last year at 4.0. This is an indicator of an overall positive experience in the program. On the other hand, alumni felt that we could improve in two particular areas. First, offer them more background training in math to help them with the courses. Second, for the program administrators to have ongoing communication with them about program developments, etc.

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The AYSPS has centralized information on study abroad programs. Information sessions are now provided by the college.

**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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: An initial dataset has been built. Information about the program has started to be sent in the Fall of 2012

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: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alumni survey.
  | Outcome/Objective: Applying Economic Models.
Implementation Description: The MA Symposium was established in Fall 2011 and has been meeting every semester since.
Responsible Person/Group: MA Director

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 changes in assessment process since last 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 will discuss adding a new math course requirement to the core which should improve performance in courses. We have continued to better integrate the MA students into the department with regular symposiums. Also, our Career Services office has become increasingly active in providing guidance with workshops and bring employers to meet students. We have introduced a new internship course which should also help students to gain experience while in the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? 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 findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

see response to Academic Program Question 2

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 3:
How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will publicize the program more widely to increase enrollments. We will make the curriculum changes proposed by the program to improve our student's skills. We will continue to work with our Career Services Office to facilitate and improve the placement of our graduates.
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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 master microeconomics, macroeconomics, and econometrics at a level required for independent professional research. Necessary skills for microeconomics are taught in Economics 9010, 9030 and 8500. Necessary skills for macroeconomics are taught in Economics 9020, 9040, and also 8500. Necessary skills for econometrics are taught in Economics 8030, 9710, 9720 and 9730. Students' mastery of these skills is assessed in midterm and final exams in these courses. Skills for microeconomics and macroeconomics are also assessed in comprehensive exams, normally taken after the first year. Additional concentration 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 demonstrated through collaboration with faculty members in research, presentation of papers and reports, and the writing of a dissertation. Students learn these skills in Economics 9510, 9515 and 9940. In these courses, they work individually with professors on research projects and gain expertise in presenting and conducting 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 at least one Comprehensive Field Examination at the end of the second-year after taking the required courses for the field. This examination tests the knowledge of the field. 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 categorized by type
(e.g., definitional, mathematical, policy-relevant, and so on). This provides opportunities for the graders to evaluate the quality of each examination and the performance in specific areas along several dimensions.

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

### Target for O3: Field Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examinations were given in four different fields. The number of students who took field examinations and the distribution of average grades in the field exams are comparable across 2010 and 2011. The Public Finance field exam was given to three students in Summer 2011 and Spring 2012; all three students passed the exam. The Labor Economics field exam was given to one student in Summer 2011 who passed the exam. The Urban/Environmental field exam was given to one student in Spring 2012 who passed with a high grade. Finally, the Experimental Economics field exam was given to four students in Summer 2011 and Spring 2012. Three of the four students passed the exam on the first attempt; one student passed it on the second attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Dissertation (O: 2, 3, 4)

After completion of the program’s coursework, students are required to 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, knowledge of the literature, writing expertise, technical proficiency, and so on).

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

### Target for O2: Theoretical and Quantitative Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the end of Spring 2011, eight Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The average score of these dissertations with respect to econometric analysis and theoretical skills is 4.4 (out of 5); the figure for data collection/management is a high 4.75. These average scores are slightly better than the ones in the previous year (4.3 and 4.7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O3: Field Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the end of Spring 2011, eight Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The average score of these dissertations with respect to econometric analysis and theoretical skills is 4.4 (out of 5); the figure for data collection/management is a high 4.75. These average scores are slightly better than the ones in the previous year (4.3 and 4.7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the end of Spring 2011, eight Ph.D. dissertations have been successfully defended. The average score of these dissertations with respect to econometric analysis and theoretical skills is 4.4 (out of 5); the figure for data collection/management is a high 4.75. These average scores are slightly better than the ones in the previous year (4.3 and 4.7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 4: Alumni Survey (O: 4)

Graduates of the Ph.D. program are asked to complete a questionnaire that aims at assessing how what was learned in the program has contributed to their performance in their current job. This survey includes questions on whether parts of the dissertation have been submitted for publication or have already been published. This survey is given at alumnae one year and three years after the graduation.

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

### Target for O4: Conducting Independent Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five alumni responded to the survey this year. Overall the alumni gave high scores to the program: on a scale of 5, the average scores varied from 4.3 (improved ability to teach) to 4.8 (improved job opportunities, analytical skills and ability to carry out research projects). These five alumni value highly the training they received in conducting research and data-analyzing techniques as well as the guidance and research assistance from the faculty and staff. They suggest that the program might benefit from: (i) introducing applied econometrics courses earlier in the program; (ii) continuing on expanding opportunities for teaching; (iii) more collaboration and joint research projects between faculty and graduate students; (iv) offering a grant writing workshop; and (v) further advancing research and policy focus training. The program should also consider establishing a network of the alumni. All five alumni would highly recommend the program to their peers (4.6 out of 5). These alumni are performing quite successfully; they have published a total number of 22 papers and book chapters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Fourteen PhD students responded to the 2011 survey. Overall, the students valued the program highly. They would recommend the program to their peers: average scores are 4.2 and 4.3 (out of 5) for 4th and 5th year students. The program is valued highly with respect to improved analytical skills (4.5) and ability to carry out research projects (4.3). Improved writing skills and collaboration with other professionals in their fields both earned a score of 4.23. The lowest score was observed on perception of "improved teaching skills should I choose an academic career" (3.0). The total number of papers, book chapters and policy reports published is 23; the figure for working papers and work in progress is 53. Furthermore, there were 35 presentations (13 of them during 2011-2012) at conferences and professional meetings. Five students have teaching experience but only one of them taught at Georgia State University. Overall, from the students' point of view the program seems to be on track; they appreciate the core courses, strong analytical skills, econometric techniques and experimental methods. They suggest the program: (i) explore opportunities for collaboration with other departments such as mathematics and statistics, and computer science department; (ii) emphasize and better assist students with respect to opportunities to teach while in the program; (iii) consider merging labor, health and education in one field; (iv) consider developing additional courses, similar to Causal Inferences course, that aim at bridging the gap between the theory and applied cutting edge research; (v) expand on training in macroeconomics and labor; and (vi) offer assistance and guidance on preparing grant applications, writing reports and policy briefs.

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%.

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

Re-organization of the summer semester I
We moved ECON 8500 “History of Economic Thought” from the summer of the second year to the spring of the first year. This change eliminated mandatory courses in the summer of the second year. This allows students to do internships in their second year and have more time to study for field comprehensive exams in the second year. This also helps with GPA requirements, since students tend to do well in this particular course.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Re-organization of the summer semester II
We also eliminated summer courses in the first year; we no longer count the summer as one of the two semesters for students to get off of academic warning for low GPA. This allows students to focus exclusively on preparing for their comprehensive exams, as opposed to the previous practice in which students would try to take additional courses in the summer to raise their GPA, only to fail their comprehensive exams.

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

Additional dissertation workshop
Students will be required to take an additional dissertation workshop (ECON 9515) in which they will present research and give peer feedback. Particular attention will be paid to presentation skills and the substance of the research; students will be videotaped while presenting.

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

Econometrics sequence
To help differentiate the Ph.D. level courses from the MA level courses, we have proposed renumbering the courses in the econometrics curriculum. These proposed changes are in line with the policy of using course numbers starting with 9 for PhD level courses. ECON 8730 was re-numbered to Econ 9710. ECON 8750 was re-numbered to Econ 9720. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8760 was re-numbered to Econ 9730. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8790 was re-numbered to Econ 9740. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum. ECON 8770 was re-numbered to Econ 9750. The prerequisites reflect the proposed course renumbering in the econometrics curriculum.

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

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 activities. The purpose is to identify determinants of what students' characteristics are correlated with success in the program and out of the program. This will help in developing a data-driven strategy in assessment of the program which will complement the information we get from the self-reporting surveys.

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

Summer support
Development of an administrative procedure that enforces professional performance responsibilities on graduate students who receive summer support.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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
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.

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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
Description: The mission of the Ph.D. program in Exceptional Students, Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at Georgia State University, is to prepare graduates who are capable of performing the roles expected of faculty members in special education at institutions of higher education. Students enrolled in this program will demonstrate the ability to (a) design, implement, evaluate, and interpret data-based research, (b) prepare and teach courses at a university level which have a theoretical foundation and convey research-based information, (c) write proposals for funded projects, (d) collaborate with colleagues at the university and K-12 levels, and with members of community organizations; and (e) are dedicated to performing service for the public schools. In 2011-12, there were a total of 31 doctoral students, including 6 who had graduated, 3 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. Twenty of the students received funding support.

Goals
G 1: Develop expertise in research skills
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will have the knowledge and skills to design, implement, evaluate and interpret their own research. In addition, students will be able to write data-based research articles for peer review journals, write grants, and critically read and analyze data-based research.

G 2: Develop expertise in teaching higher education
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will have the knowledge and skills to teach at the university level, including university courses, course lectures, and/or practicum supervision.

G 3: Engage in professional development
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will engage in professional development experiences, including collaborating with colleagues at the university and K-12 levels, and with community organizations.

G 4: Develop content expertise
Students of the Education of Students with Exceptionalities PhD program will develop content expertise in special education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Students will design and conduct investigations (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will develop expertise in research skills, specifically the ability to design, implement and evaluate their own research studies. They will also prepare their results for publication and submit their finding to refereed journals. Students will also develop skills in grant writing.
Relevant Associations: Related Measure: Doctoral Indicator Survey-Research section

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In 2011-2012 we had a total of 31 doctoral students and all students who reached candidacy submitted a manuscript as a senior author to a refereed journal. Additionally, 41 manuscripts were submitted by 18 students (with students being the senior author on 14 of these); 21 articles were published by 12 students (with students being the senior author on 8 articles); 4 book chapters were authored or co-authored by 4 students, and 8 grants were prepared with the assistance of 6 students.

#### M 2: Evidence of teaching college courses (O: 2)

Evidence of teaching college courses as teaching assistant and/or instructor, number of guest lecturers, number of students who supervised practica, as compiled from the teaching activities section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In 2011-2012, all students who had reached candidacy had assisted or taught at least one university course. For the 2011-2012 year, 11 students assisted in teaching 29 courses; 12 students taught 25 courses as GTAs; 9 students gave guest lecturers; and 9 students supervised 60 practicum students.

#### M 3: Evidence of professional development (O: 3)

Evidence or professional development including presentations and participation in professional organizations as compiled from the professional development section of the Ph.D. doctoral programs indicator survey.

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

**Target for O3: Students will participate in presentations**

- **100% of the students will have made at least one conference workshop presentation by candidacy.**

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In 2011-2012, all students who had reached candidacy had made at least one conference or workshop presentation, 12 students made 28 national conference presentations; 12 students made 18 state conference presentations; 10 students made 15 workshop presentations; and 3 students 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, comprehensive exams, and prospectus (as appropriate) and is determined by PMA faculty.**

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In 2011-2012, there were a total of 31 doctoral students, including 6 who had graduated, and 3 who withdrew from the program. All 31 students demonstrated expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical finding in special education. Twenty for 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)

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

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
New PhD program creation and Course changes
In 2011, a restructuring of the EXC doctoral program is anticipated to occur to align with proposed changes being made by the College of Education. The EXC PhD program will be reexamined to determine appropriate changes, taking into consideration assessment data.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Successful rating on annual evaluation
Outcome/Objective: The student will meet course/program requirements

Implementation Description: A new PhD program in currently in place, starting Fall 2012. Several courses were changed with new courses being created and content added. Course content may be further adjusted based upon faculty and student feedback.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: PMA committee/ department

Examine PhD Data
In addition to faculty continuously evaluating their students and monitoring their process, the PhD data base is updated each spring and results are discussed along with each EXC PhD student’s annual evaluation. Faculty to continue this evaluation process for 2012 – 2013 academic year and continue their discussions of student data and process in PMA meetings.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Successful rating on annual evaluation
Outcome/Objective: The student will meet course/program requirements

Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Kathy Heller for maintaining data base with support. PMA committee to evaluate PhD student progress and evaluate their data.

Monitor new PhD Program
Starting in Fall 2012, the department had approved a new PhD program. The program as a whole needs to be closely monitored to determine if there are any further course changes or general changes that need to be made to the program, or to the requirements of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: PMA committee

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Educational Leadership EdD
As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
MISSION STATEMENT and PROGRAM DESCRIPTION Mission: The mission of the Professional Doctorate in Education (Ed. D.) with a major in Educational Leadership is to advance the development and practice of effective educational leadership. Purpose: The Professional Doctorate in Education (Ed. D.) with a major in Educational Leadership provides senior-level administrators with the following: the knowledge and skills necessary to deal effectively with the complex issues facing education today the methods of inquiry necessary to analyze current educational problems the leadership skills necessary to direct the development and implementation of programs to address those problems and to disseminate the results in various professional and public forums the knowledge and applied skills rarely provided in traditional advanced degree programs in educational leadership in an alternative format that meets the needs of senior-level administrators

Goals
G 1: Goal 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals
Goal 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals: Graduates will possess the skills to ensure the achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission and high expectations for every student, staff member, and stakeholder.

G 2: Goal 2: Teaching and Learning
Goal 2: Teaching and Learning: Graduates will possess the skills to ensure achievement and success of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching, learning, and leadership.

G 3: Goal 3: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety
Goal 3: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety: Graduates will possess the skills to ensure the success of all students by creating and managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.

G 4: Goal 4: Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders
Goal 4: Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders
Graduates will possess the skills 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, learning, and leadership.

Goal 5: Ethics and Integrity
Graduates will possess the skills to ensure the success of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity.

Goal 6: The Education System
Graduates will possess the skills to ensure the success of all students by influencing interrelated systems of political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts affecting education to advocate for their teachers’ and students’ needs.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Objective 1.1: High Expectations for All (G: 2) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Objective 1.1: High Expectations for all: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to lead stakeholders in ensuring that the vision and goals establish high, measurable expectations for all students and educators.

SLO 3: Objective 1.3: Continuous Improvement Toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals (G: 1, 6) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5)
Objective 1.3: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to ensure the achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission, and high expectations for every student, staff member, and stakeholder.

SLO 4: Objective 2.1: Strong Professional Culture (G: 1, 2, 4, 6) (M: 1, 4, 5)
Objective 2.1: Strong Professional Culture: Graduates will demonstrate the skills to ensure a strong professional culture that supports teacher learning and shared commitments to the vision and goals.

SLO 5: Objective 2.2: Rigorous Curriculum and Instruction (G: 2, 5, 6) (M: 3, 4, 5)
Objective 2.2: Rigorous Curriculum and Instruction: Graduates will demonstrate the skills to improve achievement of all students by requiring all educators to know and use rigorous curriculum and effective instructional practices, individualized for success of every student.

SLO 6: Objective 2.3: Assessment and Accountability (G: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6) (M: 4, 5)
Objective 2.3: Assessment and Accountability: Graduates will demonstrate the skills to improve achievement and close achievement gaps requiring that leaders make appropriate, sound use of assessments, performance management, and accountability strategies to achieve vision, mission, and goals.

SLO 7: Objective 3.1: Effective Operational Systems (G: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 4, 5)
Objective 3.1: Effective Operational Systems: Graduates will demonstrate the skills to distribute leadership responsibilities and supervise daily, ongoing management structures and practices to enhance teaching, learning, and leadership.

SLO 8: Objective 3.2: Aligned Fiscal and Human Resources (G: 2, 3, 5, 6) (M: 4, 5)
Objective 3.2: Aligned Fiscal and Human Resources: Graduates will demonstrate the skills to establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching, learning, and leadership.

SLO 9: Objective 3.3: Protecting the Welfare and Safety of Students and Staff (G: 3, 4, 5, 6) (M: 1, 4, 5)
Objective 3.3: Protecting the Welfare and Safety of Students and Staff: Graduates will demonstrate the skills to ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students and staff that interfere with teaching, learning, and leadership.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 2: Objective 1.2: Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals (G: 1) (M: 3, 4, 5)
Objective 1.2: Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to ensure that the process of creating and sustaining the vision, mission, and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and genuine commitment among all stakeholders.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Dispositions Assessment (O: 4, 9)
1. Dispositions Assessment 2. This assessment is used to gain an initial understanding of candidate dispositions. It is administered during the first semester in the program. 3. This assessment is the College of Education Disposition Assessment. 4. Because this program is currently in its first year of existence, there are not data to report. Data will be uploaded as they become available.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 2: The Problem Identification Project (O: 1, 3)
EPEL 9000 Final Project Rubric: The Problem Identification Project *This assignment is given in the first semester in the program as a
The dissertation requires the field of study, the nature of the student's methodology, or the nature of the results of the investigations. Each student will develop a final written paper as well as a presentation to the class on the research questions and the literature reviewed. Submitted papers will be evaluated based on a rubric. Student presentations will be evaluated using an acceptable/unacceptable scale. Additional feedback will be given through peer feedback regarding the topic selection, literature review and the research questions developed.

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

The Literature Review Project requires the field of study, the nature of the student's methodology, or the nature of the results of the investigations. Each student will develop a final written paper as well as a presentation to the class on the research questions and the literature reviewed. Submitted papers will be evaluated based on a rubric. Student presentations will be evaluated using an acceptable/unacceptable scale. Additional feedback will be given through peer feedback regarding the topic selection, literature review and the research questions developed.

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

The Literature Review Project is an integral part of the dissertation project. In it, the student identifies an unmet need, describes the problem to be investigated, and outlines the methods to be used in the investigations. This section functions in the same way as the first chapter of a dissertation.

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

The comprehensive examination consists of a written portion and an oral portion. The students have two opportunities to pass the comprehensive examination. Students who do not pass the examination on the second attempt are not permitted to continue in the doctoral program. To be eligible to take the comprehensive examination, the students' cumulative grade point average in the doctoral program of study must be no less than 3.25. Each student's Doctoral Advisory Committee determines what coursework must be completed before he or she may take the comprehensive examination. A student's committee members will determine the content of the examination items and the scoring of the responses. It will be the decision of the committee whether to discuss and to distribute examination questions in advance. Students may pass or fail any session (A, B or C) of the exam. All sessions must be passed in order to pass the examination. Each examiner for sessions A, B or C will grade the examination on a pass/fail basis. Consensus of the student's committee is required to pass all sessions. A student who fails a session may sit for that session a second time. The committee will determine the time of the retest. After two failures on any session, the student is not eligible to retake that session, has failed the comprehensive examination, and is not eligible to continue doctoral studies.

Examinations may be written with a word processor approved by the department. A student may initially elect to write the examination by hand and to transcribe or to have the examination transcribed within 48 hours of completion of the examination. The handwritten examination shall be copied before leaving the department for transcription. Both the handwritten and transcribed copy must be turned in. Notice of the examination results will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Assistance by the end of the semester. Sample examination questions for each session are available to assist students in preparing for the examination. Sample examinations are not intended as practice exams, as study guides, nor as an indication of content of a session. Rather, sample examinations are to provide an indication of the types of questions that might be asked on the examination. Types of questions on an actual examination may differ from those on the sample examination. The department provides a sample examination for all sessions. The exams will be graded based on a rubric. Because the program is in its first semester of existence, there are not data to report at this time.

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

The comprehensive examination consists of a written portion and an oral portion. The students have two opportunities to pass the comprehensive examination. Students who do not pass the examination on the second attempt are not permitted to continue in the doctoral program. To be eligible to take the comprehensive examination, the students' cumulative grade point average in the doctoral program of study must be no less than 3.25. Each student's Doctoral Advisory Committee determines what coursework must be completed before he or she may take the comprehensive examination. A student's committee members will determine the content of the examination items and the scoring of the responses. It will be the decision of the committee whether to discuss and to distribute examination questions in advance. Students may pass or fail any session (A, B or C) of the exam. All sessions must be passed in order to pass the examination. Each examiner for sessions A, B or C will grade the examination on a pass/fail basis. Consensus of the student's committee is required to pass all sessions. A student who fails a session may sit for that session a second time. The committee will determine the time of the retest. After two failures on any session, the student is not eligible to retake that session, has failed the comprehensive examination, and is not eligible to continue doctoral studies.

Examinations may be written with a word processor approved by the department. A student may initially elect to write the examination by hand and to transcribe or to have the examination transcribed within 48 hours of completion of the examination. The handwritten examination shall be copied before leaving the department for transcription. Both the handwritten and transcribed copy must be turned in. Notice of the examination results will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Assistance by the end of the semester. Sample examination questions for each session are available to assist students in preparing for the examination. Sample examinations are not intended as practice exams, as study guides, nor as an indication of content of a session. Rather, sample examinations are to provide an indication of the types of questions that might be asked on the examination. Types of questions on an actual examination may differ from those on the sample examination. The department provides a sample examination for all sessions. The exams will be graded based on a rubric. Because the program is in its first semester of existence, there are not data to report at this time.

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

The dissertation is an original contribution to knowledge in the field of study. It is a focused research project that advances knowledge in the area of inquiry. It is recommended (although not required) that a scholarly journal to which the manuscript could be submitted be identified prior to completion of the dissertation. Because the research manuscript may be limited by the number of manuscript pages that a journal typically accepts, additional material related to the conducting the research may be included in appendices (e.g., additional tables, information regarding computer programs, details on coding, information about primary sources) so that the research document will be fully documented. The organization of the research manuscript will follow the expected format of the research field as represented in scholarly journals. At the discretion of the student's committee, an introductory section or chapter may be included in the review and research format dissertation. This section functions in the same way as the first chapter of a traditional format dissertation. In it, the student identifies an unmet need, describes the problem to be investigated, and indicates the method of inquiry. This chapter links the review manuscript to the research manuscript. The student's committee may establish additional requirements. These requirements may change depending on the nature of the questions being investigated or the field of study, the nature of the student's methodology, or the nature of the results of the investigations. In summary, this format requires: 1) a comprehensive literature review manuscript that addresses a current issue, in this case in educational leadership
policy and/or practice, prepared according to the style requirements of a scholarly journal so that the manuscript is suitable for publication. The literature review manuscript should avoid extreme brevity and be understandable to the members of the candidate's Doctoral Advisory Committee even if this necessitates some elaboration of the standard article format, and 2) a research manuscript that describes the results of an original, applied research project informed by the comprehensive literature review, described above. The two manuscripts will be integrated into the dissertation format. Oral Defense: The purpose of the oral defense of the dissertation is to enable the Doctoral Advisory Committee to judge the quality of the investigation and the students' ability to defend their work. The student, in consultation with committee members, is responsible for setting the date and time of the oral defense. Once the Doctoral Advisory Committee agrees upon the date and time, the student should notify Jeff Stockwell at jstockwe@gsu.edu and request the date, time, room, and equipment needs. When the dissertation is completed, a public announcement of the oral defense of the dissertation is disseminated via the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions to the College of Education faculty. The announcement must be submitted to the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions at least ten business days prior to the scheduled defense. Additionally, the dissertation must be defended between the first day of classes and the last day of final examinations; it cannot be defended between academic terms. Students should consult the current deadlines for doctoral candidates to plan the timely announcement of the dissertation defense. At the same time the announcement of the oral defense is submitted, two typed copies of the completed dissertation are made available for faculty review in the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions. The announcement of the oral defense includes the date and location of the defense and an abstract of the dissertation of no more than 350 words. The oral defense is scheduled during regular dates of operation (i.e., between the first day of classes and the last day of final examinations each term, excluding official holidays). The oral defense must be attended by no fewer than three (3) members of the Doctoral Advisory Committee and is open to all College of Education faculty and invited guests. The committee will invite other faculty and guests present to question the candidate and to communicate to the committee their professional reactions. Approval and acceptance of the doctoral dissertation requires a favorable vote of a majority of the Doctoral Advisory Committee. The presentation of the dissertation study shall include an overview of the study, including its rationale, design, data analysis, and results. The presentation should be approximately twenty minutes in length. The presentation will be followed by questions from the committee members. Following the period of questioning the Chairperson of the defense will invite the candidate and all visitors to leave the room while the committee deliberates. Upon returning, he/she learns of the committee's decision. The committee shall decide if the candidate passed or failed and in either case, what revisions, if any, are required. After the candidate has been asked to return to the room, it is the responsibility of the major advisor to inform the candidate of the expected revisions and determine if committee members are to be involved in reviewing the revisions. Revisions must be completed and approved 2 to 4 weeks after the defense. It is the responsibility of the committee as a whole to judge the quality of the candidate's work and recommend approval of the dissertation. All differences of opinion shall be handled by the committee as a whole with the major advisor guiding the candidate through agreed upon required changes. In cases where consensus is not possible, dissenting members have an option of not signing the dissertation approval form. This option shall be exercised very rarely; it is anticipated that differences will be resolved within the committee. In special cases, the Coordinator of the Ed.D. program may be consulted for assistance in resolving committee conflicts. The dissertation will be evaluated using a rubric Because the program is in its first year of existence, there are no data to report at this time.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
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### Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Specialist in Educational Leadership at Georgia State University is to prepare candidates to be effective instructional leaders who positively impact student achievement. The Ed.S. major in Educational Leadership is designed to build the capacity of practicing administrators to lead their schools effectively. Applicants for the major must be full time, practicing educators and be employed in a partnering school system. L-5 or NL-5 Educational Leadership certification is a prerequisite for entry into the program. The program may be designed to fulfill the requirements of PL-6 Educational Leadership certification by the State of Georgia.

### Goals

#### G 1: Goal 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals

Goal 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals: Candidates will possess the skills to ensure the achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission and high expectations for every student.

#### G 2: Goal 2: Teaching and Learning

Goal 2: Teaching and Learning: Candidates will possess the skills to ensure achievement and success of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.

#### G 3: Goal 3: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety

Goal 3: Managing Organizational Systems and Safety: Candidates will possess the skills to ensure the success of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.

#### G 4: Goal 4: Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders

Goal 4: Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders: The candidate will possess the skills 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.

#### G 5: Goal 5: Ethics and Integrity

Goal 5: Ethics and Integrity: The candidate will possess the skills to ensure the success of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity.
**Goal 6: The Education System**

The candidate will possess the skills to ensure the success of all students by influencing interrelated systems of political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts affecting education to advocate for their teachers’ and students’ needs.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Objective 1.1: High Expectations for All (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 6)**

Objective 1.1: High Expectations for all: The candidate will demonstrate the ability to lead stakeholders in ensuring that the vision and goals establish high, measurable expectations for all students and educators.

**SLO 2: Objective 1.2: Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals (G: 1, 4, 6) (M: 2, 6)**

Objective 1.2: Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals: The Candidate will demonstrate the ability to ensure that the process of creating and sustaining the vision, mission, and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and genuine commitment among all stakeholders.

**SLO 3: Objective 1.3: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals (G: 1, 2, 6) (M: 2, 3, 6)**

Objective 1.3: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals: The Candidate will demonstrate the ability to ensure the achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission, and high expectations for every student.

**SLO 4: Objective 2.1: Strong Professional Culture (G: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6) (M: 2, 4, 6)**

Objective 2.1: Strong Professional Culture: The candidate will demonstrate the skills to ensure a strong professional culture that supports teacher learning and shared commitments to the vision and goals.

**SLO 5: Objective 2.2: Rigorous Curriculum and Instruction (G: 2, 3, 5, 6) (M: 2, 5, 6)**

Objective 2.2: Rigorous Curriculum and Instruction: The candidates will demonstrate the skills to improve achievement of all students by requiring all educators to know and use rigorous curriculum and effective instructional practices, individualized for success of every student.

**SLO 6: Objective 2.3: Assessment and Accountability (G: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6) (M: 2)**

Objective 2.3: Assessment and Accountability: The candidates will demonstrate the skills to improve achievement and close achievement gaps requiring that leaders make appropriate, sound use of assessments, performance management, and accountability strategies to achieve vision, mission, and goals.

**SLO 7: Objective 3.1: Effective Operational Systems (G: 2, 3, 6) (M: 2)**

Objective 3.1: Effective Operational Systems: The candidate will demonstrate the skills to distribute leadership responsibilities and supervise daily, ongoing management structures and practices to enhance teaching and learning.

**SLO 8: Objective 3.2: Aligned Fiscal and Human Resources (G: 3, 5, 6) (M: 2)**

Objective 3.2: Aligned Fiscal and Human Resources: The candidate will demonstrate the skills to establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching and learning.

**SLO 9: Objective 3.3: Protecting the Welfare and Safety of Students and Staff (G: 2, 3, 5, 6) (M: 2, 6)**

Objective 3.3: Protecting the Welfare and Safety of Students and Staff: The candidate will demonstrate the skills to ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students and staff that interfere with teaching and learning.

**SLO 14: Objective 5.2: Examining Personal Values and Beliefs (G: 1, 2, 5) (M: 2, 6)**

Objective 5.2: Examining Personal Values and Beliefs: The candidate will demonstrate the skills prove their commitment to examine personal assumptions, values, beliefs, and practices in service of a shared vision and goals for student learning.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 10: Objective 4.1 Collaboration with Families and Community Members (G: 4, 6) (M: 2, 6)**

Objective 4.1 Collaboration with Families and Community Members: The candidate will demonstrate the skills to extend educational relationships to families and community members to add programs, services, and staff outreach and provide what every student needs to succeed in school and life.

**O/O 11: Objective 4.2: Community Interests and Needs (G: 4, 5, 6) (M: 2, 6)**

Objective 4.2: Community Interests and Needs: The candidate will demonstrate the skills to respond and contribute to community interests and needs in providing the best possible education for their children.

**O/O 12: Objective 4.3 Building on Community Resources (G: 4, 5, 6) (M: 2)**

Objective 4.3 Building on Community Resources: The candidate demonstrates the skills to maximize shared resources among schools, districts, and communities that provide key social structures and gathering places, in conjunction with other organizations and agencies that provide critical resources for children and families.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Policy Manual Review (O: 1)**
Policy Manual Review: 1) The assessment is a paper written by the candidate that reviews the school system's policy manual current status in relation to local, state, and national laws and First Amendment Rights. The following is the instructions provided to the candidate to complete the assignment: 2) Students will present a final paper based upon their review of the local school system's policy manual. This paper is to ascertain the manual's current status in relation to Georgia laws, national laws, and First Amendment Rights of students and teachers. 3) There are four indicators within the Policy Manual Review Rubric that address the ELCC Standard 6. 4) To be successful, students must achieve a score of 3 of 4 points for the average of the overall total score of all four indicators. Here is the link for the EPS Policy Review Rubric: EPEL_EDS_KeyAssessment_RUBRIC FOR POLICY/REGULATION REVIEW 4) The Educational Leadership program was reviewed under new standards in the Fall of 2010. Therefore, based on the review, the program has collected data from the year 2010-2011 and forward. There are 2 data reports attached below that indicate all of the students successfully completed the Policy Manual Review.

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

**Target for O1: Objective 1.1: High Expectations for All**
90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the policy manual review.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
1) Students will present a final paper based upon their review of the local school system's policy manual. This paper is to ascertain the manual's current status in relation to First Amendment Rights of students and teachers. 2) This assignment is aligned to Goal (ELCC Standard) 6: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. In analyzing the policy manual for elements related to Constitutional law, students demonstrate an understanding of the contexts outlined in Goal 6. 3) A brief analysis of the data findings is as follows: The starting point for any legal analysis is the claimed violation of law. State what law is claimed to be violated. 12 students or 100% exceeded expectations for this measure State the names of the witnesses and to what facts (in summary fashion) they testified. 12 students or 100% exceeded expectations for this measure Describe the documents, which helped prove the case and the important parts of each document. 8 students or 66% exceeded expectations for this measure 4 students or 33% met expectations for this measure

**M 2: GACE (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)**
GACE - Educational Leadership Content Test 1) The content assessment was a required test for all candidates aspiring to admission into the Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Leadership program for the 2009-2010 year as it was a required for the NL-5 leadership certificate. 2) All candidates (100%) admitted to the Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Leadership program had a passing score on the two-part GACE exam. Further analysis reveals that Candidates scored above the state average average on most subareas. Scaled scores are also noteworthy. Scaled scores run from 100 to 300 with 220 being the passing mark. GSU candidates ranged from 246 to 268, significantly higher that the cut-off score.

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

**M 3: School Improvement Plan Analysis (O: 3)**
1) Purposes of this assignment: (1) To understand and analyze a school's SIP in order to understand the process of effective school improvement planning and (2) to determine/analyze the ways in which the SIP is used and is useful and implemented in a school, and (3) to determine if the plan IS or IS NOT being effectively used or implemented in the school. 2)This assessment aligns with ELCC Standard 2.0: 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. In analyzing the policy manual for elements related to Constitutional law, students demonstrate an understanding of the contexts outlined in Goal 6. 3) A brief analysis of the data findings is as follows: The starting point for any legal analysis is the claimed violation of law. State what law is claimed to be violated. 12 students or 100% exceeded expectations for this measure State the names of the witnesses and to what facts (in summary fashion) they testified. 12 students or 100% exceeded expectations for this measure Describe the documents, which helped prove the case and the important parts of each document. 8 students or 66% exceeded expectations for this measure 4 students or 33% met expectations for this measure

Based on the analysis, Candidates scored above the state average average on most subareas on the GACE exam. Scaled scores are also noteworthy. Scaled scores run from 100 to 300 with 220 being the passing mark. GSU candidates ranged from 246 to 268, significantly higher that the cut-off score. This assignment provides evidence for meeting the standard because candidates are required to identify, analyze, and discuss elements related to policy (Constitutional law) and practice (how that law plays out in a school setting).
provide an effective instructional program within the school. 2.3 Students will determine how SIP procedures encourage the application of "Best Practice" to student learning. In analyzing the SIP, candidates demonstrate understanding of how this document can provide the framework for an effective instructional program and for student learning.

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

**Target for O3: Objective 1.3: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals**

The majority of students will meet or exceed for this measure.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

3) Twenty-five students were in the class for the initial administration in which 19 students were rated "Exceed", 4 students were rated "Meets", and 1 student was rated "Developing". Exceeds Expectations(A) 19 76% Meets Expectations (B) 4 16% Developing (C) 1 4% Exceeds Expectations(D or F) A majority (94%) of candidates in the program met or exceeded expectations on this assignment. This success rate would indicate that the majority of students have a clear understanding of the key to 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 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 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 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 the audit committee to understand the complex issues concerning a multicultural organization.

**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:**

1) The Portfolio Assessment examines student work and assignments collected in Live Text over the course of the Educational Leadership Program. There is a formative assessment at the midpoint of the program and a summative assessment at the conclusion of the program. 2) The candidate will collect work samples, papers, observations, and reviews during the program in Live Text that can provide the framework for an effective instructional program and for student learning. 3) The Portfolio Assessment examines student work and assignments collected in Live Text over the course of the Educational Leadership Program. There is a formative assessment at the midpoint of the program and a summative assessment at the conclusion of the program. 4) The evidence for meeting the stated standard because candidates must be able to both identify specific elements within the plan and analyze how those elements are evidenced in the school's organizational structure.

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

**Target for O4: Objective 2.1: Strong Professional Culture**

90 percent of students receiving Exceeds Expectations and/or Meets Expectations on the equity rubric (EPEL 8020).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

1) The purpose of this assignment is to determine whether the candidate's particular school has in place policies, ideas, staff, missions, and goals to be considered a multicultural organization. 2) The Equity Audit Assessment is linked to Goals (ELCC Standards) 1, 3, 4, and 5. 3) A total of 12 students participated in the first administration of the assessment. The results of the assessment are as follows: Project Element Exceeds Expectations Met Expectations Does not Meet Expectations Introduction 12 100% Identification/Statement of Problem 12 100% Literature Review 6 50% 5 42% 1 8% Proposed Methodology 8 75% 4 25% Conclusion 12 100% Presentation Summary 10 83% 2 17% Total for Each Level Of the 12 students who completed the first administration of the assessment, all met or exceeded expectations for the overall assignment with 8% not meeting expectations for the literature review portion. This information demonstrates that the majority of candidates have a solid grasp on the elements assessed. This information also suggests that further attention should be paid to ensuring that students write the literature review portion of their assessments. A total of 22 students were in the course for the second administration of the assessment. The results of the assessment are as follows: Project Element Exceeds Expectations Met Expectations Does not Meet Expectations Introduction 12 100% Identification/Statement of Problem 15 68% 5 23% 2 9% Literature Review 10 45% 10 45% 2 9% Proposed Methodology 15 68% 5 23% 2 9% Conclusion 15 68% 5 23% 2 9% Presentation Summary 20 91% 2 9% Total for Each Level Of the 22 students who completed the second administration of the assessment, the numbers mirrored those from the first assessment with the single difference being that 2 students or 9% failed the assessment altogether. While this could be indicative of a larger issue related to the difficulty of the assignment, it is believed that the two students are outliers as they did not submit the assignment for evaluation.

4) The evidence for meeting Goals 1, 3, 4, and 5 are as follows: Read and review current literature to identify and understand issues related to diversity and multiculturalism (informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice) ELCC Standard 1 Understand and be able to explain the social contexts within which ideas related to diversity and multiculturalism are developed, changed, and analyzed (informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice) engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities) ELCC Standard 4 Recognize/understand, and be able to explain historical, philosophical, social, and cultural influences on diversity theories and respond to those influences (informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice) ELCC Standards 4, 5 Understand and help others identify and understand the relationships among diversity and the setting of schools and school systems (informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice) empowered to serve as change agents) ELCC standards 1, 3 Understand how diversity and multiculturalism has an impact on the complexity of schooling (informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; committed to and respectful of all learners) ELCC Standards 3, 4, 5 Distinguish between the experiences of different stakeholders in the educational setting and identify steps to increase the equity of those experiences (empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners) Investigate and analyze the processes of the educational setting and determine how to positively impact those in areas related to the topics explored in class ELCC Standards 1, 4, 5

**M 5: Portfolio Assessment (O: 5)**

1) The Portfolio Assessment examines student work and assignments collected in Live Text over the course of the Educational Leadership Program. There is a formative assessment at the midpoint of the program and a summative assessment at the conclusion of the program. 2) The candidate will collect work samples, papers, observations, and reviews during the program in Live Text that address all six Goals of the Ed.S Educational Leadership Program. 3) Data reported for 2012 indicate all students meet or exceed expectations on the Portfolio Assessment (see attachment).

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O5: Objective 2.2: Rigorous Curriculum and Instruction**

The majority of students will meet or exceed expectations for this measure.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

1) The Portfolio Assessment examines student work and assignments collected in Live Text over the course of the Educational Leadership Program. There is a formative assessment at the midpoint of the program and a summative assessment at the conclusion of the program. 2) The candidate will collect work samples, papers, observations, and reviews during the program in Live Text that address all six Goals of the Ed.S Educational Leadership Program. 3) Data reported for 2012 indicate all students meet or exceed expectations on the Portfolio Assessment. Portfolio Assessment Final 2012 Students I. Vision II. Tchg & Lrng III. Operations IV. Collab V. Ethics VI. Political S1 3 3 3 3 1 S2 3 3 3 4 3 S3 3 3 3 3 3 S4 3 4 4 4 4 S5 4 4 4 3 4 S6 3 3 3 4 4 3 S7 4 4 4 4 4 3 S8 4 4 4 4 4 3 S9 4 4 4 4 4 3 S10 3 3 3 4 4 3 S11 3 4 4 3 4 S12 4 3 4 4 3 S13 3 4 4 4 3 S14 3 4 4 4 3 S15 4 4 4 4 3 S16 4 4 4 4 3 S17 4 4 4 4 4 S18 4 4 4 3 3 S19 4 3 3 3 3 S20 4 4 4 3 3 S21 4 3 3 3 3 S22 4 4 4 3 3 S23 4 3 3 3 3 S24 3 3 3 3 3 S25 3 3 3 3 3 S26 3 3 3 3 3 S27 4 3 3 3 3 S28 4 3 3 3 3 S29 4 3 3 3 3 S30 4 3 3 3 3

M 6: Dispositions Assessment (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16)

1) The dispositions assessment is a required element of all programs in the College of Education. 2) The dispositions assessment is linked to Goal (ELCC Standard) 5: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Objective 1.1: High Expectations for All

Students will meet or exceed expectations for this measure.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Rubric: Dispositional Endpoint 2010 Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Marginal (2 pts) Unacceptable (1 pts) Mean Mode Stdev 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 19 1 0 0 3.95 4.00 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 20 0 0 4.00 4.00 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 20 0 0 4.00 4.00 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 20 0 0 4.00 4.00 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 20 0 0 4.00 4.00 0.00 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-2.2 19 (95%) 1 (5%) 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-2.1 20 (100%) 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 20 (100%) 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 20 (100%) 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 20 (100%) Exception Acceptable Marginal Unacceptable

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
Implementation Description: This change was put into place in 2010. The program is now delivered over four semesters instead of three and is much more workable for candidates holding leadership positions.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Educational Leadership Unit
Additional Resources: None

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
Implementation Description: The coaching model was revised and implemented this year. The new model includes monthly learning sessions as well as an updated coaching handbook and required activities that span across the standards.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Educational Leadership Unit
Additional Resources: None
Course Restructuring
Because the program has been in existence for five years, because there seemed to be some repetition in the coursework, and because the new ELCC Standards (2011) were publicized, the unit decided to begin the process of aligning every course and major assessment to the standards and elements in an effort to make sure that our program was adequately meeting the articulated needs of our students and consumers (schools and systems).

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We are currently working to align the current assignments to the standards. Next steps will be to look at all of the assignments to determine overlap and modify accordingly.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Educational Leadership Unit
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 have made several changes to the assessments we use as major assessments in an effort to better conceptualize all aspects of our program through the major assessments. We added the dispositions assessment as it is a fundamental assessment for the College of Education, and we deleted several assessments that were repetitive of skills measured in the current list. In the coming academic year, we will continue the work of aligning all assessments and assignments to the new ELCC 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.

Because students continue to meet or exceed the measures almost universally, we are currently looking at whether or not to modify the assessments in order to better measure both mastery and degree of mastery. Additionally, we are reviewing the content of each course to determine whether or not it is feasible to restructure the program sequence and delivery in order to better integrate the coaching and performance requirements within both the residency and the courses.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Educational Leadership MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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.

Goals
G 1: Goal 1
1. Candidates will be leaders in applying leadership theory in practice

G 2: Goal 2
Candidates will be leaders in designing and implementing action research

G 3: Goal 3
Candidates will be change agents in schools

G 4: Goal 4
Candidates will be leaders in urban education settings

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Outcome/Objective 2
2: Can design and implement action research (Final) Student can apply the tools of action research to improve school performance

Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2009 Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Relevant Associations: Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001) 1. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by utilizing the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive
Students are able to apply general theories of leadership to practice. Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2008 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 collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans President, Georgia State University 3.1 New Academic Programs (Modes of Delivery) Institutional Priorities 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Outcomes/Objective 1 (M: 1)**

Students are able to apply general theories of leadership to practice. Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2008 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 collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans President, Georgia State University 3.1 New Academic Programs (Modes of Delivery) Institutional Priorities 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized 2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**SLO 3: Outcome/Objective 3**

3. Can perform as change agent in schools (Final) Student effectively performs as a change agent by positively impacting the culture of the school Student Learning Outcome: Yes Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2008-2009 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jami Berry on 09/29/2008 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 of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture and participating in an effective instructional program, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans President, Georgia State University 3.1 New Academic Programs (Modes of Delivery) Institutional Priorities 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized 2.22 Educational support systems that foster student access and success 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**SLO 4: Outcome/Objective 4**

4: Can provide leadership for urban education Student is able to lead an effective urban school Student Learning Outcome: No Established in Cycle: 2005-2006 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Last Updated By: Jean Yerian on 10/20/2008 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 of learning supported by the school community. 2. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. 3. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. 5. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. 6. Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. 7. Internship: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. Strategic Plans President, Georgia State University 3.1 New Academic Programs (Modes of Delivery) Institutional Priorities 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized 2.22 Educational support systems that foster student access and success 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards

**Relevant Associations:**

- Georgia PSC Standards-(ELCC - Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 2001)
- Strategic Plans
- President, Georgia State University
- 3.1 New Academic Programs (Modes of Delivery)
- Institutional Priorities 1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
- 2.22 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
- 3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
- 3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
- 4.45 Compliance with federal, state, and BoR regulations and accrediting and professional standards
Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluations in Key Courses (O: 1)


Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target for O1: Outcomes/Objective 1

70% of students will exceed expectations in the courses listed. 30% of students will meet expectations in the courses listed.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

EPEL 7000 - 91% of students exceeded expectations, 9% of students met expectations EPEL 7500 - 90% of students exceeded expectations, 10% of students did not meet expectations EPEL 7330 - 80% of students exceeded expectations, 20% of students did not meet expectations EPEL 7410 - 78% of students exceeded expectations, 11% of students met expectations, 11% of students did not meet expectations EPSF 7450 - 100% of students exceeded expectations

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluations in Key Courses | Outcome/Objective: Outcomes/Objective 1

Implementation Description: The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership is being shifted to inactive status by the Department of Educational Policy Studies. As a result of this change, the programmatic goals have been put on hold. The department plans to work over the next year to redesign the degree to better meet the needs of current and prospective students.

Responsible Person/Group: All leadership faculty

Additional Resources: Greater collaboration with research faculty and others with expertise in school-based research

Change Agent in Schools

The data indicate that students can be effective change agents at an acceptably high rate. With the redesign of the master’s program, students will have even more opportunity to serve as leaders through common essential performance assessments and through anew emphasis on issues of diversity in schools and communities.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evaluations in Key Courses | Outcome/Objective: Outcomes/Objective 1

Implementation Description: The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership is being shifted to inactive status by the Department of Educational Policy Studies. As a result of this change, the programmatic goals have been put on hold. The department plans to work over the...
next year to redesign the degree to better meet the needs of current and prospective students.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Educational Leadership Unit

**Leadership Theory in Schools**
The data indicate that students can apply leadership knowledge at an acceptably high rate. However, the Educational Leadership unit has just undergone a comprehensive program redesign required by the Georgia Board of Regents and the Professional Standards Commission. With this change, we have significantly altered the master’s program to embed performance based assessments and practicum experiences in each class. We feel this is the best way to integrate theory and practice, and the students in the program concur.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership is being shifted to inactive status by the Department of Educational Policy Studies. As a result of this change, the programmatic goals have been put on hold. The department plans to work over the next year to redesign the degree to better meet the needs of current and prospective students.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Entire Educational Leadership Unit

---

**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 M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.

**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 M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.

**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 M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.

**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 M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.

**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 M.Ed. in Educational Leadership is being shifted to inactive status by the Department of Educational Policy Studies. As a result of this change, all programmatic changes have been put on hold. The department plans to work over the next year to redesign the degree to better meet the needs of current and prospective 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.
The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership is being shifted to inactive status by the Department of Educational Policy Studies. As a result of this change, all programmatic changes have been put on hold. The department plans to work over the next year to redesign the degree to better meet the needs of current and prospective students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?
The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has been deactivated.
### Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Educational Leadership Unit of Educational Policy Studies Department is to prepare graduates to be effective school and/or school system leaders who positively impact student achievement.

The unit's mission is in keeping with the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) Standards.

### Goals

**G 1: Conducts Scholarly Research**
PhD students who graduate from Educational Policy Studies with a concentration in leadership will be researchers and practitioners who can contribute significantly to educational research and effective educational leadership.

**G 2: Possesses important values and beliefs**
PhD students who graduate from Educational Policy Studies with possess dispositions (underlying assumptions, values, and beliefs) appropriate to an educational philosophy that is dedicated to social justice and high expectations for every student.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Successfully complete comprehensive examinations (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to successfully write and defend high quality comprehensive examinations.

**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

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 2: Successfully complete prospectus (G: 1) (M: 2)**
Students will be able to successfully write and defend high quality prospectuses.

**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.
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
3. Timely graduation

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

**SLO 3: Successfully defend dissertations (G: 1) (M: 3)**
Students will be able to successfully write and defend high quality dissertations.

**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.
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
3 Timely graduation

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

SLO 4: Develop effective dispositions (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students will develop and/or enhance effective dispositions.

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

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Committee evaluation of comprehensive examinations (O: 1)
Students' comprehensive examinations will be evaluated by the students' faculty committee using the Comprehensive Examination Rubric. Students will prepare and defend their comprehensive examinations as prescribed by EPS policy.

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

Target for O1: Successfully complete comprehensive examinations
95% of students will successfully prepare and defend their comprehensive examinations. The Comprehensive Examination Rubric will be used to evaluate the examinations.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No EDL, PhD students took comprehensive examinations during this reporting cycle.

M 2: Committee evaluation of prospectus (O: 2)
In the presentation of the prospectus, the students provide the committee with a clear and concise description of the proposed study. In general, the description is to include a rationale, a review of relevant literature, the proposed research method(s), and an overall organizational plan. The members of the dissertation committee will evaluate the prospectus using the EDL Prospectus Rubric, scaled from 1 to 3.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: Successfully complete prospectus
95% of students will successfully prepare and defend their prospectuses. The Prospectus Evaluation Rubric will be used for evaluation purposes.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Three EDL, PhD students (100%) successfully defended their prospectuses upon the first preparation and presentation during this reporting cycle. Their success was determined by showing that they: 1. Sufficiently understood the concepts and tools of inquiry in foundational disciplines 2. Sufficiently demonstrated knowledge of previous research or literature in the field 3. Sufficiently demonstrated normative or critical judgments that were insightful and detailed 4. Successfully demonstrated the above through their written and oral presentations.

M 3: Committee evaluation of dissertation (O: 3)
In the dissertation and oral defense, the students present a review of the literature, an exploration of the methodology, results, and implications of their research. The members of the dissertation committee will evaluate the dissertation and defense using the EDL Dissertation Rubric, scaled from 1 to 3.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O3: Successfully defend dissertations
95% of students will successfully prepare and defend their dissertations.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Eight EDL, PhD students successfully prepared and defended their dissertations during this reporting cycle. Their success was determined by showing that they: 1. Understood the concepts and tools of inquiry in foundational disciplines 2.
Demonstrated knowledge of previous research or literature in the field 3. Demonstrated normative or critical judgments that were insightful and detailed 4. Demonstrated the above through their written and oral presentations 5. Produced work that contributed meaningfully to the field. Only one student had meaningful changes that were required following the dissertation defense.

**M 4: Advisor review of disposition assessment (O: 4)**

Students will be assessed based on the College of Education's Disposition Assessment and 4 point rubric. The characteristics assessed are: empathy, positive view of others, positive view of self, authenticity, and meaningful vision and purpose.

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

**Target for O4: Develop effective dispositions**

95% of students will score 3 or higher on the post assessment. Measure will be used when admissions to the program are re-activated.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Measure will be used when admissions to the program are re-activated.

**Establishment of unit procedures for Comprehensive Examinations**

Because there has been some variation in how advisors have handled the Comprehensive Examinations, there is a need for the members of the EDL unit to discuss and determine if more consistency would be beneficial. Therefore, prior to re-activating the readmission process for the EDL, PhD (which is currently on hold), the unit will discuss and possibly establish a consistent set of procedures within the parameters of the department's revised Comprehensive Examination policy.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Committee evaluation of comprehensive examinations
- **Outcome/Objective:** Successfully complete comprehensive examinations

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**Review of Comprehensive Examinations Policy**

1. The EPS Department is in the process of revising the Comprehensive Examinations Policy.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Committee evaluation of comprehensive examinations
- **Outcome/Objective:** Successfully complete comprehensive examinations

**Projected Completion Date:** 02/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** Department’s Faculty Affairs Committee

**Additional Resources:** None

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Educational Policy Studies/Research Measurement and Stat PhD**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics unit of Educational Policy Studies Department is to cultivate and develop educational researchers capable of investigating problems of the 21st century. This is in keeping with Georgia State 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 1: Key educational researchers**

Students who graduate from Educational Policy Studies with a concentration in Research, Measurement, and Statistics will be key researchers who can contribute significantly to educational research.

**G 2: methodological expertise**

Students who graduate from Research Measurement and Statistics program will be experts in the areas of quantitative and or qualitative research methodologies.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Design a research study (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will design a research study to address educational questions using an appropriate methodological framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Associations

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Literature review (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to critique existing research literature and use appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Associations

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Data collection and analysis (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will collect data needed for dissertation research work, analyze them using the appropriate methodologies and present the findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Associations

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Complete a dissertation study (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to write and defend a dissertation study that meets the standards set by the RMS unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: methodological expertise (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to evaluate research methodologies for their appropriateness to specific research questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Plan Associations

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: Committee Evaluation of the Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

In the dissertation and oral defense, the student presents a review of the literature, an exploration of the methodology, 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 content knowledge of the issue, design of the study, review and critique of the literature, application of methodological expertise, and implications. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 3. 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 O1: Design a research study
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

Target for O2: Literature review
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

Target for O3: Data collection and analysis
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed
| Target for **O4**: Complete a dissertation study |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| Target for **O5**: methodological expertise |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| **M 2**: Committee evaluation of the Prospectus (O: 1, 2, 3, 5) |
| Students’ dissertation proposal will be evaluated using a rubric and analytic guide. The students work in close collaboration with their research advisor and their dissertation committee to prepare a prospectus report. The learning outcomes are assessed by the dissertation advisory committee members following the student’s oral presentation of the prospectus. The committee rates the student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 3. The criteria for these scores are set by the RMS faculty. An analytic guide accompanies this rubric. |
| Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group |

| Target for **O1**: Design a research study |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| Target for **O2**: Literature review |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| Target for **O3**: Data collection and analysis |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| Target for **O5**: methodological expertise |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| **M 3**: Comprehensive Exam (O: 2, 5) |
| Ph.D. students in RMS write a comprehensive exam when they have completed their course work. This exam covers the knowledge(s) gained in the major/content/cognate areas of the program. The members of the advisory committee will evaluate the learning outcomes with a scoring scaled from 1-3 and an analytic guide that the faculty of the RMS program created. |
| Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam |

| Target for **O2**: Literature review |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| Target for **O5**: methodological expertise |
| 85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed |

| **M 4**: Faculty Scaled Rubric (O: 1, 2, 5) |
| This rubric is a 3 point scale that evaluates students' performance on the comprehensive exam. |
| Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam |

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

**Redesigning assessment plan**
Following the Annual Program Review (APR) the decision was made to report the units in the department individually. Research, Measurement, and Statistics is one of the three units in Educational Policy Studies. This is the first year of planning to create the assessment. The unit is meeting to decide on mission, the goals, the learning outcomes and the measures that we will use to evaluate them.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Educational Policy Studies/Social Foundations PhD**

*(As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

THIS REPORT IS FOR THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS UNIT ONLY. 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 SF 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 SF 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 SF 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 & Feminities, 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 SF 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Four Social Foundations students met the assessment.

**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
Target for O2: Students will prepare a cultural studies analysis
95% of students will obtain a score of 2 or better as evaluated by program faculty for this activity.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
9 students met or exceeded the outcomes.

M 3: Dissertation Scoring Assessment (O: 3)
The scoring assessment of dissertations for Social Foundation (SF) students.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
One Social Foundations student graduated during the assessment 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: Finished
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

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: Finished
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

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: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Power Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Students will examine policymaking power

Responsible Person/Group: LOA 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?

Since undergoing APR review this year we will make changes to the LOAs. There will be an annual assessment report for SF doctoral students that will establish data for performance indicators. We will no longer use the power analysis and cultural studies analysis reporting from the two doctoral cohort 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 are completing the APR review in Fall Semester 2012. An action plan regarding LOA improvements and reporting structure for SF doctoral students is forthcoming.
Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

We are completing the APR process this semester, fall '12. An action plan for SF doctoral student LOAs is forthcoming.

---

Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

2011-2012 Educational Psychology MS

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

(Include 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 2010; 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 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 (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.
Target for O1: Students demonstrate expertise in Ed. Psych.

All students will pass the oral and written portions of the comprehensive exam.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

All students passed their comprehensive exams.

M 2: Thesis or Project (O: 2)

Each MS student in the Educational Psychology program must complete a thesis research study or a comprehensive literature review project. For the thesis, students conduct their own research, and for the project students write an in-depth analysis of an area within the field. The written component of the comprehensive exam is followed by an oral defense of the thesis or project and is conducted by the student’s committee.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: Students demonstrate independence and competence

All students will complete their theses/projects.

Findings 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 orient 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

Faculty will review the program to determine if changes need to be made

EPY 8961, a course which orients them to GSU, EPSE, and EPY was developed. This past fall, the COE approved our decision to make this a requirement. During this year we developed a test option for students to choose from, in addition to selecting a project or thesis.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Added to the handbook
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

**The Master's Handbook was updated**

The Master's Handbook was updated to reflect new changes in policy and new URL addresses.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Made available to students
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: EPY Coordinator

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Educational Psychology PhD**

(As of: 12/13/2016 04:41 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 21 students as of Fall 2010 in the Ph.D. program; of these 0 graduated during this academic year.

**Goals**

**G 1: Annual Review**

Students will undergo an annual review of their PhD performance

**G 2: Professional Seminar**

Students will attend a professional seminar in their first semester of enrollment in the EPY PhD program.

**G 3: Dissertation**

Students will undergo the scholarly activity of writing and defending a dissertation.

**G 4: College teaching**

Develop competence in college teaching

**G 5: Scholarly activities**

Participates in scholarly activities
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will receive a satisfactory or better on their annual reviews, indicating their developing abilities to communicate professionally, orally and in writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Exposure to the field of EPY (G: 2) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will attend EPY 8961 to obtain exposure to major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in the field of Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation (G: 3) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully write and defend their dissertation, indicating that they understand and apply research methods including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Develop competence in college teaching (G: 4) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop competence in college teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Demonstrate competence in scholarly activities (G: 5) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate independence and competence in scholarly activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Annual review (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Communicate professionally, orally and in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students will receive a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better in their annual review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students except for 3 received a rating of &quot;satisfactory&quot; or better in their annual review. These 3 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Educational Psychology seminar (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O3: Exposure to the field of EPY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All doctoral students will complete this professional development seminar during the first semester of their first year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All first year doctoral students completed this seminar in their first semester and received satisfactory grades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Dissertation (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students must defend a dissertation based on a data-based study to their dissertation committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O4: Demonstrate expertise with research design, data analysis, and interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who attempt, will successfully defend their dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who attempted, successfully defended their dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Teaching Internship (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teaching internship includes attending class sessions, teaching a specified unit of the class under supervision of the instructor, assessing students on the material taught during the unit, and providing feedback to the class regarding their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O5: Develop competence in college teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who attempt the teaching internship will successfully complete the requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students who attempted the teaching internship successfully completed the requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

During this reporting period, approximately 20 presentations, publications, and grant proposals were authored or coauthored by Educational Psychology doctoral students.

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

**EPY 9660**

The teaching residency will become an official course, called EPY 9660: Internship in Educational Psychology.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The course became available in August of 2009.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

**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

**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

**Improve our Recruitment efforts to the Ph.D. program**

We have established a recruitment committee with the focus attracting more highly qualified students to our program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We will design additional recruitment materials and strategies.
PhD Handbook was updated

The PhD handbook will be continuously reviewed and updated to reflect new requirements and URL address changes

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: EPY Coordinator

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 English Assessment of Core
As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

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. Our program's work with students also aims to connect writing to larger University initiatives. The FLC program, the First Year Reading Book, Student Success Academy, WAC, and the Department's Writing Studio have influence on the course curriculum and stated outcomes and goals.

Goals

G 1: Competency in Writing
Student will demonstrate competency in writing through consideration of the rhetorical situation, and through their ability to identify key issues, present their findings in a logical structure, formulate an alternative point of view, formulate a central/anchor thought (thesis), and use effective support and evidence.

G 2: Reading Comprehension
Student will demonstrate ability to interpret a text accurately, particularly in terms of main ideas or important concepts. Additionally, students will demonstrate ability to identify, summarize, and evaluate both major and minor issues, as well as the interrelationships between them.

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. 2) Develop their writing style by engaging in several forms of writing (summary, expository, argumentative, etc.) 3) Help student connect their writing process to the larger University community, 4) Work with University programs (FLC, First Year Book, Student Success Academy, Writing Studio, Writing Across the Curriculum, etc.) to create and maintain writing program initiatives, and 5) train Graduate Teaching Assistants in the proper assessment and feedback models needed to encourage and direct our students.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identification (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Identification and articulation of key issue(s) (does it answer the question?).

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.

SLO 2: Logical Structure (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)
Identification of valid positions on the issue (presented in a logical structure).
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 3: Alternative Viewpoints (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)
Student is able to formulate and effectively articulate alternative view 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.

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: Thesis (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their formulation of a position on an issue. Their papers will develop a central thesis, and their papers will follow the structure and line of argument supported by this thesis.

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: Evidence (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate effective use of reasons in support of stated position.

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 6: Reading Comprehension (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate their ability to effectively summarize and evaluate texts (in this case, The Other Wes Moore). Students should be able to identify major arguments and the interrelationships between the major and [minor] sub-arguments.
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, 5)

In order to assess writing skills, instructors gave ENGL1101 students a prompted essay question for the University's freshman reading book, The Other Wes Moore. Instructors graded these essays using the revised 2012 rubric (in documents section).

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

Target for O1: Identification

At least 70% of students will score a “3” out of "4" on Identification.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

88% of students received a score of 3 or 4.

Target for O2: Logical Structure

At least 70% of students will score a “3” out of "4" on Logical Structure.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

71% of students received a score of 3 or 4.

Target for O3: Alternative Viewpoints

At least 70% of students will score a “3” out of "4" on Alternative Viewpoints.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

50% of students scored a 3 or 4.

Target for O4: Thesis

At least 70% of students will score a “3” out of "4" on thesis construction.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

80 % of students scored a 3 or 4.

Target for O5: Evidence

At least 70% of students should score a 3 or 4 on Evidence.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

69% of students scored a 3 or 4.

M 2: Written assignment assessing reading comprehension (O: 6)

In order to assess reading comprehension skills, instructors gave ENGL1101 students a reading comprehension quiz. The instructors graded these quizzes using the revised reading comprehension rubric (attached in documents section).

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

Target for O6: Reading Comprehension

Students will score at least a "3" out of "4" on the Reading Comprehension Rubric. Please see "documents" section for 2011-2012 Rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

72% of students received a 3 or 4.

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.

**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. We have moved toward a themed model for these courses. We have also started requiring TAs to develop "select texts" (Bedford St. Martin’s is helping us with this) for their reading materials.

**Revise Rubrics**

Our new reading comprehension rubrics allowed us to assess the comprehension levels of our incoming 1101 students.

**1101 through 1102 tracking of individual students**

Our new assessment data collecting allows us to track student progress in the 1101 and 1102 courses. We would like to retest the same sample students once they exit 1102 to see if their writing scores improve. This will require devising a similar essay prompt and grading this prompt with the same revised rubric used in the 1101 assessment. We can compare the individual assessment scores to track student progress and to assess areas in which we need to improve our pedagogical approach.

**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 revised the rubric, we made the first year book and the data collection a mandatory part of each TA's syllabus, and we used the preliminary data to direct students (those scoring 2 and 1) to learning 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.

Next year we will revise the course to introduce evidence and alternative points of view earlier in the curriculum. We will also start assessing the University's Freshman Success Academy students separately from our "regular" incoming Freshman class.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

We have worked to train TAs in assessment. In four meetings throughout the year, we went over assessment models and conducted grade norming sessions using the revised writing and reading comprehension rubrics. With this additional training, we are more confident in the reporting we receive from our TAs. We also devised a single prompt for assessing writing in the 1101 course. We feel
the single prompt gives us more accurate assessment reports. We collected writing and reading comprehension data from all of our 1101 students (sample size included in this report). In addition to the information reported here, we also collected demographic information we feel will be useful in tracking student progress through their 1102 courses.

**Challenges for Next Year**—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department’s outcomes.

The 1101 and 1102 courses have increasingly become the catch-all for assessment and University-initiated programs. We anticipate more programs designed to use the 1101 and 1102 courses as a way to collect data. This puts a burden on our TAs. Additionally, these new initiatives often do not consider the goals and aims of our approach to teaching.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**—If you modified any of the measures or methods you use in the measurement process, please note those here.

We used newly revised rubrics for both the reading and writing assessment portions of this data collection period.

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

1101 and 1102 are core courses. We work closely with the office of student retention (implementing their new attendance policy and continuing to participate in their early alert program, the FLC office, the Atlanta Connection program, the Student Success program, and with the tutoring services offered by the athletic program.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The English department prepares its students in the Creative Writing concentration with knowledge of literary composition, aesthetics, vocabulary and techniques, familiarity with established literary models, and the ability to produce creative engaging literary works so that they are prepared to enter graduate programs and publish in creative writing or embark upon other writing careers.

**Goals**

**G 1: Mastery of Writing**

Graduates of this concentration are competent writers, both in terms of basic communications skills and imaginative expression.

**G 2: Knowledgeable about Genre**

Graduates of this concentration are well versed in the literary production (significant figures and works, aesthetic techniques, literary vocabulary) of their chosen genre.

**G 3: Knowledgeable about the Profession of Writing**

Graduates of this concentration are aware of sources of contemporary literature that they can read for models of good writing and are familiar with appropriate venues for publication.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 01: Demonstrate Content Knowledge Related to Creative Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2010-2011 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 for the fiction senior portfolios. The target for poetry senior portfolios was dropped to a 4.0 instead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twenty fiction students submitted senior portfolios this year as did seven poetry students. The average score for the fiction students for this outcome was a 4.50, meaning that these portfolios did meet the target. The average score for the poetry students was a 4.45, which is also slightly above the target for poetry portfolios. The score for the fiction writers was an increase over last year’s mark (4.28) and the score for the poetry students matched what was earned by poetry students in the last assessment cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for 02: Demonstrate Familiarity with Appropriate Examples of Literary Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2010-2011 assessment plan indicated that a target of 4.2 out of 5.0 would be set for this outcome concerning students’ familiarity with appropriate examples of literary work. On the other hand, the target for poetry senior portfolios was dropped to a 4.0 instead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twenty fiction students submitted senior portfolios this year as did seven poetry students. The average score for the fiction students for this outcome was a 4.25, meaning that these portfolios met the target. The average score for the poetry students was a 4.40, meaning that they exceeded the target. In the last assessment cycle, the fiction score has been a 4.56, while the previous poetry score was a 4.0, meaning that the poetry students showed a significant increase on this outcome this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 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: In-Progress |
| 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: Finished |
| Priority: Medium |

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: Finished |
| Priority: Medium |
Address concern over diminishing student numbers in poetry specialty
For this past two years, the department has been tracking the number of poetry students who graduate each semester and has observed that it is often less than the number of fiction students by at least 50%. This raises concerns because with a diminished student base, specialty classes in poetry such as English 3150a (Introduction to Poetry), English 3170 (Poetry Technique), and English 4310A (Senior Seminar; Poetry) will undoubtedly be affected (by being very small in size or unable to run during a particular semester because of under enrollment). Another concern is that with fewer specialty courses being offered, advanced graduate students in poetry will not have the opportunity to teach these courses, and this would detract from the value of the graduate program. While the department is still unclear about the reason for this shift in numbers, the situation seems serious enough to warrant immediate discussion and possible action. Therefore, the director of Creative Writing will bring this question to the poetry faculty and work with them to brainstorm possible solutions. The Director of Creative Writing will meet with the poetry faculty during the fall of 2012 to address this concern and offer possible solutions that could be implemented by the beginning of the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.

Consider other possible assessment tools
Faculty associated with this concentration will begin to discuss the development of other assessment tools beyond the senior exit portfolio. One possibility is to create a measure that assesses students' skills in grammar and syntax in the introductory classes (English 3150a and 3150b). Getting a clearer sense of students' mastery of basic writing skills early on in their program would be helpful in determining what specifically needs to be addressed in the specialty classes that follow to bring students up to the level of competence that is expected by the end of their studies. The Director of Creative Writing will meet with Creative Writing faculty to begin a discussion about additional assessment measures with the intention of being able to create and implement any new tools by the beginning of the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.

Examine previous poetry portfolios that received divergent scores
In an effort to determine why the poetry scores fall below fiction scores in most instances, the Assessment Coordinator will work with the director of the Creative Writing program to identify past portfolios that received divergent scores from different readers so that faculty members in this concentration can look at these examples and discuss expectations concerning the portfolio with the hope of creating greater consistency in the scoring of the portfolios. The Assessment Coordinator will gather these materials and make them available to the director of Creative Writing by Dec. 31, 2012. Then, the faculty will discuss the discrepancies and generate ways to address this issue by May 31, 2013.

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?

One significant change is that this concentration now has a mission statement and goals specific to its program (rather than the general statement and goals for the whole English program). The next step for improving undergraduate assessment is to investigate other opportunities when assessment can happen, ideally in a course that occurs early on in the program. Consequently, the next year will be spent considering other assessment tools with the hope of implementing any new measures by the beginning of the 2013-2014 school 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 Creative Writing portfolios met all of the assessment targets. In part, this was due to the fact that the targets for poetry were set lower since this sub-specialty was not meeting its targets in the past three years (since the department began distinguishing poetry results from fiction results). The seven poetry portfolios submitted in 2011-2012 met the target set for knowledge related to creative writing because of the lower standard. On the other hand, these portfolios far exceeded the lower standard on the other criterion related to familiarity with literary examples. Since the concentration is still trying to determine the cause of the lower scores in poetry...
as compared to fiction, the Director of Creative Writing in conjunction with the Assessment Coordinator will identify examples of past portfolios that received widely divergent scores and meet with the poetry faculty to discuss expectations about the portfolio. Ideally, this action will improve the norming of scores in the poetry section of this concentration. The 20 fiction portfolios submitted in 2011-2012 met the targets set for them, by a wide margin in the case of knowledge related to Creative Writing and by a small margin in the case of familiarity with literary works. The Creative Writing faculty are going to begin to discuss other measures for assessing student work in the concentration at other points in the program rather than just the final semester of the senior seminar. Since there are so many classes that students are required to take in this concentration, there a number of courses that could be selected for this purpose.

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2011-2012 English Concentration in Literature**  
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**Mission / Purpose**  
The English Department prepares its graduates with a concentration in literature to demonstrate exceptional critical thinking, interpret and analyze texts of all kinds, and communicate effectively, both orally and in writing.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Critical Thinking Skills**  
Students think critically by reading closely, applying theoretical models, and discerning and interpreting cultural, political, and historical contexts.

**G 2: Interpretation Skills**  
Students read and interpret written texts of all types—especially those containing imaginative or artistic representations of human experience—by conducting research and adopting various critical approaches and perspectives.

**G 3: Effective Communication**  
Students communicate their ideas effectively and eloquently, both orally and in writing.

---

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

There were 38 portfolios submitted in the Literature concentration this year. The average score for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills was a 4.51, meaning that it met the target. This average also represented the highest score for this outcome in the past six assessment cycles.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The average score for this outcome related to the knowledge of literary history, major figures, and genres was a 4.43, meaning that it met the target. This average was also the highest score earned for this outcome in the past six assessment cycles.

Target for O3: Mastery of basic elements of writing

The target for this outcome related to the mastery of basic elements of writing was a 4.2 out of 5.0.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The average score for this outcome related to the mastery of basic elements of writing was a 4.48, meaning that it met the target. This reflects a slight improvement over last year's average for this outcome which was a 4.35.

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

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate Studies

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Begin discussing additional assessment tools

Faculty associated with this concentration will begin to discuss the development of other assessment tools beyond the senior exit portfolio. One possibility is to create a measure that assesses student mastery of content knowledge in the single author courses. This particular class may be an ideal course for assessing content knowledge in this concentration since all students are required to take one single author course; in addition, the syllabus of this course typically involves some type of culminating writing that determines student knowledge about the author under consideration. An assessment tool could be created in conjunction with this culminating project. Another possibility for further assessment of student work in this concentration is the internship course. While the internship is not a required course, the department has made efforts in recent years to promote this opportunity since it offers students such a unique and meaningful educational experience. Implementing an assessment tool for the internship program could help the department to clarify its value and to determine its success.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The director of Undergraduate Studies will begin a discussion about additional assessment measures with faculty members associated with the Literature concentration with the intention of being able to create and implement any new tools by the beginning of the 2013-2014 assessment cycle.
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Undergraduate 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?

One significant change is that this concentration now has a mission statement and goals specific to its program (rather than the general statement and goals for the whole English program). The next step for improving undergraduate assessment is to investigate other opportunities when assessment can happen, ideally in a course that occurs early on in the program. Consequently, the next year will be spent considering other assessment tools with the hope of implementing any new measures by the beginning of the 2013-2014 school 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 assessment results for the Literature concentration in 2011-2012 were very encouraging with students earning the highest mean average of the past six assessment cycles on all three of the outcomes associated with the senior exit portfolio (content knowledge, reading interpretation, and the ability to use basic elements of writing). Given this success, this concentration is not planning any changes to the educational program; however, faculty members associated with this concentration will begin to discuss the possibility of creating an additional assessment tool that could capture student success rates at a point in the program other than just the senior seminar. The single author course and the internship are possible courses that could provide meaningful assessment information in content knowledge (the single author course) and in professional training (the internship).

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 English Concentration in Rhetoric/Composition
(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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. (This mission statement is in the process of being revised and will be updated by Oct. 2012.)

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of language and linguistics
Students will demonstrate an awareness of the centrality of language to human experience as well as an understanding of some of the structures and functions of language.

G 2: Effective Written Communications
Students will be able to apply knowledge of the elements of rhetoric for effective communications in writing; to write for a variety of forms as appropriate to audience, purpose, and occasion; to recognize a range of social, academic, and professional situations and adapt language accordingly; and to comprehend the grammatical and syntactical patterns of the English language and use them as tools in writing and revising.

G 3: Interpretive Skills
Students will be able to interpret figurative language, to identify literary and thematic patterns, to read for multiple meanings, to apply knowledge of conventions from different periods and genres; to read and use scholarly and theoretical works, and to evaluate critical arguments and construct alternative positions when necessary.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts (M: 1)
Students will be able to interpret figurative language, to identify literary and thematic patterns, to read for multiple meanings, to apply knowledge of conventions from different periods and genres; to read and use scholarly and theoretical works, and to evaluate critical arguments and construct alternative positions when necessary.

SLO 2: Effective written communications (M: 1)
Students will develop the skills to use language effectively in written communications.

SLO 3: Knowledge of language and linguistics (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate an awareness of the centrality of language to human experience as well as an understanding of some of the structures and functions of language.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Rhetoric and Composition senior exit portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3)
While the senior exit portfolios have been required of students since the fall of 2002, 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 that are aligned with the department's undergraduate learning outcomes, 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 Rhetoric and Composition concentration chose to continue to focus on the following three outcomes: knowledge of language and linguistics; effective written communications; and the ability to think critically and interpret texts.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Ability to think critically and interpret texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The target for this outcome related to critical thinking and interpretation skills is a 3.2 out of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the late spring of 2012, the department’s server went down and the back-up system did not function. Consequently, many department documents were lost, including all the portfolio assessment forms from the fall 2011 and spring 2012 assessment review process. (Rhetoric and Composition is the only concentration that currently does an electronic portfolio, so they were the only concentration affected by this problem.) As a result, the department's 2011-2011 assessment report will not be able to include any reporting on this undergraduate concentration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Effective written communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the 2009-2010 assessment report, the target for this outcome related to effective written communications was determined to be a 3.3 out of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the late spring of 2012, the department’s server went down and the back-up system did not function. Consequently, many department documents were lost, including all the portfolio assessment forms from the fall 2011 and spring 2012 assessment review process. (Rhetoric and Composition is the only concentration that currently does an electronic portfolio, so they were the only concentration affected by this problem.) As a result, the department's 2011-2011 assessment report will not be able to include any reporting on this undergraduate concentration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Knowledge of language and linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2009-2010 assessment report indicated that target for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics is a 3.2 out of 4.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the late spring of 2012, the department’s server went down and the back-up system did not function. Consequently, many department documents were lost, including all the portfolio assessment forms from the fall 2011 and spring 2012 assessment review process. (Rhetoric and Composition is the only concentration that currently does an electronic portfolio, so they were the only concentration affected by this problem.) As a result, the department's 2011-2011 assessment report will not be able to include any reporting on this undergraduate concentration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revise the mission, goals, and objectives to match the particulars of the Rhetoric/Composition concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 |
| Priority: High |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change the outcomes assessed for the senior portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Established in Cycle: 2010-2011 |
| Implementation Status: Finished |
| Priority: Medium |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change the portfolios to a 5-point rather than a 4-point assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Established in Cycle: 2010-2011 |
| Implementation Status: Finished |
| Priority: Medium |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set new targets for the portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consider other assessment measures
The faculty in the Secondary English concentration will discuss other options for implementing new assessment measures in courses that occur earlier in this program than does the Senior Seminar. Ideally, the department should strive to capture data from an early point in the program to go along with the assessment currently being done at the end point of the 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?

One significant change is that this concentration now has a mission statement and goals specific to its program (rather than the general statement and goals for the whole English program). The next step for improving undergraduate assessment is to investigate other opportunities when assessment can happen, ideally in a course that occurs early on in the program. Consequently, the next year will be spent considering other assessment tools with the hope of implementing any new measures by the beginning of the 2013-2014 school 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.

Because the assessment data for this concentration for 2011-2012 was lost, there is no analysis for this section. There are also no programmatic changes planned for the upcoming year.
Students will be able to reflect upon the profession of teaching and the effectiveness of particular classroom practices.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Secondary English Senior Exit Portfolio (O: 2, 3, 4)**

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.

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

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Twenty-one Secondary English senior portfolios were submitted this year. Students averaged a 4.40 for this outcome related to the knowledge of language and linguistics, meaning that their portfolios met the target for this outcome. This score also represented the highest mark for this outcome in the last six assessment cycles.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students averaged a 4.30 for this outcome related to effective written communications, meaning that their portfolios met the target for this outcome. This score was slightly lower than the last score for this outcome which was a 4.43.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for this outcome was a 4.40. 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.

**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**

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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

This year, students were asked to write a teaching philosophy for the senior seminar and this was used in place of the exam. This statement was scored on four criteria: comprehension of key pedagogical concepts, effective reflection on pedagogical practice; integration of pedagogical concepts and practice into their own ideas about teaching; and demonstration of audience awareness. A four-point ranking was used, with excellent indicating the knowledge or skill was demonstrated masterfully and frequently, competent indicating the knowledge or skill was demonstrated competently and frequently, uneven indicating the knowledge or skill was demonstrated masterfully and frequently was demonstrated unevenly, with some competence and some frequency, and insufficient indicating the knowledge or skill was insufficiently or frequently demonstrated. The average score for the comprehension of key pedagogical concepts was a 3.5 which falls short of the target. The average score for the effective reflection on pedagogical practice was a 3.6. The average score for the pleasant side of the pedagogical concepts and practice into their own ideas about teaching was a 3.5. And the average score for the demonstration of audience awareness was 3.6. All three of these criteria met the target.
**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

### 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:** In-Progress  
  **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:** In-Progress  
  **Priority:** High  
  **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:** On-Hold  
  **Priority:** Medium  
  **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:** Finished  
  **Priority:** Medium  
  **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011  
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Assessment Coordinator

### Consider options for additional assessment measures

Since it is uncertain at this point whether student enrollment can support the creation of a specialized English 3040 class, the faculty in the Secondary English concentration should discuss other options for implementing new assessment measures in courses that occur earlier in this program than does the Senior Seminar. Ideally, the department should strive to capture data from an early point in the program to go along with the assessment currently being done at the end point of the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
  **Implementation Status:** Planned  
  **Priority:** Medium  
  **Implementation Description:** The Chair of the Secondary English committee will find out about the decision concerning the specialized 3040 class from the Department Chair and the Associate Chair and then bring the matter to the Secondary English committee for discussion.  
  **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013  
  **Responsible Person/Group:** the Chair of the Secondary English committee

### Coordinate key pedagogical ideas to be presented in the senior seminar
The missed target on the criterion related to the comprehension of key pedagogical ideas in the teaching philosophy assignment suggests that students are not fully comprehending and internalizing the critical teaching ideas presented in the senior seminar. This could be related to the fact that the concentration does not have a strong sense of which concepts are critical to teacher preparation, so instructors who teach the senior seminar will meet during the course of 2012-2013 to agree upon the concepts to be presented and integrated into students’ teaching philosophies.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The instructors who teach the senior seminar for this concentration will meet to come up with a list of key pedagogical ideas to be presented in this course.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: The Assessment Coordinator and the instructors of this senior seminar.

Decide whether or not to run the specialized 3040 class for Secondary English students
Last year, the faculty in Secondary English decided to begin offering a specialized course in English 3040 (Introduction to Literary Studies) for students in this concentration, but this class did not run in the fall 2012 semester for two reasons: the instructor ended up taking family leave and the class was seriously underenrolled. The department needs to decide if enrollment can be improved with additional advertisement and whether or not to offer a specialized English 3040 in 2013-2014.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Chair of the Secondary English committee will discuss this matter with the Associate Chair of the department who, in consultation with the chair, will decide whether or not this course should be offered again.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Ultimately, the chair of the 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?

One significant change is that this concentration now has a mission statement and goals specific to its program (rather than the general statement and goals for the whole English program). The next step for improving undergraduate assessment is to investigate other opportunities when assessment can happen, ideally in a course that occurs early on in the program. Consequently, the next year will be spent considering other assessment tools with the hope of implementing any new measures by the beginning of the 2013-2014 school 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.

Because the targets for the senior exit portfolio were met, this concentration does not have specific programmatic actions to be taken at the moment related to this assessment measure. On the other hand, the assessment from the teaching philosophy assignment had one criterion that was not met—the mastery of critical concepts of English pedagogy. Because of that, the instructors of this course will meet this year to discuss the critical elements and to make sure that the course offers an effective approach for introducing this material to students. In addition, since it is uncertain at this point whether student enrollment can support the creation of a specialized English 3040 class, the faculty in the Secondary English concentration should discuss other options for implementing new assessment measures in courses that occur earlier in this program than does the Senior Seminar. Ideally, the department should strive to capture data from an early point in the program to go along with the assessment currently being done at the end point of the program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 English Creative Writing MFA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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. (This mission statement is in the process of being revised and will be updated by Oct. 2012.)

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. 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 2010-2011, the decision was made to include 6 rankings on the MFA thesis assessment form because the score of 6 is reserved for work that is ready to go to publication and some MFA theses are of that quality. Consequently, the target for the content knowledge outcome of the MFA thesis was revised to be 5.0 out of 6.0.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Two students completed the MFA thesis in 2011-2012. The average score for all of the criteria on the M.F.A. thesis was a 6.0. That score exceeded the target and represented an improvement over last year’s scores.

**Target for O2: Application of Literary Studies**

In 2010-2011, the decision was made to include 6 rankings on the MFA thesis assessment form because the score of 6 is reserved for work that is ready to go to publication and some MFA theses are of that quality. Consequently, the target for the content knowledge outcome of the MFA thesis was revised to be 5.0 out of 6.0.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for the application of literary studies outcome on the two M.F.A. theses completed this year was a 6.0. That score exceeded 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 2011-2012 - 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 6.0. That score exceeded 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 or a fail on their exams.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Two MFA exams were taken this year and neither received a low pass or failing grade. One exam was awarded a high pass while the other exam earned a pass. The target was met, with a 0% low pass/failure rate and a 100% high pass/pass rate.

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 or a fail on their exams. This target was set to build upon the progress shown in last year's, where only 14% of exams were given a score of a low pass or a failure.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Two MFA exams were taken this year and neither received a low pass or failing grade. One exam was awarded a high pass while the other exam earned a pass. The target was met, and the 0% low pass/failure rate and a 100% high pass/pass rate.

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

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)

Rewrite mission and goals for MFA program

By spring of 2013, 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: 12/2012
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: Finished
Priority: High
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: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

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: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to the Graduate Director

Consider limiting the number of outcomes in assessment of MFA theses
In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work of the MFA theses. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Director of Creative Writing.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: the Assessment Coordinator and the Director of Creative Writing

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 in the assessment process for the MFA concentration. During the next year, a number of steps will be taken. The mission statement and goals will be revised to address the specifics of Creative Writing. Also, the department will begin to discuss whether we should continue using the full range of outcomes in our assessment tools or limit the number of outcomes we consider each year (perhaps on a rotating basis). In addition, the department will create an explanation sheet that explains the possible rankings for the thesis work (similar to the document we use with the dissertation 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.

This year, two MFA exams were taken; one received a high pass and the other a pass, meaning that they exceeded the target of a 15% or less low pass/fail rate. This matched the results from the previous year. There were also two MFA theses completed this year. Both received the highest scores in all areas, meaning they also exceeded the target. These thesis results were an improvement over the last year. Because of the success in both areas, this concentration has no plans to make changes to the program this year.
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 (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Content Knowledge GACE Scores (O: 1)**
Candidate performance on GACE tests for English Language Arts, forms 020 and 021.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O1: Content knowledge**
100% of candidates will pass the required GACE II tests for English language arts education.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Note: The GACE II scores are reported a year later than the current year under review. Our 2010-2011 aggregate pass rate for the exams is 96% One student failed the GACE English 20 exam and 2 students failed the English 21 exam. Students scored slightly lower on 10 of the 12 state average subareas of English 20 Exam and scored slightly lower on 6 of the 12 state average subareas on English 21 Exam.

**M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework (O: 1)**
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment are based on a score of 3 or higher on all of the criteria within the scoring guide. The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment administered in Fall 2011 is 95% at the Adequate Demonstration (Score 3) Level. At least 42% of the students met the criteria on the scoring guide at the Effective level (Score 4) on all 4 aspects of the content knowledge domain.

M 3: Planning performance (O: 2)

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment are based on a score of 3 or higher on all of the criteria within the scoring guide. The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment administered in Spring 2012 is 100% for the rubrics used to assess Design for Instruction, Contextual Factors, and Learning Goals at the Acceptable (Score 3) level. The aggregate pass rate for the Assessment Plan, rubric was 100% at the Acceptable (Score 3) Level for four of the five criteria. On the criterion "Adaptations Based on Individual Needs of Student", 87% of students scored at the Acceptable (Score 3) Level. Our analysis of the Spring 2012 group further indicates the following: Contextual Factors: at least 12% scored at the proficient level (Score 4) and a minimum of 68% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5) Learning Goals: at least 6% scored at the proficient level (Score 4) and a minimum of 87% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5) Design for Instruction: at least 6% scored at the proficient level (Score 4) and a minimum of 73% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5). In contrast, on the Assessment Plan: at least 11% scored at the proficient level (Score 4) and a minimum of 70% scored at the exemplary level (Score 5). Two students did not meet the acceptable level, scoring at the developing (Score 2) level on one dimension: "Adaptations Based on Individual Needs of Student”

M 4: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 3)

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment are based on a score of 3 or higher on all of the criteria within the scoring guides. The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment administered in Spring 2012 is 100% at the Adequate Demonstration (Score 3) Level. Furthermore, on the Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation criterion, 68% of students scored at the exemplary (Score 5) level and 31% scored at the proficient (Score 4) level.

M 5: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 4)

Target for O4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Midpoint: The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 68% 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 (Score 4 or higher). On both subcategories of classroom management and classroom environment, 52% scored at the effective level, while 89% scored at the adequate level for communication. Further analysis also shows that 57% scored at the effective level in an overall score regarding their skills and professional knowledge with learning environments. Assessment: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 21% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 95% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 26% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Professionalism: 95% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 66% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher).
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 the 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
- Pedagogical Knowledge
- Clinical Practice at Endpoint
- Dispositions
- Professionalism

Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge

Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

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

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.

Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge GACE Scores

Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

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

---

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Endpoint: 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 98% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Learning Environments: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 81% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Classroom Environment scored 99% at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 68% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Classroom management 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 81% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Planning and Instruction: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 75% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Planning and Instruction: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and 87% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment are based on a score of 3 or higher on all of the criteria within the scoring guides. The aggregate pass rates for this key assessment administered in Spring 2012 is 100% at the minimum Acceptable Performance (Score 3) Level or higher. Among the five categories assessed for dispositions (Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful and Purposeful Vision), 100% of candidates demonstrated an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and a minimum of 75% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).
**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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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

**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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

**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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge GACE Scores | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Faculty will obtain scores from data manager.
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 have not made changes to our assessment process because we are working through a system that was initially implemented in 2010-2011. At this point, we are working our way through this process in order to better understand how we can use this data for serving our students well and developing our ideas about 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.

We present our discussion of our assessment results to improve our program in each of the three areas: 1) content knowledge; 2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and 3) student learning. 1. Content knowledge Based on data from students' passing rates on the GACE English exams and on their performance of content knowledge while being evaluated during student teaching, we find that our students are consistently knowledgeable about the content needed to teach English language arts. They perform at or above the expectations set for the cohort and the state. We can use this data to continue to implement our curriculum and to fine tune it to be sure that students continue to perform their knowledge of English language arts in terms of language, literature, reading, writing, speaking, viewing, and listening skills. Changes that we have implemented to the English MAT program include a streamlining of the portfolio project to focus on a well-crafted teaching philosophy to be accompanied by a host of artifacts that illustrate students' achievement, knowledge, and core principles established across the coursework required in the program. We introduced this change specifically because students requested a more focused effort on teaching philosophies and ways to connect their coursework. Students voiced these needs for change during our EDCI 6600, EDLA 6550, and EDLA 7550 course conversations and opportunities for writing and giving feedback. Since our students tend to score higher than the state average on the GACE exams for English language arts, we encourage them to work in small groups to foster collegial relationships that support each other in preparing for these exams. We made available through electronic chat and discussion forums, opportunities for students who had completed the exams to share their study materials and discuss their strategies for preparing for the exams. We also confer with students at least twice a year during our Professional Advisement Week, as well as prior to the start of the summer methods courses, to advise students on how to choose English literature and language courses to supplement and enhance their content knowledge in our field. 2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions Based on data from students' teaching performances in their practicum and student teaching experiences, and in the domains of planning, clinical practice, and dispositions, we find that our students are consistently successful and knowledgeable in practicing their teaching and planning skills. The high ratings of our students support the efforts we put into our curriculum throughout the year, from the initial summer methods courses through to the spring student teaching experience in our year-long program. We can use this data to continue to implement our curriculum and to fine tune it to be sure that students consistently present their content knowledge and dispositions for teaching in their daily practices. Like the changes we made to the portfolio requirements for the program, we expanded the professional reading texts in the EDLA 6550 and 7550 courses to include more research-based literature on differentiation for a number of key populations that students expressed a need for further knowledge and skills. Specifically, we introduced texts and sessions in class to teach students about working with African American male youth, students with special educational needs, students who are English Language Learners, and gender differences—all of whom were discussed in light of teaching them literacy, literature, and language skills and processes. Based on student feedback from exit surveys at the end of the year, we find that our students are consistently successful and knowledgeable in making an impact on student learners. The high ratings of our students support the efforts we employ to prepare students to meet the needs of diverse learners, especially those learners located in urban schools. We can use this data to continue to implement our curriculum and to fine tune it to be sure that students consistently understand, plan for, and meet the needs of diverse student learners. To support the MAT students' learning and reflecting on their learning, we implemented a project in which they are required to present what they learned during the semester that they take the EDLA 6550 course. The project requires students to use multiple media, present their material to the class, thus using their knowledge and skills for media, language, and literacy use, as well as modelling for them a synthesis and summative assessment that can be used with adolescent youth in English language arts classes. This project encourages the graduate students to experience reflection on their own action and serves as a model that can be used in student teaching and later teaching experiences. The implementation of the Teacher Work Sample, in addition to supporting students' expressed needs for support in developing lesson and curriculum plans, also serves as a means for observing and analyzing student learning when the graduate student is in the teaching role. With careful observation of students,
attention to details in planning for student engagement with language, literature, and culture, our graduate students learn to address
issues of classroom management as well. Besides help with planning, classroom management is the singular topic that our students
say they need help with when they are in our methods courses, when they discuss their field experiences with mentors and
supervisors, and when they reflect on their student teaching experience at the end of the final semester.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:  Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s
(2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle?
What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:  What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your
department’s effectiveness?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:  How will you use your findings from this year? 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
2011-2012 English MA: Literature
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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, and secondary education. Our students will develop strong oral, written, and electronic communication skills as
they progress through our programs. (This mission statement is being revised and will be updated by October 2012.)

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;
进一步，他们将能够讨论这些可能性和限制性的问题。

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 Rimé 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.
### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The fifteen students in this year’s pro-seminar classes averaged a 4.6 (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 a slight decline from scores for this outcome from the previous assessment cycle (5.0).

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for the students in this year’s Pro-Seminar classes 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 just met the target and matches the score earned in the previous assessment cycle.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for the students in the Pro-Seminar classes this year was a 4.5 for this outcome related to the use of scholarly vocabulary. This just met the standard and represented a decrease over the score (5.0) for this outcome from previous assessment cycle.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The average for the students in the Pro-Seminar classes this year was a 4.0 for this outcome related to the knowledge and application of theoretical approaches to reading literature. This does not meet the target. It also represents the lowest score earned for this criterion in the four years of assessment results.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for the students in this year’s Pro-Seminar classes was a 4.5 for this outcome related to the ability to formulate effective questions, which just meets the target and represents a decrease from last year’s score of a 5.0.

#### 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.
The average of the students in the Pro-Seminar this year was a 4.1 for the ability to communicate effectively in written and spoken communications. This score does not meet the target, but it does mark a slight increase over last year’s score of 4.0.

**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.

The average score for students in the Pro-Seminar classes this year for the criterion related to researching skills is a 4.2. This score does not meet the target but it does represent a slight increase over last year’s score of 4.0.

**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 disserting 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**

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.

The average score for the 11 theses assessed was a 4.50 for this learning outcome related to knowledge of figures, genres, periods, and movements. This score just meets the target, and it represents a slight increase over last year’s average score of 4.45.

**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.

The average for the 11 theses assessed this year was a 4.50 for this outcome related to knowledge of language, meaning that it just met the target. This score was also a slight decrease from last year’s average score of 4.55.

**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.

The average for the 11 theses assessed this year was a 4.50 for the use of scholarly vocabulary, which just meets the intended target. It also represents an increase over the 4.38 score of the previous assessment cycle.

**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.

The average for the 11 theses assessed this year was a 4.2 for the outcome related to critical approaches, theoretical frameworks, and cultural contexts, meaning it did not meet the target. This is the lowest score for all six outcomes. Similarly, in the 2010-2011 assessment, it was on the lower end of the results with a 4.35 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.

The average of the 11 theses assessed this year was a 4.5 for this outcome related to effective written communications. This just meets the target. It is also a decrease from the 2010-2011 score for this outcome which was a 4.9.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score for the 11 theses assessed this year was a 4.7, which exceeds the target and represents a slight improvement over the 2010-2011 score which was a 4.69.

### 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 (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
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator will work with the Graduate Director to create this document.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** 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:** In-Progress
- **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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of the Graduate Program

#### Apply the assessment tool for the Pro-Seminar to the prospectus instead of the class

Since the Pro-Seminar class was initiated five years ago, the assessment measure has always been used to evaluate student work in the entire course. To gain a better assessment of the primary work of the Pro-Seminar—the draft of the prospectus of the thesis—the assessment form will be retooled to be directed towards the particulars of that work. Ideally, this will give a more direct measure of student success in the class.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The Director of Graduate Studies will consult with the Graduate Studies Committee to revise the current form. Hereafter, instructors of the Pro-Seminar will use the form at the end of the semester to evaluate each student's thesis prospectus.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** the Director of Graduate Studies

#### Consider limiting the number of outcomes used to assess thesis work

In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work of the M.A. theses. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Graduate Director
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** the Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director

### 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 in the assessment process for this MA concentration. During the next year, a number of steps will be taken. The mission statement and goals will be reviewed to see if any revisions are needed. Also, the department will begin to discuss whether we should continue using the full range of outcomes in our assessment tools or limit the number of outcomes we consider each year (perhaps on a rotating basis). In addition, the department will create an explanation sheet that explains the possible
**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 results from the Pro-Seminar were mixed, with four of the criteria meeting their targets and three (in researching skills, effective communications, and theoretical/conceptual framework) falling just below their targets. The department has decided to retool this assessment so that it is applied to the draft of the prospectus instead rather than to the student work of the entire class. The purpose of this shift is to get a more direct evaluation of the prospectus writing since this is linked to the development of the thesis. The revised assessment form will be distributed to students at the beginning of the Pro-Seminar so that they understand the outcomes which will be used to evaluate their work. The form will also draw special attention to the learning outcome related to the application of theoretical knowledge since this is often an area of weakness in both the Pro-Seminar assessment data and the thesis assessment data. (For example, the results of the eleven theses that were completed this year indicate that all targets were met with the exception of the criterion related to theoretical/conceptual framework.)

---
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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. (This mission statement is being revised and will be updated by October 2012.)

---

**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: Mastery of Rhetorical Practices (G: 3) (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 (G: 2) (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 (G: 1, 2) (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 (G: 1, 3) (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 (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)**

M.A. students in Rhetoric and Composition will be able to isolate a fruitful question for in-depth investigation and to carry out research, using both traditional and non-traditional research methods.

---

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: M.A. Thesis in Rhetoric and Composition (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
Starting in the fall of 2007, students who entered the M.A. Program were required to complete a thesis by the end of their program. While we had hoped to develop and begin using the thesis assessment tool by the spring of 2009, more time was needed to create a system for this assessment process that will guarantee that each thesis is evaluated in this manner. Starting in the spring of 2010, students who finish their thesis will be assessed by their thesis committee, using a form (with a 6-point scale) that is aligned to the graduate learning outcomes. The committee chair will be responsible for calling an assessment meeting after the thesis work has been submitted, and the assistant to the Graduate Director will be responsible for checking to see that the assessment forms are completed. A student will not be advanced for graduation if this assessment step has not been done.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

### Target for O1: Mastery 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Three M.A. theses in Rhetoric and Composition were defended this year. The average score for the outcome related to mastery of rhetorical practices (in particular the thesis genre) was a 5.0, 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Three 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 4.3, meaning that it did not 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Three 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 4.7, 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Three 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Three 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
Consider limiting number of outcomes used in assessing thesis work
In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work of the M.A. theses. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

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 in the assessment process for this MA concentration. During the next year, a number of steps will be taken. The mission statement and goals will be revised to include more specifics related to the study of rhetoric and composition. Also, the department will begin to discuss whether we should continue using the full range of outcomes in our assessment tools or limit the number of outcomes we consider each year (perhaps on a rotating basis). In addition, the department will create an explanation sheet that explains the possible rankings for the thesis work (similar to the document we use with the dissertation 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.

This year, three students completed their M.A. theses in this concentration. All targets for the M.A. thesis were met with the exception of knowledge of the history of rhetoric (it earned a 4.3 mean score while the target was a 4.5).
## Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

### 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.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The four Creative Writing dissertations defended this year scored a mean average of a 5.3 on the three criteria related to Content Knowledge: the knowledge of representative examples of writing by major figures in poetry or fiction, depending on the student's choice of genre; the knowledge of literary history of English or American poetry or fiction, depending upon the student's choice of genre; and the knowledge of form and theory of fiction or poetry, depending upon the students' choice of genre. This score surpassed the target but did not achieve the same average as the two previous assessment cycles (when the dissertations earned a 6.0 for these criteria in both years).

### Target for O2: Applying Literary Studies to Creative Writing

In the 2009-2010 assessment report, a target of 4.7 out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to the application of literary studies to a student's creative writing.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The three Creative Writing dissertations each scored a 5.0 for this learning outcome (as listed in the criterion that rates the dissertation's ability to draw upon the knowledge of composition and aesthetics in English studies to create meaningful literary works, deemed worthy of publication). This exceeds the target but represents a decrease from the score of 6.0 earned for this outcome in the two previous assessment cycles.

### Target for O3: Craftsmanship

In the 2009-2010 assessment report, a 4.7 target out of 6.0 was set for this outcome related to craftsmanship.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The three Creative Writing dissertations scored an average of a 5.4 on the three criteria related to the learning outcome that addresses issues of craftsmanship: the ability to produce work that is authentic and engaging (with a score of 5.3); the ability to produce work that is grammatically sound and syntactically correct (with a score of 5.5); and the use of a variety of literary techniques (with a score of 5.3). This score exceeds the target but represents a decrease from the 6.0 averages earned in the two previous assessment cycles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: PhD Exams (O: 1, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Creative Writing 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: PhD Exams (O: 1, 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The three Creative Writing dissertations scored an average of a 5.4 on the three criteria related to the learning outcome that addresses issues of craftsmanship: the ability to produce work that is authentic and engaging (with a score of 5.3); the ability to produce work that is grammatically sound and syntactically correct (with a score of 5.5); and the use of a variety of literary techniques (with a score of 5.3). This score exceeds the target but represents a decrease from the 6.0 averages earned in the two previous assessment cycles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 2: PhD Exams

Dissertations are assessed on a scale of four possible grades: high pass, pass, low pass, and fail. The readers provide written commentary that explains the assigned grades to the Director of Graduate Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Applying Literary Studies to Creative Writing (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Craftsmanship (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students will be able to produce writing of a sufficient quality to be deemed publishable in national literary journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Revising Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Researching Skills</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Effective Communications (M: 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 English studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 PhD exams that 20% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass or a fail on their exams.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Ten Creative Writing Ph.D. exams were taken in 2011-2012, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 20%, meaning that the target was just met. This was an improvement over the previous assessment cycle, where there was a 30% low pass/ failure rate. In addition, the high pass/pass rate this year of 20% which matches the rate from last year. This concentration's low pass/ failure rate continues to be higher than that of the other concentrations. Looking more closely at the exam results, the two primary poetry exams both earned a high pass; the two primary fiction exams earned a pass and a low pass; the four secondary poetry exams earned three passes and a low pass; and the two secondary fiction exams both earned passes. These results indicate that the poetry students fared better on their exams than the fiction students, as the low passes were earned on a primary fiction exam and a secondary poetry exam.

**Target for O6: Effective Communications**

In the 2009-2010 assessment plan, a target was set for the Creative Writing PhD exams that 20% or fewer of the examinees would earn a low pass of a fail on their exams.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Ten Creative Writing Ph.D. exams were taken in 2011-2012, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 20%, meaning that the target was just met. This was an improvement over the previous assessment cycle, where there was a 30% low pass/ failure rate. In addition, the high pass/pass rate this year of 20% which matches the rate from last year. This concentration's low pass/ failure rate continues to be higher than that of the other concentrations. Looking more closely at the exam results, the two primary poetry exams both earned a high pass; the two primary fiction exams earned a pass and a low pass; the four secondary poetry exams earned three passes and a low pass; and the two secondary fiction exams both earned passes. These results indicate that the poetry students fared better on their exams than the fiction students, as the low passes were earned on a primary fiction exam and a secondary poetry exam.

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

**Revise the mission statement and the goals**

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.

<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>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Director of the Creative Writing program in collaboration with the Creative Writing faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Assistant to the Graduate Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>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>

**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.

<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>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Director of Creative Writing and poetry faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: In-Progress
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

Consider changing the targets for the Creative Writing dissertations

Description: Because the dissertations in this concentration have received strong scores over the past three years since we began reporting on them (with scores ranging from 5.3-6.0), the department will consider whether the 4.7 target needs to be revised.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Consider limiting the outcomes used in assessing Creative Writing dissertations

In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

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 in the assessment process for this PhD concentration. During the next year, a number of steps will be taken. The mission statement and goals will be revised to be more specific to the work of Creative Writing. Also, the department will begin to discuss whether we should increase the target for the dissertation needs and whether we should continue using the full range of outcomes in our assessment tools or limit the number of outcomes we consider each year (perhaps on a rotating basis). Finally, the Director of Creative Writing will work with the Assessment Coordinator to create an explanation sheet for the rankings on the dissertation assessment form.

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 Creative Writing dissertations fared very well this year. All the scores were in the range of 5.0 - 5.5, well about the 4.7 average that was set as the target. This year four students defended their dissertations, the largest pool in the past three years of assessment tracking, so it is all the more impressive that the scores were so high. The ten PhD exams that were taken by Creative Writing students just met the target of having a low pass/failure rate of 20%. This year, we distinguished between scores on primary exams as compared to secondary exams, and by poetry students and fiction students. The data reveals that on the primary exam, the poetry students did better, with two high passes, while the fiction students has a pass and a low pass. On the secondary exam, there was no clear advantage of one over the other as poetry had three passes and one low pass and fiction had two passes. Given that all the targets were met, the Creative Writing faculty are not intending to make any programmatic changes this year.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Fifteen literature dissertations were completed in 2011-2012, 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 5.1), 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 5.0), 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 5.1). These averages for the three areas of content knowledge average out to a 5.07, and therefore the target was very successfully met. These scores also represent a decrease from 2010-2011 (where the average was 5.20) but an increase over the average in 2009-2010 (where the average was a 4.70).

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The mean average for the knowledge and application of literature theory for the fifteen literature dissertations assessed this year was a 5.1. This average was well above the target and was in keeping with the average earned in the previous year.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Fifteen literature dissertations were defended in 2011-2012, and the scores related to the two criteria used to evaluate effective communications skills on the dissertation were above the target. The two criteria are "the dissertation effectively communicates the argument and results of the research" (which received a 4.9 average) and "the oral defense demonstrates mastery of the topics researched and sound defense of the project" (which received a 5.2 average). The combined average of these two criteria related to effective communications was a 5.05, which again was considerably higher than the 4.7 target. The combined average did represent a decrease from the 2010-2011 average which was 5.5.

Target for O4: Effective Researching Skills

A target of 4.7 was set for this outcome related to effective research skills.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

The average score for this outcome on the fifteen literature dissertations defended in 2011-2012 was a 5.3. This score clearly met the target; it also represented a decrease from the average earned in the previous year of 5.71.

M 2: PhD exams (O: 1, 2, 3)

The Ph.D. examinations are conducted in the fall and the spring each year. Each student writes two exams (one in a primary area of study and a second in a secondary area). The candidate works with a primary advisor to create a reading list for each exam. The exams serve to demonstrate detailed and thorough knowledge of all facets related to the candidate’s study and dissertation area. Each exam is read by three faculty members and is assessed on a scale of four possible grades: high pass, pass, low pass, fail. The readers provide written commentary that explains the assigned grades to the Director of Graduate Studies.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Content Knowledge of Literary Studies

In the 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 of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Exam results in 2011-2012 show that only 7.1% of the 14 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2010-2011 scores where 9.4% of literature exams earned such scores. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 92.8%, which is the highest rate earned over the past four years, with the exception of 2008-2009 when the pass/high pass rate was 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 of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Exam results in 2011-2012 show that only 7.1% of the 14 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2010-2011 scores where 9.4% of literature exams earned such scores. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 92.8%, which is the highest rate earned over the past four years, with the exception of 2008-2009 when the pass/high pass rate was 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 of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Exam results in 2011-2012 show that only 7.1% of the 14 exams earned a low pass or fail rate. This score is an improvement over the 2010-2011 scores where 9.4% of literature exams earned such scores. In addition, the pass/high pass rate for this year were 92.8%, which is the highest rate earned over the past four years, with the exception of 2008-2009 when the pass/high pass rate was 93%.

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

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: In-Progress
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 fall of 2013 and to offer it year after that.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assistant to the Graduate Director

Consider changing the target for the PhD dissertations
Because the dissertations in this concentration have been very strong for the past two years (with scores ranging from 4.9-5.7), the department will consider whether the 4.7 target needs to be revised.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: the Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Graduate Director
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director

Consider limiting the number of outcomes assessed each year
In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the graduate assessment work. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year in the assessment of PhD dissertations, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: the Assessment Coordinator will discuss this with the Graduate Director
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Graduate Director

Review mission statement and goals to see if they need to be more particular to the concentration
The Director of Graduate Studies will review the mission statement and the goals of the Literature concentration to see if they need to be revised to add more specific information about this particular graduate concentration.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Director of Graduate Studies, at the request of the Assessment Coordinator, will review the mission statement and goals and decide if they need to be revised.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

Set high pass target of 40% or greater for PhD exams
In addition to the 15% or lesser low pass/failure rate for the PhD exams, the department will also set a target of 40% or greater for the high pass rate.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will report in the next assessment cycle on the high pass rate for the Literature exams, indicating whether or not they met the target of 40% or greater.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2012
Responsible Person/Group: the 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 have been made in the assessment process for this PhD concentration. During the next year, a number of steps will be taken. The mission statement and goals will be reviewed to see if any revisions are needed. Also, the department will begin to discuss
whether we should increase the target for the dissertation needs and whether we should continue using the full range of outcomes in our assessment tools or limit the number of outcomes we consider each year (perhaps on a rotating basis).

**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 on the Literature dissertations completed in 2011-2012 was encouraging as the target of 4.7 for all criteria was met. The fact that the scores were strong across the board (mean scores of 4.9-5.3) was especially affirming considering that as many as fifteen dissertations were defended this year. Comments included by faculty on the dissertation assessment forms indicate that four of these dissertations are strong enough to be submitted for publication without too much revision work. The score of 5.1 on the criterion related to the theoretical/conceptual strength of the dissertation marks the second year in a row that dissertations have met the target in this area. (Previously, this was consistently the weakest area of dissertation work.) Even so, the department is now very committed to the idea of creating a doctoral writing workshop to provide more guidance on dissertation writing, especially in terms of the theoretical/conceptual aspects. While the idea of such a class has circulated around the department for some time, there is momentum now to create this seminar course and to pilot it in the fall of 2013. Besides helping students as they work towards a prospectus, the course is also intended to focus on writing style and to provide guidance about courses and exams—the other key elements of the PhD program. The Literature PhD exams were also successful. The low pass/fail rate for the fourteen exams that were taken was a 7.1%, far below the target of less than 15%. In addition, the high pass rate was 57.4% which marks a huge increase of 11% over the best high pass rate of any previous year. What might account for this improvement in exam scores is that the majority of students are opting to take the take-home exam as opposed to the on-site exam, and they seem to do better in this alternative setting. Two actions will be taken regarding the exams this year. Firstly, when the data is collected the primary exams will be distinguished from secondary exams. Secondly, the department is going to set a high-pass target of 40% or more to be used in addition to the low pass/fail target to determine student success on the exams.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2011-2012 English PhD in Rhetoric/Composition**
(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Department of English at Georgia State University is to promote the pursuit and development of knowledge, critical inquiry, creative endeavor, and professional training in areas of English language studies, 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. (This mission statement is in the process of being revised and will be updated by October 2012.)

**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**

**SLO 1: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric (M: 1, 2)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history of rhetoric from pre-classical Greece to the modern era. Students will also specialize in one time frame and area of the discipline (emphasizing, for example, classical rhetorical history or the history of composition pedagogy or professional writing history).

**SLO 2: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices (M: 2)**

Students will have mastery of typical genres of academic writing (e.g., research paper, research proposal, abstracts, presentations, book reviews, websites for teaching). Students focusing on Professional and Technical Writing will also have mastery of professional writing genres and electronic media (e.g., technical article, documentation, websites for multiple purposes).

**SLO 3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric (M: 1, 2)**

Students will have read the work of rhetorical theorists from a wide range of periods, covering a diverse set of perspectives. Theories of writing practices and pedagogy should be included in the dissertation.

**SLO 4: Effective Written Communications (M: 1, 2)**

Students will be able to communicate effectively in a wide range of written and spoken contexts and will be prepared for professional publication in journals and publications devoted to Rhetoric and Composition.
## SLO 5: Researching Skills (M: 1)

Using and building upon the knowledge and skills acquired during master's level study, doctoral graduates will be able to isolate a fruitful question for extended, in-depth investigation and to carry out focused, productive, and thorough research, using both traditional and non-traditional research methods.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: PhD dissertation (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)
Graduating Ph.D. students in Rhetoric and Composition are assessed on the work of their dissertation. This assessment is facilitated by the Graduate Director at the student's dissertation defense, and the form is completed by faculty members on the student's committee. The dissertation assessment form, which uses a 6-point scale, rates how effectively the student work demonstrates the graduate learning outcomes. (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.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

One Rhetoric and Composition PhD student defended his dissertation this year. The score he earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the history of rhetoric was a 5.0 which met the target. This score was a decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.8.

**Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

One Rhetoric and Composition PhD student defended his dissertation this year. The score he earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the theories of rhetoric was a 5.0 which met the target. This score was a decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.8.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

One Rhetoric and Composition PhD student defended his dissertation this year. The score he earned for this learning outcome related to the knowledge of the theories of rhetoric was a 5.0 which met the target. This score was a decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.8.

**Target for O4: Effective Written Communications**

In the 2009-2010 action plan, a target of 4.7 was set for all outcomes related to the Rhetoric and Composition dissertation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The one Rhetoric and Composition dissertation assessed this year received a score of 4.0 for the mastery of academic writing (in particular that of the dissertation genre) and 4.0 for the ability to effectively communicate an argument and results of research. The average of these two scores is a 4.0 for this learning outcome related to effective written communications. This does not met the target, and represents a decrease from last year's score, a 5.8.

**Target for O5: Researching Skills**

In the 2009-2010 action plan, a target of 4.7 was set for all outcomes related to the Rhetoric and Composition dissertation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

The one Rhetoric and Composition PhD dissertation assessed this year earned a 5.0 for this learning outcome related to the researching skills which met the target. This score was a decrease from the average earned in the previous cycle, a 5.8.

### M 2: PhD Exams (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

The Ph.D. examinations are conducted in the fall and the spring each year. Each student writes two exams (one in a primary area of study and a second in a secondary area). The candidate works with a primary advisor to create a reading list for each exam. The exams serve to demonstrate detailed and thorough knowledge of all facets related to the candidate's study and dissertation area. Each exam is read by three faculty members and is assessed on a scale of four possible grades: high pass, pass, low pass, fail. The readers provide written commentary that explains the assigned grades to the Director of Graduate Studies.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O1: Knowledge of the History of Rhetoric**

In the 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2011-2012, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last assessment cycle. On the other end of the scale, the high pass/ pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 100%, which also matches the rate of the 2010-2011 exams.
Target for O2: Knowledge of Rhetorical Practices

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2011-2012, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last assessment cycle. On the other end of the scale, the high pass/ pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 100%, which also matches the rate of the 2010-2011 exams.

Target for O3: Knowledge of the Theories of Rhetoric

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2011-2012, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last assessment cycle. On the other end of the scale, the high pass/ pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 100%, which also matches the rate of the 2010-2011 exams.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Eleven Rhetoric and Composition Ph.D. exams were taken in 2011-2012, and the percentage of low passes and failures was 0%, meaning that the target was exceeded. This matches the rates of the last assessment cycle. On the other end of the scale, the high pass/ pass rate for Rhetoric and Composition students was 100%, which also matches the rate of the 2010-2011 exams.

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

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: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

Consider limiting the number of outcomes for the assessment of Rhetoric and Composition dissertations

In past years, the department has always used the full range of outcomes in the work of assessing the dissertations for this concentration. The department will now consider if it wants to limit the number of outcomes to be considered each year, perhaps on a rotating basis, as is done with the undergraduate assessment work.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will discuss this issue with the Rhetoric and Composition faculty member assigned to assessment work.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Continue tracking dissertation results
This year’s dissertation results included two scores that did not meet the target (regarding criteria related to effective written communications and graduate level research). But since this was based on one dissertation alone, the department will continue to monitor dissertation results next year rather than making particular action plans for these areas at this time. This is based on the assumption that the low scores had more to do with the individual student than with the success of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The Rhetoric and Composition faculty will give special consideration the dissertation results when provided with the assessment data by the Assessment Coordinator at the end of the spring semester.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: the Rhetoric and Composition faculty

Distinguish between primary and secondary exams
The reporting on Rhetoric and Composition 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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The assistant to the Graduate Director will indicate whether each exam is a primary or secondary exam in her reporting to the Assessment Coordinator.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2012
Responsible Person/Group: the 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 have been made in the assessment process for this PhD concentration. During the next year, a number of steps will be taken. The mission statement and goals will be revisions to include specifics related to Rhetoric and Composition. Also, the department will begin to discuss whether we should continue using the full range of outcomes in our assessment of the Rhetoric and Composition dissertations or limit the number of outcomes we consider each year (perhaps on a rotating basis).

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, Rhetoric and Composition students took eleven PhD exams and performed extremely well on them. The low pass/failure rate was 0% and the high pass rate was 72.7%, the best score in four years of dissertation assessment tracking. On the other hand, there was only one dissertation completed this year, and two out of the six criteria received scores that fell below the targets set for them. Because this was based on a single student, the department does not want to make programmatic changes at this time but rather will continue to monitor the dissertation results next year.
O/O 1: Seeing the big picture (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will advance the knowledge and expertise required to identify, understand, and successfully tackle the interdisciplinary, big picture issues that characterize global business management today.

O/O 2: Honing the skills (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will develop in the student the skills in formal social inquiry required to define and address complex issues and to disseminate knowledge related to their profession in a variety of professional and public outlets “to influence professional activity and public policy.”

O/O 3: Giving the global perspective (M: 1, 2, 3)
The Executive Doctorate in Business will give an interdisciplinary, globally oriented perspective that is unavailable in traditional advanced degree programs.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Performance in coursework (O: 1, 2, 3)
The program will have six content courses to provide students with knowledge about global business leadership and five courses on research practices, design and analysis to equip the students with the understanding required to undertake formal research. Students are expected to maintain a 3.0 average in coursework. Students must earn a C or better in all courses. Students who do not meet these requirements or who are struggling to meet them are counseled out of the program.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

M 2: Group projects (O: 1, 2, 3)
During the second and third semesters, students participate in research projects in groups of two to three people, under the supervision of a senior researcher. Each project will address a contemporary business issue and be conducted with the objective of publishing the results.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 3: Independent research (O: 1, 2, 3)
During the fourth, fifth and sixth semesters, each student engages in an independent research project under the supervision of a senior researcher. This project addresses a business issue affecting the student's firm. Each student will produce and defend a doctoral thesis with the expectation of publishing it.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Exercise Science BS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Kinesiology and Health in accord with the College of Education and the other colleges and departments of the university seeks an ever increasing degree of excellence in a wide variety of programs. The Department’s mission includes instruction, research and scholarly activity, and community service in the areas of exercise science, sports administration, sports medicine, health and physical education, and recreation. The department provides professional preparation and continuing education in each of these fields, generates and communicates knowledge, and serves the community with particular emphasis on the urban setting of which it is a part. The Department recognizes the necessity of cross cultural competence and actively supports international development activities in research, teaching and service. Although the department is diverse in the disciplines it embraces, the members of the faculty are united in their interdisciplinary commitment to the highest quality in all of these pursuits.

Goals

G 1: Problem Solving
Exercise science students will become better problem-solvers.

G 2: Critical Thinking
Exercise science students will demonstrate clearer critical-thinking skills.

G 3: Content Knowledge
Exercise science students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline.

G 4: Preparation for relevant positions
Students will be prepared for positions in the discipline including corporate, community, commercial, and clinical centers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
**SLO 1: 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.
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 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
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 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.
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

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: First Aid Cpr Certification (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPR and First Aid certification pass rates in KH 3390 Advanced First Aid and Emergency Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: ACSM Domain Score (O: 1)</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 3: Practical Exam score KH 3500 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical Exam Score in KH 3500 Athletic Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Practical Exam KH 4630 (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical Exam Score in KH 4630 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 5: KH 4350 Project (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on KH 4350 Fitness Center Management Project (CTW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: ACSM Domain score (O: 2)</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 7: KH 4630 Case Study Presentation (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on KH 4630 Case Study Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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 KH 4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15: KH 4360 Case Studies (O: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance on Case Studies in KH 4360 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 KH 4360 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 KH 4630 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 KH 4630 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 KH 4360 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>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 24: KH 4360 Lab practical (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on lab practical in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 25: KH 3650 Lab assignments (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on lab assignments 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 26: KH 4360 Exam (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 27: KH 4360 Practical Exam (O: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on practical exam in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 28: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 7)</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 29: KH 4360 Clinical Case Study Presentation (O: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on case study presentation in KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 30: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 8)</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>
M 31: KH 4630 Case Study (O: 9)
Performance on KH 4630 Case Study
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 32: KH 4630 Exercise Prescription Project (O: 9)
Performance on exercise prescription project in KH4630 Fitness Assessment and Exercise Prescription
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

M 33: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 9)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 34: KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology Exam (O: 9)
KH 4360 Clinical Exercise Physiology exam.
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

M 35: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 10)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

M 36: Exams KH 2520, KH 3000 (O: 10)
Performance in KH 2520 Performance and Analysis: Fitness and Aerobics, and KH 3000
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

M 37: KH 4280 Exam (O: 11)
Performance on take home assignments in KH 4280 Psychology of Physical Activity
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 38: Domain score on ACSM Exam (O: 11)
Domain score on ACSM Exam
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

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 compiled 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
2011-2012 Exercise Science MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 Outcomes 4.6.1.1, 4.6.1.7, and 4.6.2. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

O/O 4: Understands research and human subjects issues (G: 1) (M: 4, 5)
Students should understand and interpret research in exercise science and should understand issues associated with clinical testing and research involving human subjects, including informed consent.

Relevant Associations: Accreditation Standards: American College of Sports Medicine Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Learning Outcomes 4.6.1.6, 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.8, 2.6.0.4, and 2.6.0.5. In addition, Program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Basic Content Knowledge examinations and quizzes (O: 1)
Written examinations and quizzes in KH courses 6280, 7500, 7510, 7550, 7620, 8270, and 8390.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science
75% scoring at or above 80% on exam

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Target achievement was 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, KH 7500, KH 7510, KH 7550, KH 7630, and KH 8870.

M 2: Practical Exams (O: 2)
Oral arrhythmia examination and laboratory exams

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

Target for O2: Apply knowledge to practical situations
90% of students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of students demonstrated proficiency on this measure based on the following courses: KH 7550 and KH 7630.
### M 3: GXT practical exam (O: 3)
Practical exam assessing students’ ability to administer graded exercise tests to various populations
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target for O3: Demonstrates knowledge of exercise testing**
90% of students will demonstrate proficiency.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of the students demonstrated proficiency in this measure based on results from the following courses: KH 7550.

### M 4: Case Studies and Labs (O: 4)
Laboratory assignments associated with instrumentation and testing and written Case Studies
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Understands research and human subjects issues**
90% of the students will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of the students demonstrated success in this measure in the following courses: KH 6280 and KH 7550.

### M 5: ACSM EXAM (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
American College of Sports Medicine Standardized Test: Health Fitness Specialist or Clinical Exercise Specialist
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) national standardized exam

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% of our students passed the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist Exam

**Target for O2: Apply knowledge to practical situations**
80% of students will pass the American College of Sports Medicine Health Fitness Specialist (HFS) or Clinical Exercise Specialist (CES) national standardized exam

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% 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 revi***e 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
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
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
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science faculty

Compare ACSM exam content with course content

Compare ACSM exam content with course content. Add deficient content into appropriate courses.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** ACSM EXAM | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates content knowledge in Exercise Science

Implementation Description: Exercise Science Faculty meeting
Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Exercise Science Faculty

Additional final exam options

Given the diverse nature of the students in the M.S. Exercise Science Program, we will allow students to take national level certifying exams from agencies other than American College of Sports Medicine. For example, a growing interest in Exercise Science field is the development of strength and conditioning coaches at the middle school, high school, college, and professional levels. Therefore, our program will allow students to take the Certified Strength and Conditioning Specialist exam from the National Strength and Conditioning Association.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Students will be allowed to take CSCS exam to satisfy the M.S. Exercise Science program requirement.
Responsible Person/Group: KH 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?

No significant changes were made to the assessment plan last year. Students have met or exceeded nearly all achievement goals. However, students achieved borderline results on the requirement of 80% pass rate on the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) certifying exams. Several factors may contribute to this borderline result. First, passing the exam is not a requirement to obtain the degree or to work in the field. Therefore, individual differences in students' motivation for studying and the passing exam may contribute the current pass rate of approximately 67%. Second, some students have already taken ACSM certifying exams and are forced to take ACSM exams that may not be well suited for their career aspirations. Third, students have expressed the desire to take certifying exams that are more appropriate to their career aspirations regardless of whether they have taken an ACSM exam already. Based on these factors, the faculty have decided to allow students more options in satisfying the program requirement of a national certifying exam, e.g., Certified Strength and Conditioning Specialist from the National Strength and Conditioning Association.

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.

Borderline pass rates on American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) exams have prompted the faculty to allow for greater options in the national certifying exam requirement of the M.S. program (Fitness and Health Promotion concentration). The reasons for this achievement result has already been discussed in this report. In addition to allowing more national certifying exam options to suit career goals of the students, the faculty will meet to determine whether curriculum proposals will be developed to address specific career paths (e.g., adding/refining concentrations focusing on cardiac rehabilitation, corporate wellness, strength and conditioning, gerontology) within the Exercise Science field.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Film & Video BA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The film program at Georgia State multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are focused on student development beyond the academic unit. The program promotes a broad appreciation of both artistic, creative endeavors and intellectual, critical traditions in the study of film and media. It is the program's belief that a graduate's success will largely be determined by a developed sense of critical thinking, aesthetic contemplation, and the intellectual cultivation. Our program seeks to enhance the Department of Communication's mission of participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication.

Goals
G 1: understand and interpret
Students 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
SLO 1: understand and interpret (G: 1) (M: 1)
Understand and interpret ideas presented in media and can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.

SLO 2: narrative structures (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students will be able to identify and discuss various narrative structures in media using moving images employed for story delivery.
### SLO 3: prod/post-prod concepts (G: 3) (M: 3)
Students will understand the fundamental concepts of mise-en-scene, editing and cinematography relating to the generation of meaning.

### SLO 4: spectator/textual pleasure (G: 4) (M: 4)
Students will be able to recognize and articulate a relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: writing assignment (O: 1)
Students in the senior capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will write analytical papers and will be assessed using the following rubric:

1. Can understand basic filmic ideas expressed by others.
2. Can fully understand, comment on, and discuss the ideas and theories of others.
3. Has the ability not only to understand and interpret the ideas of others but to use that as the groundwork to begin establishing unique ideas.
4. Can fully establish, develop, and communicate logical, coherent, and engaging ideas on specific topics.

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

**Target for O1: understand and interpret**
70% of students will score 3 or above on the writing rubric.

#### M 2: descriptive writing assignment (O: 2)
Students in the senior capstone courses will write a paper that identifies and discusses key narrative features of visual media, and it will be assessed with the following rubric:

1. Has minimal to basic understanding of narrative structures.
2. Can identify various narrative structures.
3. Is able to identify, understand, and discuss various narrative structures as well as the complications within.
4. Has a full understanding of narrative structure, as well as how to interpret, identify, and dissect it and discuss its meanings and implications.

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

**Target for O2: narrative structures**
70% of the students will score a 3 or above on the rubric.

#### M 3: mise-en-scene (O: 3)
Students in the capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will identify in a written assignment mise-en-scene and the consequences that it has in media using moving images.

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

**Target for O3: prod/post-prod concepts**
70% of students will score 3 or above on the written assignment about mise-en-scene using the following rubric:

1. Has a basic understanding of mise-en-scene and its implications.
2. Can have limited discussions about mise-en-scene.
3. Understands the broad concepts of mise-en-scene and can comprehensively discuss its ideas and theories.
4. Fully grasps the idea of mise-en-scene and can discuss the placement of images on screen and well as its implications that relates to and supports the story and characters.

#### M 4: spectator/textual relationship (O: 4)
Students in the senior capstone courses, Film 4750 and Film 4910, will be able to write a paper describing the relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure involving media using moving images.

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

**Target for O4: spectator/textual pleasure**
70% of the student papers about the relationship between spectatorship and textual pleasure will score at least 3 or above on the following rubric:

1. Has an introductory sense of how cinematic pleasure occurs.
2. Has a basic understanding of the mechanisms of spectator positioning and identification.
3. Articulates the basic theoretical underpinnings of spectatorship.
4. 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
- Responsible Person/Group: Film/Video faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Student Understanding Measures**

Establish a system to measure students' understanding and interpretation of ideas presented in media and if they can deploy such understanding to formulate unique ideas.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Faculty will meet to examine these results and then assess our target and specific means of achieving goal. In class, do we talk in one direction then expect student papers to meet goals taken from another direction? Do we talk about media but not about arguments?
- Responsible Person/Group: Film/Video Faculty
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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-Fall2011: Direct Assessment of Course Performance” for findings from Fall 2011 and “Exhibit 1b-Spring2012: Direct Assessment of Course Performance” for findings from Spring 2012. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in “Exhibit 2-2012: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.

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 2011-2012 - 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 or higher and that their foundation knowledge thus 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 2011-2012 - 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 or above the expected level of performance and that their technical skills thus meet 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
Findings 2011-2012 - 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 or above the expected level of performance and that their analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills thus meet 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 3-2012: 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 and Accounting and at the 80th percentile in International.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Analyzing recent and long-term performance, finance majors are achieving this target fairly consistently in the areas of Finance and Accounting. Performance in all the other areas has significantly improved since the previous year.

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 2-2012: 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
  Responsible Person/Group: Professor Rasha Ashraf, course coordinator for FI 4000

Critical thinking through writing
We seek to improve the critical thinking and written communication skills of students through the implementation of the University's Critical Thinking through Writing Initiative. With the finance major, this program continues to be integrated within our FI 4020 course, which is a required course for all finance majors in the BBA program.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Alignment of student learning outcomes | Outcome/Objective: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills
  Implementation Description: continuous
  Responsible Person/Group: Professors Rich Fendler and Pete Eisemann
  Additional Resources: student assistants

Practical training
The field study in finance course "FI 4391" has been found useful for providing BBA-Finance majors with real-world experience in independent project management (in both financial services firms and non-financial global business organizations). This has become increasingly important given the global recession and the decline in employment in the financial and non-financial sectors of the 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
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?

As different instructors continue to rotate through our courses, we continue to educate them on the assessment process as applies to the learning objectives in their courses. We will continue this process during the coming academic year with new 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.

We observed that our greater emphasis on developing mathematical and accounting skills and increasing awareness of international finance issues has resulted in significant improvement in student exit testing performance in these and other key areas. We will continue this emphasis during the next year. Further, we are increasing our utilization of databases obtained with a Student Technology Fee Grant to further students’ understanding of financial market operations through practical applications.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? 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 Esemann 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, during the past year we built 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. This class size limit will continue for the 2012-2013 academic year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

All individual and overall targets were met indicating that the Department of Finance continues to be at the forefront of the 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 are pleased that student performance on the ETS exam significantly improved, especially in the non-finance subject areas. We will continue to monitor initiatives taken in the previous year to ensure high levels of performance.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? 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 curriculum review committees along with input from our external industry 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) and continue the implementation of our action plan for improving the effectiveness of our BBA program. One item of note in the plan that will have a direct effect on the BBA program is the development of a Finance Major Honors program.

Georgia State University
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 develop problem-solving skills used in the analysis of commonly encountered issues in the practice of finance.

G 4: The development of critical thinking skills
Students will develop critical thinking skills for analyzing complex financial issues.

G 5: Professional leadership skills
Students will be prepared to join senior management levels in financial and non-financial organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: The development and application of foundation knowledge (M: 1, 2, 3)
MS-Finance students will be able to: (i) Apply principles of macroeconomic theory and policy. (ii) Apply principles of microeconomic theory of the firm. (iii) Acquire a general knowledge of business and business practices outside of the area of finance.

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: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and integrative finance skills (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
MS-Finance students will: (i) Possess knowledge and capability in their chosen specialization from corporate finance, investments, or financial institutions and markets. (ii) Be proficient in assessing the impact of financial transactions on a corporation, investment portfolio or other financial entity. (iii) Be able to identify and assess the valuation and risk of real and financial assets. (iv) Be capable of applying models for analyzing financial strategies and alternatives for purposes of solving real world financial problems. (v) Be exposed to educational and career development opportunities resulting from the globalization of finance.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Representative questions from courses (O: 1, 2, 3)
To examine student performance in select courses from each specialization (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310), the course instructors selectively chose five representative questions [from the assignments, quizzes, cases, mid-term and final exams] for their courses that together represent core learning in these courses. The questions are briefly described indicating how the questions fulfill learning objectives of the course. Each instructor has also indicated student performance on these five selected, representative questions using the median and maximum score attainable. In the Document Repository see "Exhibit 1a-2011:Direct Assessment of Course Performance-I (Fall 2011)" for findings from Fall 2011 and "Exhibit 1b-2012: Direct Assessment of Course Performance-II (Spring 2012)" for findings from Spring 2012. This measure has 3 related learning outcome objectives as indicated in "Exhibit 2-2012: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
**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. 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

**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 3-2012: MS Exit Survey”. In addition, we have conducted a course satisfaction survey for both the Spring 2011 and Fall 2011 Fast Track MS-Finance sets of courses. These results are presented in “Exhibit 4a-2012: Fast Track MS Course Survey (Spring 2011)” and “Exhibit 4b-2012: Fast Track MS Course Survey (Fall 2011)”, respectively. The findings indicate an encouraging response from students and their comments will provide guidance in the fast track program moving forward.

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 2-2012: MS Assessment Plan and Alignment” for details showing how learning outcomes of representative courses (FI 8020, FI 8200, and FI 8310) align with program learning outcomes. This alignment indicates that the representative questions testing student learning outcomes are well aligned with overall program learning outcomes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**M 4: Enhance student practical training (O: 2, 3)**

To enable students to engage in the practicum of finance, we partner with Atlanta area corporations to offer field study experiences to students. These field study assignments, offered in conjunction with FI 8391 “Field Studies in Finance”, allow students to gain course credit as well as the opportunity to work with senior managers on real world projects that are of implementable interest to these organizations. Feedback over the last several years indicates high levels of satisfaction of employers and high levels of applied learning on the part of student participants.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

---

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that our MS students are continuing to learn at or above the expected level of performance and that their technical skills meet 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Findings are reported in the attached documents on performance on direct measures in courses. These findings indicate that our MS students are continuing to learn at or above the expected level of performance and that their technical skills meet 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.
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: The development and application of analytical, conceptual, and 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 format 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 FMBA program to similarly complete the MS-Finance degree requirements in an efficient manner. Further improvements were planned for the summer schedule commencing in 2012 to make the program more family and employer friendly. The results of these initiatives appear to be paying benefits. For the cohort starting January 2012, we began with 32 students, which is the highest to date.

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. This program name was maintained for the 2012 cohort and appears to be developing a brand to be used for cohorts in future years.

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 2011-2012 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 hope that such surveys will be implemented with each cohort going forward to include in our assessment process. Finally, the Department recently completed is Academic Program Review and has begun implementation of the Action Plan that 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 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 years ago the Department changed the title of its formerly called Executive MS in Finance program to Fast Track MS in Finance program. The admissions office continued to modify slightly entrance requirements as to years of work experience. Due to this change and improvement in marketing efforts, the enrollment in the program has significantly increased. There were changes made in the curriculum including a new course in Financial Leadership. Also, the course scheduling was revised with now only 2 classes offered in the summer and an additional 5 class offered in the Spring and Fall semesters. Further, effective Fall 2012, we have replaced the course on corporate restructuring and finance with a course on global banking and finance. We will continue to review the progress of this program and obtain feedback from students, faculty, and the industry advisory committee for improving the curriculum and structure. In response to earlier feedback from students, we continue to seek participation from leading industry executives to enhance student learning in the classroom.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:  Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

As mentioned, in 2011, the Executive MS-Finance program title was changed to Fast Track MS-Finance program, which reduced the years of required work experience of applicants. A number of structural changes were made to help promote the quality of the program and student success. Included was a one course reduction in the number of classes taken during the Summer, thus allowing a one month break. In turn, 5 classes were added on Saturdays during the Spring and Fall semesters. Also, a new course on Financial Leadership was added to the program replacing a course on applied regression analysis. The more important aspects of this latter course were incorporated into the business modeling course. The new course on Financial Leadership appears to have been well received by students and the instructor will continue to make improvements with repeated offerings and experience teaching this very unique class in financial education.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

Overall targets continue to be met indicating that the Department continues to be a college leader in terms of the quality of students produced. We will continue to be diligent in ensuring a high quality program for students. Our findings continue to provide us with valuable information for improving the curriculum. To facilitate continual improvement we are also actively involving our industry advisory board to provide input on program design and curriculum and to enhance student interaction with senior executives in industry.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We will continue to pursue similar strategies that have been successful in the past including the use of faculty review committees along with input from our MS-Finance industry 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) and the resulting action plan for improving the effectiveness of our MS program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 French BA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 4: Knowledge of French and French Literature
Student shall demonstrate several 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. and to write French with clarity and grammatical accuracy. 5. Students demonstrate a general acquaintance with the various cultures where French is spoken and literatures written in French. 6. Students shall demonstrate the ability to critically interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

G 5: Outcomes for the current period
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. The rubric for these goals 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%).

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 will also demonstrate a general acquaintance with French cultures and the ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of literary texts.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 4: Knowledge of French Literature (G: 4) (M: 1)
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.

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

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: paper (O: 4)
In French 3033 (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts), students wrote an end-of-course paper whose purpose was to demonstrate their ability to critically analyze and interpret the literary, cultural and historical content of a literary text. They were evaluated for their appropriate focus on the topic (35%), their literary lens use (35%), the clear and succinct organization of their paper (15%), and the correctness of their grammar and spelling (15%).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target for O4: Knowledge of French Literature

The target is for students to achieve a score of 8.0-8.4 in their assessment for literature.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

The BA programs in MCL have a new reporter/director of undergraduate studies. During this reporting cycle the new reporter is using the resources, methods, and results given to him by his predecessor. Two French 3033 (Introduction to the Analysis of Literary Texts) were taught during this cycle. The stated target of 8.0-8.4 was partially met. The average student score in one section was 8.93 (meets target). Meanwhile, in the other section the average student score was 6.55 (does not meet target), which includes the score for one student who received zeros in every measure. Not counting this student, the average rose slightly to 7.6. The French Section will continue in its efforts to reach the target score in every section, although the limited sample group in the second section (one class with only ten students, one of whom did none of the work for the course) suggests that the underperformance regarding the stated target may be an anomaly.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 French MA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 French the opportunity to develop appropriate proficiencies in the French language, to acquaint them with the literary and cultural productions of France and French speaking countries, and to provide them the opportunity to acquire critical skills through linguistic, literary and cultural analysis as they prepare for careers in teaching and research, translation and interpretation, international business, and other areas. The Department's mission, with regard to students preparing for the M.A. in French, is to encourage them to contribute to the development, organization and dissemination of research and criticism in the focus areas of French and Francophone literatures and cultures, linguistics and language pedagogy. As a core element in the University's mission of internationalization, the Department encourages their interest and involvement in international exchanges.

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 Collectiong 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

### Target for O1: Effective writing, communication and editing
Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1= Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students were rated as the following: 1= 22 2= 56 3= 24 4=6 94% of students met the standard

### Target for O2: Research and Data Collectioning Skills
Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1= Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students were rated as the following: 1= 4 2= 22 3= 9 4=1 97% of students met the standard

### Target for O3: Critical Thinking Skills
Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1= Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students were rated as the following: 1= 5 2= 30 3= 12 4=1 97% of students met the standard

### Target for O4: Acquisition of Knowledge
Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 Target is to have 90% of students at or above a rate of 2. 1= Fails to Meet Standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students were rated as the following: 1= 12 2= 38 3= 20 4=2 97% of students met the standard

### 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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Geography BA**

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

### 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: Thinking Skills**
Students are thinking critically to understand and apply knowledge of environmental patterns found in the world around them

**G 2: Research**
Student formulates appropriate questions for geosciences research.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluates claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Contemporary Issues - Diverse Disciplines (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students effectively analyzes contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Methods (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will learn concepts and methods of geographical research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Research Papers (O: 1, 2, 3)
Research Papers: For Urban Geography and Issues Courses: Final research paper and policy brief designed for students to integrate course concepts with some original research on public policy or policy analysis.

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

**Target for O1: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation**
75% to be proficient in critical thinking scoring 3 out of 5 50% to be proficient in critical thinking scoring 4 out of 5 25% to be proficient in critical thinking scoring 5 out of 5

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average student score in critical thinking was 4 out of 5

**Target for O2: Contemporary Issues - Diverse Disciplines**
75% to be proficient in diverse disciplines scoring 3 out of 5 50% to be proficient in diverse disciplines scoring 4 out of 5 25% to be proficient in diverse disciplines scoring 5 out of 5

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students in these courses averaged 4 of 5

**Target for O3: Methods**
75% to be proficient in methods scoring 3 out of 5 50% to be proficient in methods scoring 4 out of 5 25% to be proficient in methods scoring 5 out of 5

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Students averaged 4 of 5

### 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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2009

**Improve scores on Outcome 10 in GEOG 4764**
In order to improve scores on Outcome 10 (Critical Thinking -- Information Evaluation) in Geography 4764 (Urban Geography), the instructor will provide students with solid examples of appropriate evaluations of claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Increase the number of measures for certain outcomes**
It has been determined that the program needs at least six measures per learning outcome. There were 82 outcome/measure combinations for the 2008-2009 assessment, thereby yielding a mean value of six measures per outcome. To reach the minimum number of six measures per outcome, the following is needed: at least five additional measures for Outcome 4 (Communication – Visual) and Outcome 5 (Quantitative Skills – Arithmetic Operations); at least three additional measures for Outcome 6 (Quantitative Skills – Problem Solving), at least two additional measures for Outcome 8 (Critical Thinking – Question Formulation (2)), Outcome 9 (Critical Thinking – Evidence Collection), and Outcome 11 (Technology); and one additional measure for Outcome 3 (Communication – Oral), Outcome 12 (Collaboration), and Outcome 13 (Contemporary Issues – Diverse Disciplines). Therefore, a high-priority area is increasing the number of measures for outcomes linked to quantitative skills, visual communication, and critical thinking.

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

Combining disciplines
This year the department will combine Geography and Geology into one major. We will discuss ways to combine our goals and objectives and find ways to measure these.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

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 changed our measure of assessment from a departmental examination to actual class assignments.

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.

To assess percentage of students achieving targets, rather than using whole-class data.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Geology Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

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: Natural Processes
Students will recognize how natural processes shape the world around them.

G 2: Society and Environment
Student will better understand the interactions between society and the natural world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Earth System (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will recognize the components of the earth spheres and explain how they work together to form the earth system.

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

SLO 2: Global Society (G: 2) (M: 2)
Students will recognize the relationship between human cultural interactions and global change.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Exam Questions for Natural Processes (O: 1)
GEOL and GEOG core courses were given questions to answer related to natural processes. See attachment for questions.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O1: Earth System
We anticipate that at least 70% of students will answer each question correctly.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
We collected data related to earth systems from 3 courses (GEOL 1121, GEOL 1122, and GEOG 1113) and tested a total of 757 students. Of the students tested, we found the following: In GEOL 1121: 75% answered Question 1 correctly. 72% answered Question 2 correctly. 81% answered Question 3 correctly. 63% answered Question 4 correctly. 93% answered Question 5 correctly. In GEOL 1122: 85% answered Question 1 correctly. 69% answered Question 2 correctly. 27% answered Question 3 correctly. 41% answered Question 4 correctly. 56% answered Question 5 correctly. In GEOG 1113: 82% answered Question 1 correctly. 82% answered Question 2 correctly. 73% answered Question 3 correctly. 94% answered Question 4 correctly. 82% answered Question 5 correctly.

M 2: Exam Questions for Society and Environment (O: 2)
GEOL and GEOG core classes were given questions to answer related to Society and Environment. See attached questions.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Global Society
We expect that 70% of our students will answer each question correctly.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
We collected data related to global society from 1 course (GEOG 1101) and tested a total of 100 students. Of the students tested, we found the following: In GEOG 1101: 39% answered Question #1 correctly. 68% answered Question #2 correctly. 81% answered Question #3 correctly. 66% answered Question #4 correctly. 24% answered Question #5 correctly.

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

Exam Questions for Society and Environment
These results come from just one course, and the questions were created mid semester, so we will need to continue to observe how these questions work in this course.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exam Questions for Society and Environment | Outcome/Objective: Global Society

Exam Questions Natural Processes
We did not meet our goals for several of the questions on the examinations. We created these questions at the mid-semester, so we are new to the faculty teaching the courses. When we next teach these courses, the faculty should be aware of the questions and prepare to work with students on these topics. We will also look at questions that had a high rate of failure and consider how we can address them.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exam Questions for Natural Processes | Outcome/Objective: Earth System

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 used exam questions in the past as a form of assessment for the core courses. We revised these questions in the fall and have started collecting data. We plan to work in making sure that these questions are implemented in all of our core courses 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 just started using these new questions, so we will spend this year making sure that faculty are aware of them and integrating them into their curriculum.
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: Structure
Geology majors are familiar with the phases, structures, and workings of the earth.

G 2: Human Impact
Geology majors will be aware of human impact on the earth.

G 3: Data
Geology majors will be able to collect and analyze data related to the lithosphere and hydrosphere.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition (G: 1) (M: 2)
Student demonstrate knowledge of key geological concepts.

SLO 6: Critical Thinking - Evidence Collection (G: 3) (M: 2)
Student collects appropriate evidence.

SLO 7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)
Student evaluates claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: “LOESS” Exit Survey
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

M 2: Problems (O: 4, 6, 7)
Students complete homework problems that require them to practice concepts discussed in class. For example, students may be asked to interpret geological maps and cross sections.

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

Target for O4: Foundation knowledge Acquisition
75% of students should score 3 out of 5, or proficient, in foundation knowledge acquisition. 50% of students should score 4 our of 5, or high, on foundation knowledge acquisition. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on foundation knowledge acquisition.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In Geol 4007, the students averaged 3 out of 5 in foundation knowledge acquisition. In Geol 4013, the students averaged 4 out of 5, but very close to 5, in foundation knowledge acquisition.

Target for O6: Critical Thinking - Evidence Collection
75% of students should score 3 out of 5, or proficient, in critical thinking. 50% of students should score 4 our of 5, or high, on critical thinking. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on critical thinking.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In Geol 4007, the students averaged 3 out of 5 in critical thinking-evidence collection. In Geol 4013, the students averaged 4 out of 5, but very close to 5, in critical thinking-evidence collection.

Target for O7: Critical Thinking - Information Evaluation
75% of students should score 3 out of 5, or proficient, on information evaluation 50% of students should score 4 our of 5, or high, on information evaluation. 25% of students should score 5 our of 5, or exceptional, on information evaluation.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
In Geol 4007, the students averaged 3 out of 5 in information evaluation. In Geol 4013, the students averaged 4 out of 5, but very close to 5, in information evaluation.

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

Combine Departments
This year the department will combine Geography and Geology into one major. We will discuss ways to combine our goals and objectives and find ways to measure these.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- 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 in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We changed our measure of assessment from a departmental examination to actual class assignments.

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.

To set individual targets rather than combined goals and objectives for the courses. Now they are averaged.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Geosciences MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The primary mission of the Geoscience MS degree is to produce well-educated students in Geology and Geography. That mission includes delivering courses at the MS level relevant to what students in Geology and Geography need to know and providing stimulating research opportunities in both concentrations at the MS level.

Goals
G 1: Students will be knowledgeable Geoscientists
Students will learn research and practical knowledge toward success in their respective fields of Geography and Geology.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Quality Non-thesis Project (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate well conceived non-thesis projects for each of the Geoscience concentrations: Geography and Geology. The outcomes include: coverage of topic, quality of data collected, quality of interpretation, discussion and conclusions

SLO 2: Quality Thesis Research (M: 2)
Students will demonstrate quality research design and implementation for each of the Geosciences concentrations: Geography and Geology.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Non-thesis project Rubric (O: 1)
Non-thesis projects in each area (Geography and Geology) are 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

**M 2: Thesis Research Rubric (O: 2)**

The thesis for each concentration (Geography and Geology) will be measured on a 5-point scale rubric for: research design, data collection, implications, and discussion.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 German BA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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**

After consultation with GSU's Director of Academic Assessment, the German Section 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The BA programs in MCL have a new reporter/director of undergraduate studies. During this reporting cycle the new reporter is using the resources, methods, and results given to him by his predecessor. One Course of German 3311 (Reading German Literature) was taught during this period (the course was taught in Fall 2011). Students majoring in German achieved a result of 8.75.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 German MA**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)
**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 editin (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**

**2011-2012 Health & Physical Education BSED**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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: Students will demonstrate ability to use assessment data from students 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 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. Objective #3: Candidates will develop goals and objectives as determined by the following criteria: a. Lesson plans goals are written for all 3 domains. b. Lesson plan goals demonstrate continuous progress toward reaching unit goals. c. When appropriate goals specify both process and product.

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  2011-2012 - Target: Met
Explaination 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. The rubric for scoring task presentation reflects qualitative behaviors that correspond respectively to the following: Lesson progressions use no refinement and extension activities to develop skill (1 point unsatisfactory); Lesson consists mostly of informing and application tasks (2 points needs improvement); Lesson progressions use few refinement and extension activities to develop
skill (3 points satisfactory); Lesson consists mostly of informing and application tasks (4 points very good); Care is taken to
present information sequentially so that students can build on prior knowledge when asked to complete more complex tasks (5
points outsdtanidng). Analysis of Task Presentation A total of 71% of candidates demonstrated very good or outstanding
performance in task presentation in KH 4520, a midpoint evaluation metric. In the equivalent graduate Non-T4 class (KH 7250)
50% of candidates were very good 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 at this point in their respective curiculum. However, task presentation scores
improved after student teaching. A total of 80% of candidates following student teaching were outstanding in their task
presentation skills. These findings emphasize (a) the importance of the opportunity to work full time 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. [Preview Formatting]

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 (KH 4520 and KH 4710). 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, why they chose that model and not another model as well as analyze specific features and characteristics of the HPE setting
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 KH 4520 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 2011-2012 - 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. Contextual Analysis and Rationale Uses only direct instruction. No effort made to
consider other instructional models. Uses only direct instruction regardless of the content delivered. Choice o f instructional
model inhibits student learning OR Model selection is based on teacher preference rather than student needs/abilities.
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 questionable 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.
Someone unfamiliar with the lesson could use the plan as written and know the exact expectations for students. Lesson
modifications are based on research done by the teacher candidate. Modifications for special needs students are
developmentally appropriate. Generalizes important concepts for the unit to other activity areas. Teacher candidate shows
relationship of activity to those areas with related concepts. Someone unfamiliar with the lesson could use the plan as written
and know the exact expectations for students. Lesson modifications are based on research done by the teacher candidate.
Modifications for special needs students are developmentally appropriate. Learning Goals & Objectives Goals for unit are
superficial, target unrelated topics and/or are missing. No connection between program and instructional goals Goals for unit
are superficial and/or target extraneous topics. Little connection between program and instructional goals. Goals are set at an
inappropriate level of difficulty (students may already be able to achieve them) Lesson plan goals are stated in measurable
terms about observable behavior and are related to unit plan goals, goals are linked to state standards. Level of difficulty will
require student learning to achieve them. Goals are realistic and based on pre-assessment of student needs Lesson plan
goals are written for all 3 domains and demonstrate continuous progress toward reaching unit goals. When appropriate goals
specify both process and product. Lesson plan goals are written for all 3 domain, are measurable, s and demonstrate
continuous progress toward reaching unit goals. When appropriate goals specify both process and product. Analysis of
Findings for Key Assessment #3 Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) There are three assessments that comprise
planning (pedagogical knowledge and skills). These include contextual analysis and rational for the teaching model selected
in the respective class, block and lesson plans, and learning goals and objectives. HPE candidates do very well on these
assessments due to the design of the overall program (see Tables 2D and 2E). The design is integrative in nature: HPE
candidates start early in their career at GSU in all aspects of planning from curriculum plans to unit 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 83% and 40% of the BSEd and Non-T4 candidates, respectively, were
very good in writing a contextual analysis and rationale prior to student teaching. After the completion of student teaching 83%


% of HPE candidates were outstanding in writing a contextual analysis. Block and Lesson Plans. Data from this key assessment show that 71% and 80% of the BSEd and Non-T4 candidates, respectively, were very good in writing block and lesson plans midway through their program. By the end of student teaching 83% of students were rated as outstanding in writing block and lesson plans. Learning Goals and Objectives. Data from this key assessment show that 57% and 50% of BSEd and Non-T4 candidates rate very good in the writing of learning goals and objectives prior to student teaching with 83% being outstanding in writing learning goals and objectives at the end of student teaching.

M 3: Goal 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 3)

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 multip types of assessments to determine P-12 student's learning HPE material. GSU students are then required to report the data from these assessments, analyze the results from their assessments and describe the changes they will and/or did make to their teaching to address the findings of their assessments. HPE faculty use the HPE key assessment rubric to grade student's assessment project (this project is part of the model's project).

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

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 2011-2012 - Target: 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 the impact they have on P-12 student learning. It is important to recognize that candidates are at 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 the type of instructional mode selected and the anticipated outcomes for that model. Rubric for Scoring Analysis of Student Learning Unsatisfactory 1 point Needs Improvement 2 points Satisfactory 3 points Very Good 4 points Outstanding 5 points. Analysis of Findings of 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 28% of candidates scored very good on their ability to demonstrate their impact on student learning. KH 7250 serves as the first class in which graduate HPE non-T4 candidates completed this same assessment. Here to, 40% of candidates received a score of very good. HPE candidates completed an analysis of student learning in KH 4710 as part of their student teaching requirements. At this time, 83% of candidates received a score of outstanding.

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 2011-2012 - 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/teenagers 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. Analysis of Lesson Reflections Lesson reflections were the key assessment to evaluate clinical practice. Prior to student teaching 71% of BSEd candidates received very good ratings for their lesson reflections. At the end of student teaching 80% of students were outstanding in writing lesson reflections. These numbers suggest that candidates have developed an increased ability to engage in self-evaluation not only on what they do as teachers but they are strongly aware of the reasons their decisions may or may not have been effective as well as providing suggestions and insights on what and how they would change things for the future.

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

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Performance

The following discussion is a summary of the principle findings, faculty’s interpretations of those findings and changes planned for the preparation program resulting from analysis of the data. Steps the HPE faculty will take to use the information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the preparation program also are addressed. Content Knowledge Summary of principal findings. After analyzing the data from the two major assessments chosen to demonstrate content knowledge (GACE and average GPA for content courses) it can be determined that these two assessments measure the content knowledge of HPE candidates. GSU program completers are passing the GACE content knowledge test with between 88-98% pass rates and have pass rates within 2 percentage points and above on all 6 subareas on tests 115 and 116. In addition, HPE candidates have a content core average GPA of 2.97, 3.1 and 3.24 for the last three years, respectively. Steps taken to use information from assessments. The HPE faculty as a group are reflective and responsive to candidate performance. Last year, in response to faculty perceptions regarding the sequencing of course content, the HPE faculty developed a content matrix for the Initial preparation program (BSEd and Med non-T4) to better determine in which courses specific content was taught. This information serves two purposes; the first is to
improve student performance, and the second, to ensure the program effectively addresses the dual curriculum of health and physical education across P-12. Changes planned for the preparation program. The current plan is to maintain and monitor both GACE and average GPA. Candidates’ subscores will be shared with program faculty responsible for teaching related content so they can improve or add additional time for developing content in existing classes. Scores also will be shared with HPE faculty so we can revise curriculum sequencing and/or add new courses to ensure content is effectively addressed. Lastly, the HPE faculty plan to review core content average GPA at each transition point in the program. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, skills and Dispositions (including planning, clinical practice and dispositions) Summary of principal findings. There are multiple assessments for analyzing HPE candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions. These include a contextual analysis, lesson planning, learning goals and objectives, lesson reflections, task presentation, analysis of student learning, and dispositions. After analyzing the data from the contextual analysis, lesson planning, and learning goals and objectives between 84-92% of candidates were very good or outstanding in their performance across these three assessments at the end of student teaching suggesting that HPE candidates have a readiness to teach and a confidence and clarity to meet their teaching goals, ensure continuity of learning from lesson to lesson, provide for individual differences and strive to adapt learning material to the needs of the students. On lesson reflections, 84% of candidates were rated very good or outstanding at the end of student teaching suggesting that candidates developed the ability to engage in self-evaluation not only on what they did as teachers but on the reasons their decisions may or may not have been effective. Following student teaching, 81% of candidates were very good or outstanding in task presentation highlighting the importance of full time teaching with full classes of students to strength teaching skills. Data from dispositions (100% rated as very good by faculty) are strongly supportive of the professional expectations and behaviors demonstrated by candidates at the end of student teaching. Steps taken to use information from assessments. The information from 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?

In the previous year we tested the effectiveness of changes made to our rubric and evaluated the link of key assessments with goals and objectives. In the previous year we also revised the instructions and expectations for the respective key assessments. In the coming year we will continue to monitor assignment instructions and assignment quality based on the rubric and make any changes necessary to ensure students continue to perform to meet and/or exceed expectations.

**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. Changes and improvements focus on both improving areas that are currently strong and strengthening areas that are weaker to ensure a strong program that prepares students to be effective teachers and contributing members in the school community.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

This past year we implemented the rubric designed the previous year to assess student competence on selected key assessments.
**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

We learned that we developed an effective rubric from which to evaluate key assessments. We also learned that the assignment selection is meaningful and appropriate reflection of student learning and performance.

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

We will use the knowledge this year to continue to monitor improvements as the impact of some course changes will not be evident for another year when upcoming students will have taken courses with revised content corresponding to the goals and objectives previously outlined.

---
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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 outcomes 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 professionally

**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 process for the purpose of the enhancement of student learning.

**G 5: should be able to reflect on & learn 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 instructional units 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 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: 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

Relevant Associations:
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

Relevant Associations:

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).

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 modifications 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

Relevant Associations:

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: KH 7240 Unit plan (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Should be able to demonstrate the ability to plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target is 75% of program completers with at least 6 of the 9 indicators in the Unit Plan Project scored as Acceptable or Target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of our KH 7240 students demonstrated the ability to plan an instructional unit towards the end of the semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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. |

| **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 2011-2012 - Target: Met** |
| Of the 7 students who submitted their supervision project by the due time all met the target and received at least 25 points out of the 30 available points for the live supervision project. |

| **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. |

| **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
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

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

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

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

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
**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

**Additional Resources:**

- None

---

**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

**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

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

Normal 0 false 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
**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

**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

- **Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas

- **Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance (O: 6)

- **Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty (O: 6)

- **Source of Evidence:** Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

### M 8: Capstone questions (O: 1)

- **Source of Evidence:** Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

## 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 | **Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** GPA of each HA student | **Objective:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Capstone questions | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | **Objective:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Student evaluation of H.A. program | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations
- **Measure:** Development of student knowledge areas

### 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 | **Objective:** Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | **Objective:** Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills
- **Measure:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** GPA of each HA student | **Objective:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Capstone questions | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Student evaluation of H.A. program | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations
- **Measure:** Development of student knowledge areas

### Additional Information

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

---

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

**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 | **Objective:** Competency in Business skills and knowledge
- **Measure:** Competency in Knowledge of the healthcare environment | **Objective:** Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills
- **Measure:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Assessment of residents by HA faculty | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** GPA of each HA student | **Objective:** Provide CAHME specified competencies areas
- **Measure:** Capstone questions | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Student evaluation of H.A. program | **Objective:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations
- **Measure:** Development of student knowledge areas

### Additional Information

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

---

**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 | **Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas | **Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for H.A. | **Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Student evaluation of H.A. program | **Objective:** Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills
- **Measure:** Develop real world experience in the HA field
- **Measure:** Preceptor evaluation of student performance during residency, on-site visits, and residency presentations
- **Measure:** Development of student knowledge areas

### Additional Information

- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche
Implementation Description: Fall 2010 target for CAHME competencies in IHA
Projected Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Andrew Sumner and Dr. Pat Ketsche

Additional Resources: Development and Implementation of CAHME competencies requires much additional faculty effort.

Marketing of MHA and MSHA program
Many potential students are not aware of HA area of study, including many that are int eh 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Health Science-Nutrition MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
To prepare professionals who enhance individual and community health through dietetics practice and to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge in the fields of nutrition and dietetics.

Goals
G 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.

G 4: Knowledge of Health Care Policies
Candidates in the Master of Science in Health Sciences with a concentration in Nutrition program are informed health care professionals who have knowledge of health care policies needed to successfully provide services to clients and patients.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate entry-level competence in the design, interpretation, and ethical conduct of nutrition research.

SLO 2: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care (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 (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: Understand the Essential Components of Delivering Health Services (M: 5)
Candidates will successfully evaluate contemporary principles of health policy in the U.S. and other countries to better understand the essential components of delivering health services.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: 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**

- Target – 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

- 7 of 9 (78%) scored >90%; 9 of 9 (100%) scored >80%

#### M 2: Research Presentation (O: 2)
**NUTR 6012** (Orientation to Practice) – Research Presentation  
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

- 80% (4 of 5 groups) received an evaluation of exceeds or meets/exceeds expectations on all presentation evaluation criteria by the majority of the 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

- 10 of 19 (53%) scored >90%; 17 of 19 (89%) scored >80%

#### M 4: Micronutrients Quizzes (O: 3)
**NUTR 6106** (Advanced Normal Nutrition – Micronutrients) - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

- 0 of 11 students (0%) scored >90%; 7 of 11 students (64%) scored >80%

#### M 5: Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment (O: 4)
**SNHP 8000** (Trends Affecting Health Policy) – Debate on Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment  
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target for O4: Understand the Essential Components of Delivering Health Services**

- Of the total points available on the assignment, 25% of students will score >90% and 75% will score >80%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

- 31 of 31 (100%) scored >90%

#### 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
- **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
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011

Continue to Monitor
Continue to monitor this assessment
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Continue to Monitor
This assessment measure will continue to be monitored as the faculty instructor changed from academic year 2010-2011 to 2011-2012
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Trends Affecting Health Policy Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Understand the Essential Components of Delivering Health Services

Continue to Monitor
Continue monitoring this assessment and encourage students to utilize this assignment as a means of beginning their research interest for a future thesis project
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Proposal Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Design, Interpretation and Conduct of Research

Continue to Monitor
The target for at least 10% of students to achieve >90% on the quizzes was not met but we did meet the target for 50% of students achieving >80%, which is an improvement from the 2010-2011 academic year. We will continue to monitor student progress in NUTR 6106 (Advanced Normal Nutrition - Micronutrients). NUTR 6106 is a core course in the graduate curriculum. Students who are not successful in this course will need assistance in order to function as a nutrition professional.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Micronutrients Quizzes | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Continue to Monitor
The target for this assessment measure was not met in the last academic year but was met in the current academic year. We will continue to monitor this assessment.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Use of Current and Emergent Technologies to Enhance Nutrition Care

Continue to Monitor
This assessment measure was not met in the last academic year but was met in the current academic year. We will continue to monitor this assessment measure.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Macronutrients Final Exam | Outcome/Objective: Comprehend Interrelationships between Macro- and Micronutrient Intakes

Continue to Monitor
This assessment measure will continue to be monitored as the faculty instructor changed from academic year 2010-2011 to 2011-2012
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
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?

All Goals, Objectives and Measures were revised for academic year 2010-2011 and forward to reflect the core learning outcomes for the Master of Health Sciences with a concentration in nutrition program. Additional assessment measures may be added 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.

All targets were met in academic year 2011-2012. Two required courses for the Master of Health Sciences with a concentration in nutrition (NUTR 6104 and NUTR 6106) will be converted to an online format in an effort to provide a program that is accessible to working Dietitians. The assessments will permit evaluation of student success before and after the format change.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 History Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The U.S. History Survey (2110) introduces students to the fundamentals of historical thinking and historical methods through analysis of political, economic, and social developments in the United States.

Goals
G 1: Historical Knowledge and Critical Thinking Skills
The history department expects students of the U.S. History Survey to develop an aptitude for the knowledge and the critical thinking skills necessary to historical literacy and historical analysis.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Source Differentiation (M: 1)
Students in 2110 will be able to identify and differentiate primary and secondary sources, and to analyze and interpret them.

SLO 2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context (M: 2)
Students in 2110 will be able to discuss and analyze historical developments across cultural and geographic boundaries, with an appreciation for how historical context, change over time, and/or spatial dimensions affect historical responses.

SLO 3: Historical Geography (M: 3)
Students in 2110 will demonstrate knowledge of the historical geography of the United States.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Source Differentiation (O: 1)
A student who receives a 1 cannot differentiate a primary source from a secondary source. A student who receives a 2 is able to differentiate a primary source from a secondary source, but not able to put those differences to use in historical interpretation. A student who receives a 3 can both differentiate primary sources from secondary sources and put those differences to use in historical interpretation.

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

Target for O1: Source Differentiation
60% to receive 2 or above; 30% to receive 3

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data collected for 2011-12.

M 2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context (O: 2)
A student who receives a 1 cannot understand or explain encounters or conflicts within or between past cultures within their historical context; no awareness of change over time. A student who receives a 2 can analyze encounters or conflicts within or between past cultures, and is able to use historical context to demonstrate rudimentary understanding of multiple historical perspectives and change over time. A student who receives a 3 can analyze encounters or conflicts within or between past cultures; is able to use historical context to competently recognize and interpret multiple historical perspectives and change over time.

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

**Target for O2: Encounters and Conflicts in Historical Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Reported This Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data collected for 2011-12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Designate new specific skills for assessment**
Identify more precisely the discipline-relevant student critical thinking skills that can be measured in assessments and can provide data for ongoing tracking of student progress.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** Medium
**Implementation Description:** October 08
**Responsible Person/Group:** Freshmen Studies Committee

**Establish new measurements to assess student learning**
Develop an assessment rubric for the specific critical thinking skills identified in Action 1 that can measure student progress across assignments over the course of the semester

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** Medium
**Implementation Description:** October 08
**Responsible Person/Group:** Freshmen Studies Committee

**Assess data**
Collect and assess data for fall 2012 and spring 2013. Submit findings into WEAVE.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**New Assessment Process**
For the cycle 2012-13, we have revised the Outcomes, Measures, and assessment rubric for the Core. We will begin collecting data for HIST 2110 in the fall of 2012, and will continue to do so through the spring of 2013.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High

**Revise Assessment Instrument (Rubric)**
After collecting and assessing data from 2012-13, revise rubric so that it includes a category of "Excellent." Incorporate feedback from instructors and faculty teaching 2110.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
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, geographical, and national 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)
For 2012, five members of the Department of History Undergraduate Studies Committee read a randomly selected sample of fifteen student research papers (three papers each from five different classes) written for HIST 4990 in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 Semesters. 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 2011-2012 Assessment Summary/Findings. 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 excelled 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
In 2012, the Department of History’s assessment of Learning Outcome #1 on Professional Skills fell short of the benchmark of seventy percent. Only 60% or 9 out of the 15 papers demonstrated having met or exceeded expectations suggesting that all of our students achieve some level of professional skills. Indeed, across all five learning outcomes the percentages of students meeting or exceeding the expectations of the department diminished in 2012, thereby necessitating an evaluation of the assessment tool in relationship to the stated Learning Outcomes as a possible course of action.

**Target for O2: Historiography**
The department's target is for 60% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
In 2012, the Department of History’s assessment of Learning Outcome #2 on Historiography fell short of the benchmark of sixty percent. Only forty-five percent or 6 out of the 15 papers demonstrated having met or exceeded expectations, nevertheless with all of the papers ranking above 1, suggesting that all of our students achieved some understanding of the usefulness of the paper in demonstrating an understanding of historiography.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
In 2012, the Department of History’s assessment of Learning Outcome #3 on Interdisciplinary Awareness fell short of the benchmark of sixty percent. Only forty-six percent or 7 out of the 15 papers demonstrated having met or exceeded expectations. Indeed, across all five learning outcomes the percentages of students meeting or exceeding the expectations of the department diminished in 2012, thereby necessitating an evaluation of the assessment tool in relationship to the stated Learning Outcomes as a possible course of action.

**Target for O4: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective**
The department's target is for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
In 2012, the Department of History’s assessment of Learning Outcome #4 on Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective fell short of the benchmark of sixty percent. Only forty-eight percent or 7 out of the 15 papers demonstrated having met or exceeded expectations. To be fair, the course description of History 4990 with its research paper that is used as the assessment tool does not require an analysis of interdisciplinary awareness as a class requirement, thereby necessitating an evaluation of the usefulness of the paper in demonstrating an understanding of a comparative/global/transnational perspective.

**Target for O5: Professional Values**
The department's target is for 70% of our graduating students to score three or four in this area.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
In 2012, the Department of History’s assessment of Learning Outcome #5 on Professional Values fell short of the benchmark of seventy percent. Some fifty-eight percent or 9 out of the 15 papers demonstrated having met or exceeded expectations suggesting that all of our students achieved some level of awareness regarding Professional Values but also revealing the need to revisit course requirements and assessment tools in calculating success in this area.

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

**Comparative/Global/Transnational**
The majority of our student papers performed well in this area. Those that did not treated topics that made comparison difficult. We plan to circulate our department’s standards to remind students and faculty that this is one of our defined goals.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: capstone course seminar paper
  - outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective
- **Projected Completion Date:** 03/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Denise Davidson

**Historiography**
We plan to do more to emphasize historiographical debates in our upper-division courses. Students learn about historiography in HIST 3000, Introduction to Historical Studies. Many of the intervening courses drop the issue of historiography to a large extent. We hope that by assigning more short research-type assignments in our upper-division courses, our students will become more comfortable with talking about historiographical debates in their seminar papers. We have also changed to pre-requisites for HIST 4990, our capstone course, to require at least two 4000-level classes prior to enrolling in the class. By ensuring that all our majors...
get some experience doing research and writing about historiography in our 4000-level classes, we hope that their performance will improve in 4990.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Historiography

Implementation Description: We have already submitted the proposal to change the prerequisites for 4990 in the course catalog, and the department agreed with the idea of working on emphasizing research skills and historiography in our upper-division courses.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson

Interdisciplinary Awareness
We seem to be doing quite well in terms of interdisciplinary awareness as all but two of our sample group satisfied the criteria. We continue to emphasize different disciplines and their impact on history in HIST 3000.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Interdisciplinary Awareness

Professional Skills
To improve our students’ level of preparedness for the capstone seminar paper, we have agreed as a department to do more to emphasize research skills in our upper-division courses. We will be organizing a pedagogy workshop on research and writing assignments for these classes later this semester.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Skills
Projected Completion Date: 03/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson

Professional Values
We hope that the changes described under in action plan for the “historiography” outcome will have a similar effect in this area. We are going to emphasize more research-type assignments in our 4000-level classes so as to give students more research and writing experience in the classes that lead up to 4990. This experience should help them to develop the skills and values described here. The faculty have agreed to attend a workshop on research assignments during the upcoming semester.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Professional Values
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson

Revision of outcomes
The history department’s undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students’ level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective
Implementation Description: The history department’s undergraduate studies committee will work on revising the outcomes in Fall 2010 and present them to the department as a whole in early Spring 2011. They should be finalized in time for the 2011 assessment cycle.
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

Revision of outcomes
The history department's undergraduate studies committee plans to revise our outcomes in the upcoming year. Currently, we have a total of ten, five for the core courses and five for the upper division courses. However, our majors need to demonstrate mastery of both the lower-division and upper-division outcomes. We also noticed some redundancy in our current five upper-division outcomes. Our plan is to combine the ten outcomes for both levels and then collapse some to create eight for the upper-division courses. We believe that these revisions will allow us to track better our students' level of mastery of the desired outcomes. Once we have revised the outcomes, we will create a new, more detailed rubric for the assessment process.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
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 ready 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.
Responsible Person/Group: Denise Davidson, soon to be replaced by Glenn Eskew.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: capstone course seminar paper | Outcome/Objective: Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective
Implementation Description: The Undergraduate Studies Committee will have to consider both the rules that produce the product being evaluated and the method of assessment to determine an appropriate solution to this problem.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Studies Committee

Appropriateness of Assessment Tool
Using the evidence from three years of assessment in History 4990, it is apparent the capstone research paper serves the purposes of assessment only when the course is designed to address such Learning Outcomes as "Interdisciplinary Awareness" and "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective." While students can be expected to have engaged "Professional Skills," "Historiography" and "Professional Values" in other courses and demonstrate those skills in the 4990 paper, unless the topic for the class specifies an "Interdisciplinary Awareness" or "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective," then these skills—while no doubt obtained in other history courses—will not be demonstrated in the paper, thereby weakening it as an assessment tool. To address this problem, the Undergraduate Studies Committee will meet and consider possible solutions that might include the revision of course requirements or the adoption of new assessment tools.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Revision of course requirements and catalog copy.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Studies 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?

Over 2011-2012, the Undergraduate Studies Committee began a discussion regarding the usefulness of the History 4990 capstone paper as an assessment tool. The committee decided to wait until the third year of evaluations could demonstrate a pattern of learning in the major. Consequently with three years of assessment, it is apparent the 4990 paper does not adequately demonstrate an awareness among the student of "Historiography," "Interdisciplinary Awareness" and "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective." As a result, the Action Plan of the Undergraduate Studies Committee will be to determine a more suitable solution, perhaps to alter course requirements to address these shortcomings and still use the History 4990 paper as an assessment tool, or to add additional assessment tools that can measure these desired 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.

Using the evidence from three years of assessment in History 4990, it is apparent the capstone research paper serves the purposes of assessment only when the course is designed to address such Learning Outcomes as "Interdisciplinary Awareness" and "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective." While students can be expected to have engaged "Professional Skills," "Historiography" and "Professional Values" in other courses and demonstrate those skills in the 4990 paper, unless the topic for the class specifies an "Interdisciplinary Awareness" or "Comparative/Global/Transnational Perspective," then these skills—while no doubt obtained in other history courses—will not be demonstrated in the paper, thereby weakening it as an assessment tool. To address this problem, the Undergraduate Studies Committee will meet and consider possible solutions that might include the revision of course requirements or the adoption of new assessment tools.

### 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 6 on assessment instrument) or sophisticated level (rank of 7-8 on assessment instrument).

**SLO 6: Writing Skills**
A student's writing skills will be assessed from a range of weak to exceptional.

**SLO 7: Oral Presentation & Participation**
The student's oral presentation and participation will be rated from weak to exceptional.

**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 2012-2013 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 2013 semester
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013

**Rubric Testing**
The graduate assessment instrument is now in use in all graduate courses. It was modified with a broader range of numerical rankings and new categories of evaluation in 2011-12 to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate student progress in meeting outcomes and objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The end of Spring semester 2012
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty members who will teach respective courses

**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?

Following our assessment action plan, during Spring semester 2010, the department for the first time utilized its new assessment instrument in all graduate courses. The department instituted this policy in order to better track and record student progress in meeting programmatic outcome goals. The graduate committee reviewed the assessment results and decided to modify the assessment instrument in 2011-2012 by extending the range of numerical rankings to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate outcomes and objectives. We also replaced the "professional skills" category on the assessment instrument with "writing skills" and "oral presentation and participation" to better reflect what "professional skills" actually are in the history field. In the future, we will design and implement a new assessment instrument for graduate comprehensive 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 curriculums or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The collated assessment ranking show that on average the department is meeting its achievement target. The assessment instrument measures a number of student learning outcomes twice in the course of the semester: mid-point and at the end. At the midpoint of the semester, learning outcomes average 5.75, meeting the low-competent level. By the end of the semester, learning outcomes averaged 6.18, meeting the high-competent level, the baseline for our achievement outcome. (The results of the Fall 2011 assessment process are available for review in the department's graduate office). Students performed somewhat below the high-competent level in "Interdisciplinary Awareness" and "Comparative Perspectives" but somewhat above the high-competent level in "Professional Values", "Historiography", and "Writing Skills". Such rankings suggest that instructors could do more to design assignments that support our interdisciplinary and comparative awareness learning outcomes. In addition, the overall assessment rankings indicate that some students may need extra help meeting specific outcome goals. The department will continue its mentoring program for first year students to ensure they are making progress toward meeting all outcome goals. In addition, the assessment outcomes show that Ph.D. students tend to perform better than MA students, which we expect given their level of training. Yet this data also suggests that the department could do more to prepare MA students in basic outcomes, particularly in our required 7000-level course offerings.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

The department is now using the revised assessment instrument in all graduate courses, which has resulted in ranking for outcome goals for individual students as well as a broad view of how the department is helping MA students as a group meet those goals. Annual assessment reports will allow the department to track student success on both the individual and group levels in time and will continue to identify strengths and weaknesses in the graduate program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

The department values improved information on the preparation and learning of its graduate students and we are pleased that for the most part they rank highly on our objective/outcome goals. Yet we would like all students to show outcomes at the high-competent (rank of 6 on the current assessment instrument) or sophisticated (rank of 7-8 on the current assessment instrument). Once we have assessment results for several years, said results will aid the department's evaluation of the recent graduate curriculum changes. Assessment rankings will facilitate annual evaluations of student progress and will aid in the determination of assistantship appointments.

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

We are in general pleased with the results of the department's revised assessment instrument and will continue to use the current instrument. In the future we will implement an assessment instrument for our PhD comprehensive exams, an important component of our graduate program. The instrument will be designed to measure student performance in the exams, in order to evaluate the department's exam procedures. While it is difficult to anticipate results, we hope that on-going data collection on graduate courses and evaluation of the exam procedures will increase the accuracy and usefulness of the assessment process and will contribute to improving our graduate programs.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

Implemented assessment instrument in graduate courses in Fall 2011 and evaluated instrument results.

**Challenges for Next Year**—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.

Design and implement assessment instrument for graduate comprehensive exams.

**Contributions to Student Retention**—Please discuss here any direct or indirect contributions your department has made to the retention, progression, or graduation of students.

In Fall 2010, the department implemented a new MA program designed to improve retention and facilitate progress toward graduation by streamlining the program, setting clear core course and field requirements, and instituting a graduate student mentoring system.
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
Nurture in students the qualities of honesty and accuracy

G 4: Global Perspective
Help students understand the links between history and the larger world

Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 1: Professional Skills (M: 1)
The student demonstrates skills essential to conducting and presenting historical research, including techniques and methods of archival/primary material research, synthesis and analysis of secondary material, as well as organization and historical argumentation. All students should show outcomes at the high competent level (rank of 6 on assessment instrument) or sophisticated level (rank of 7-8 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 2012
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Program committee
Rubric Testing

The graduate assessment instrument is now in use in all graduate courses. It was modified with a broader range of numerical rankings and new categories of evaluation in 2011-12 to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate student progress in meeting outcomes and objectives.

<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 end of Spring semester 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>04/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate Program Committee</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?

Following our assessment action plan, during Spring Semester 2010, the department for the first time utilized its new assessment instrument in all graduate courses. The department instituted this policy in order to better track and record student progress in meeting programmatic outcome goals. The graduate committee reviewed the assessment results and decided to modify the assessment instrument in 2011-2012 by extending the range of numerical rankings to enhance accuracy and encourage instructors to better evaluate outcomes and objectives. We also replaced the "professional skills" category on the assessment instrument with "writing skills" and "oral presentation and participation" to better reflect what "professional skills" actually are in the history field. In the future, we will design and implement a new assessment instrument for graduate comprehensive 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 collated assessment rankings show that on average the department is meeting its achievement target. The assessment instrument measures a number of student learning outcomes twice in the course of the semester: mid-point and at the end. At the mid-point of the semester, learning outcomes averaged 5.75, meeting the low-competent level. By the end of the semester, learning outcomes averaged 6.18, meeting the high-competent level, the baseline for our achievement outcome. (The results of the Fall 2011 assessment process are available for review in the department's graduate office). Students performed somewhat below the high-competent level in "Interdisciplinary Awareness" and "Comparative Perspectives" but somewhat above the high-competent level in "Professional Values", "Historiography", and "Writing Skills". Such rankings suggest that instructors could do more to design assignments that support our interdisciplinary and comparative awareness learning outcomes. In addition, the overall assessment rankings indicate that some students may need extra help meeting specific outcome goals. The department will continue its mentoring program for first year students to ensure they are making progress towards meeting all outcome goals. In addition, the assessment outcomes show that Ph.D. students tend to perform better than MA students, which we expect given their level of training.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

The department is now using the revised assessment instrument in all graduate courses, which has resulted in rankings for outcome goals for individual students as well as a broad view of how the department is helping PhD students as a group meet those goals. Annual assessment reports will allow the department to track student success on both the individual and group levels over time and will continue to identify strengths and weaknesses in the graduate program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

The department values improved information on the preparation and learning of its graduate students and we are pleased that for the most part they rank highly on our objective/outcome goals. Yet we would like all students to show outcomes at the high-competent (rank of 6 on the current assessment instrument) or sophisticated (rank of 7-8 on the current assessment instrument). Once we have the baseline results for several years, said results will aid the department's evaluation of the recent graduate curriculum changes. Assessment ranking will facilitate annual evaluations of student progress and will aid in the determination of assistantship appointments.

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

We are in general pleased with the results of the department's revised assessment instrument and will continue to use the current instrument. In the future we will implement an assessment instrument for our PhD comprehensive exams, an important component of our graduate program. The instrument will be designed to measure student performance in the exams, in order to evaluate the department's exam procedures. While it is difficult to anticipate results, we hope that on-going data collection on graduate courses and evaluation of the exam procedures will increase the accuracy and usefulness of the assessment process and will contribute to improving our graduate programs.

Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year:** Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

Implemented assessment instrument in graduate courses in Fall 2011 and evaluated instrument results.
**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**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, tradeshow 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.

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 4, 6, 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills in gathering, analyzing and applying relevant information in making strategic and sound business decisions. This information will include both internal and external influences on the respective business operation. For example, current economic conditions, competitive forces, social trends, demographics and legal/governmental/political affairs are involved in the analysis of external business conditions. An internal analysis includes factors such as profit and loss ratios for the business, condition of facilities, product and service levels in competing with other businesses, marketing strength, ownership/management relations, employee stability (in recruiting and retention), and knowledge/skill level of the internal workforce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Associations:

- The School of Hospitality is accredited through the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA). Required curricular content areas required by ACPHA and related to this objective include an introduction, emphasis and reinforcement of:

  1. The marketing of goods and services
  2. The legal environment
  3. The economic environment
  4. Exposure to critical thinking skills
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 4: Work Experience Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3)
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 current practices and what the hospitality business could be doing. This measure is related to all of the three stated objectives. The student portfolio includes sections that require the student to provide examples of their work behavior in providing quality service and products to external customers, providing quality service to internal customers, handling ethical situations, dealing with organizational change, workplace conflicts, working with cultural diversity and analyzing areas of opportunities for profitability as well as cutting costs. Based on their work experiences, students are also asked evaluate their knowledge and skills areas in the work portfolio and are asked to elaborate on specific career goals.

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

#### Target for O1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations
The target is for a minimum of 90% of students to show critical thinking skills in evaluating the application of service skills (internal and external), organizational change, conflict management and working in a diverse workplace.

**Findings** 2011-2012 - Target: Met

For this past academic year, 94% showed evidence of critical thinking skills in the designated areas.

#### Target for O2: Apply principles of financial analysis in the evaluation of business results
At least 90% of the students should show evidence of observing, evaluating and making recommendations for areas of financial opportunity in increasing profits and reducing overhead costs.

**Findings** 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of the students provided at least one area for enhancing profitability and one way to control costs.

#### Target for O3: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills
The target is for a minimum of 90% of the students to comprehensively evaluate their service experiences in the workplace showing evidence of effective application of service knowledge and skills.

**Findings** 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of the students showed evidence of effectively applying service knowledge and skills during their work experience.

#### M 5: Employer Evaluation of Work Experience (O: 3)
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 9. Willingness to learn 9. Work habits (attendance, punctuality, accuracy) 10. Demonstration of potential leadership abilities 11. Credibility/ethical behavior 12. Work performance was reflective of what would be expected of a major in hospitality

**Source of Evidence:** Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

#### Target for O3: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills
At least 95% of the employers of hospitality majors will provide a satisfactory evaluation of their service knowledge and skills.

**Findings** 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of hospitality majors positively critiqued the application of service knowledge and skills in a hospitality work-setting.

#### M 6: Food Safety/Sanitation Certification (O: 1, 3)
HADM 3401/3402 (Food Production Lab) requires that all students complete a standardized food safety/sanitation exam during the semester of that course. Because of the importance of food safety and sanitation, this measure is directly related to service knowledge and skills for those students working in foodservice and those working indirectly with foodservice departments or

**Findings** 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of hospitality majors positively critiqued the application of service knowledge and skills in a hospitality work-setting.
outsourced providers. Knowledge of food safety and sanitation is also applicable to the objective of critical thinking skills in the hospitality industry regarding food sourcing decisions, facility lay-out (kitchen and storerooms) and minimizing human error.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The standard for the School of Hospitality is that 100% of majors will successfully pass the national certification test for food safety and sanitation. The goal is for a minimum of 95% to pass on the first try with the remaining 5% to pass on the second try.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Hospitality majors passed the Food Safety and Sanitation exam resulting in 100% being certified. Less than 3% of the students had to take the exam twice to become certified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Apply Service Knowledge and Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The standard for the School of Hospitality is that 100% of majors will successfully pass the national certification test for food safety and sanitation. The goal is for a minimum of 95% to pass on the first try with the remaining 5% to pass on the second try.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All hospitality majors became certified in Food Safety and Sanitation with less than 3% having to take the exam a second time to pass.

**M 7: Hospitality Case Study (O: 1)**
An average of three case studies are assigned per semester in HADM 4800. One of these case studies per semester is reviewed for the demonstration of critical thinking skills in a business setting.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in analyzing hospitality business operations**
A minimum of 75% of the hospitality majors in the senior capstone course will achieve a minimum of 85% on the case study demonstrating the ability to evaluate and analyze a business situation incorporating internal and external information to the operation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
For the selected case analysis, 90% of the students had a minimum of 85% on the case study demonstrating the application of critical thinking skills in analyzing a hospitality business situation.

**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
**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 CTW course continues to be "Hospitality Strategic Management." Whereas this course was focused on project-based assignments, a change for this academic year is to utilize case studies. The projects, which were with industry partners, varied in their results depending on the involvement of the industry partners and time constraints that we faced with industry participation. Case studies are more structured and can be selected and revised to reflect real-world changes. Comparing students from semester to semester is also more realistic with case studies versus projects with numerous changing factors.

**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 adequately demonstrated critical thinking based on the targeted goals established for the measures. One of the important variaives for students in optimizing their critical thinking abilities is their level of confidence. Between entry and exit in the course, the focus is on students 1) having an increased awareness of what critical thinking is; 2) understanding the importance of critical thinking in making business decisions in the real-world; 3) increasing level of confidence in their abilities to think critically and 4) having the ability to transfer these skills and confidence level from the classroom to a professional work 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?**

We continue to revise measures to reflect the needs of the hospitality industry. The increased attention on analytics will be seen in possibly adding a hotel simulation exercise to HADM 4800 with structured business decisions incorporated into this simulation experience. Several products (hotel simulation learning packages) have been reviewed and the most appropriate one has been selected. Funding is now being considered for this addition to HADM 4800, the 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?**

There is a greater awareness of CTW courses among students and faculty. There is more discussion among non-CTW instructors and the CTW instructor on changes to the CTW course. It is not just one person who determines the content since this is also the department's capstone 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?

For this year, we revised the learning objectives to have a stronger tie to the stated goals. We also modified some of the measures to reflect classroom changes based on new faculty. For example, our "Hospitality Cost Control and Financial Analysis" course no longer uses the business simulation because it had become outdated and did not adequately reflect business reality. The list of objectives...
and measures are more streamlined. We also referred to the accreditation standards for the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration (ACPHA) in guiding these objectives and measures. We our reaccreditation scheduled for 2014, we want to make sure the assessment process is lateral to the ACPHA standards. Reinstating the hospitality senior exit exam and possibly including one more industry-based certification for majors (in addition to the food safety and sanitation certification) are likely. A pilot group of students will be taking the certification exam at the end of fall semester 2012 and the senior exit exam could be ready by spring 2013.

**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 support that most hospitality majors are meeting the measures tied to our program's curricular objectives and goals. Because more attention is being placed on analytical skills in the areas of financial information and business results, the School of Hospitality will revise particularly the two senior required courses (HADM 4100 and HADM 4800) to include more of the industry-accepted metrics and analytic reports.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

We revamped the outcomes and measures from 2010-2011. The team project, included as a measure in 2010-2011, was difficult to replicate each semester. More structured case studies replaced the team project which had too many variables that were hard to control. The case studies are discussed in a team setting which does provide the opportunity to share different perspectives.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

The department did reach its stated target goals. The findings incorporated both in-class measures (through assignments such as the case study and food safety/sanitation certification), student analysis of learning experiences and work performance (the work portfolio) and feedback from employers (the employer evaluation of performance) as related to the delineated objectives. A continued emphasis on oral and written communication is necessary in maximizing the professionalism of our students.

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

We have discussed stronger assessment measures such as an industry-based certification and reinstating the hospitality senior exit exam incorporating more analytical information. The industry certification will be piloted this semester (fall 2012) with the senior exit exam possibly being reinstated spring 2013.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Human Resource Management MS**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Master of Science in Human Resources Management program prepares students for careers as specialists or generalists in the practice of Human Resource Management. Students are offered detailed knowledge in functional areas of recruiting, compensation, employment law, organizational development, and related Human Resources areas. Coursework provides preparation for the Human Resources Certification Institute (HRCI) examination.

This Mission Statement was actually established in the 2007-2008 cycle. It did not migrate, however, to the 2008-2009 cycle.

**Goals**

**G 1: All facets of compensation in organizations**

To graduate students from the MS in HRM program with an awareness of the role and techniques of all facets of compensation in Human Resources Management.

**G 2: Facets of recruitment and selection**

To graduate students from the MS in HRM program with an awareness of the role and techniques of all facets of recruitment and selection in Human Resources Management.

**G 3: Labor relations law**

To graduate students from the MS in HRM program with an awareness of the role and knowledge areas of employment relations law in Human Resources Management.

**G 4: Performance management and employee relations**

To graduate students from the MS in HRM program with knowledge and skills in the area of performance management and employee relations in Human Resources Management.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
### SLO 1: Compensation System Design (M: 1, 2)

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to design a comprehensive compensation system that incorporates strategic alternatives, job and pay structures such as grades and bands and incentive programs, and compensation budgets.

### SLO 2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment (M: 3, 4)

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to design an accurate, valid, and detailed employee recruitment and selection system that incorporates job analysis, behavioral interviews, work samples, and tests.

### SLO 3: Employment Law (M: 5, 6)

The MS-HRM graduate will understand and effectively apply employment law. The student will be able to identify relevant case issues and laws, draw reasonable conclusions, and recommend policies to address the situation.

### SLO 4: Employee Relations (M: 7, 8)

The MS-HRM graduate will be able to understand and effectively choose and design performance management techniques that enhance employer productivity and minimize bias.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>1.85/3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Integration of All Compensation Components (O: 1)</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>2.1/3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: Job Analysis and Description (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>1.78/3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: Behavioral Interview Questions (O: 2)</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>1.78/3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O2: Comprehensive Employee Recruitment</td>
<td>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, and validation for both. Student designs behavioral interviews, work samples, and additional selection tests with validation for all methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>Average faculty rating of 1.87/3.0. 78% of MS HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Employment Law</th>
<th>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. Complete and correct identification of most issues, laws, and conclusions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Average faculty rating of 2.18/3.0. 82% of MS in HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 6: Clarity of HR Policies - Legal Requirements (O: 3) | Students will be able to produce appropriate and clearly-written HR policies in response to situations and laws. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Employment Law</th>
<th>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 Criterions: Understand and effectively apply employment law. Fails to Meet Standard = 1 Meets Standard = 2 Exceeds Standard = 3.6. Appropriate and clearly-written HR policies A few ambiguous or inappropriate HR policies. Most appropriate and clearly-written HR policies. All appropriate and clearly-written HR policies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met</td>
<td>Average faculty rating of 1.77/3.0. 67% of MS in HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M 7: Performance Management Concepts (O: 4) | Students will be able to discuss appropriate use of performance management tools and the advantages and disadvantages of each as exhibited in answers to exam questions in MGS 8300. Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Employee Relations</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</td>
<td>Average faculty rating of 1.72/3.0. 63% of MS in HR students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Employee Relations</th>
<th>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 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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</td>
<td>Faculty rating of 2.2/3.0. 85% of MS students met or exceeded all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Compensation System Design**
With respect to the first learning outcome, the student's ability to design comprehensive compensation system, two actions will be taken:

- In MGS 8390 add a homework assignment to teach linkages among competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.
- In MGS 8390 provide a written check sheet of items to be included for project to students. Evaluate after next offering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employee Recruitment and Selection**
With respect to the second learning outcome, the student's ability to understand and effectively apply all major components into a comprehensive employee recruitment and selection system, two actions will be taken:

- In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise job analysis, job description, and job specification. Evaluate after next offering.
- In MGS 8360 offer students the opportunity to use instructor feedback to revise questions, scoring system, work sample, and other tests. Evaluate after next offering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>11/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>HR Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$0.00 (no request)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Added Case Example**
Provide sample of case analysis with issues, laws, and conclusions. Evaluate after next offering.

<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>

**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.

<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>

**Compensation Class Content Change**
Add one hour class time to review competitive conditions, strategies, and compensation strategies. Evaluate after next offering.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Alternatives and Rationale in Compensation | Outcome/Objective: Compensation System Design

Responsible Person/Group: Lucy McClurg
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Finished
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
Implementation Description: Refer students who need additional language skills to University Center for help.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
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
Implementation Description: Check coverage of topics in all HR core classes.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
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
Implementation Description: Check coverage of topic across instructors to be sure it is being emphasized in all classes.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
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
Implementation Description: Continue to use in-class rewrite exercise on policy statement formulation.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2012
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
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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.

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.

Apply more CTW techniques to grad class
Apply more writing assignments and rubrics used in the undergraduate CTW classes to the MGS 8320 class.
**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 involved new faculty and PTIs to a greater extent in the evaluation of the program and in collecting data. This has resulted in more discussion about strengths and weaknesses of our programs and 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.

We were able to identify several key areas in which students were not making good progress, including linkages with strategic business plans and in general writing skills. We changed delivery of course materials and increased class time to target those weaknesses. In general, we left more of the coverage of basic knowledge and concepts to the students and made them responsible for learning those easier topics on their own, and we used more of class time to focus on application and advanced skills.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Instructional Technology MS**

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

**Goals**

**G 1: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in P-16**

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the P-16 education sector.

**G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Corp**

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the corporate, government and military sectors.

**G 3: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Non-Profit Sectors**

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the non-profit and non-governmental organization sectors.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development (G: 1, 2, 3) (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, 3) (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, 3) (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, 3) (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, 3) (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 (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: Internship Report (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2011-2012**
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 2011-2012**
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 2011-2012**
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 2011-2012**
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 2011-2012**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

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 2011-2012**
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 2011-2012**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 3: End of Course Assessments (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Utilizes Processes &amp; Resources for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - Target: <strong>Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of completers achieved &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of completers will achieve &quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot; on all standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Target for O1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Target for O4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

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

Continue to Monitor Curriculum
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty
**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
  - Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Implement Certificate in Online Education Program**
We implemented our add-on certificate program in online education.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**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:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** We determined not to pursue state certification.
**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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** 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 (Key Assessment):** 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
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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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

Deactivate Endorsement of Online Teaching
Program enrollment has been low and we have had difficulty keeping up with the reporting burden. We will deactivate this program this year.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In-process
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Shoffner
Additional Resources: None

Increase Focus on Corporate Training
As part of an effort to diversify program offerings in the College of Education we will seek to increase the focus of our MS program on the corporate training sector.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In-process
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty
Additional Resources: None

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 completed and analysis of the MS program and decided to begin implementing two major changes. 1. We will deactivate the Endorsement in Online Education. Demand for this program has been low and the paperwork burden has been too onerous to justify the small number of students involved. 2. We will shift the focus of the MS toward corporate training. While we still will provide service courses to our and other programs' students we will seek to help the college in its efforts to diversify program offerings by focusing on corporate training. The state GOML program in this area is focused on p-16 education so we see corporate training as an under-served niche for us. Additionally, we will pursue a major at the undergraduate level in Human Learning and Development that will serve as a conduit for students into the MS program. We have succeeded in increasing enrollments in the MS program over the last couple of years and we will continue to seek to do so in the future.

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 have become more discerning consumers of information. Their search strategies are improving and they are doing a better job of evaluating the information they find.

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?
We are maintaining the same assessment program as last year since it has proved to be effective. In the coming year as our National Standards are revised we will need to revisit and perhaps revise the assessment 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.
Based on our assessment data we decided to discontinue the Endorsement in Online Teaching and Learning and to not pursue a state teacher certification program in instructional technology.
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? 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 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 (Key Assessments), 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**

95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**

95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**

95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**

95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O6: Develops a professional identity**

95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**

95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Target for O1: Understands and uses technology**

Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession**

Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
### Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Target for O4: Engages in scholarship
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Target for O5: Understands foundations of education
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Target for O6: Develops a professional identity
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

### M 3: Residency Report (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

### Target for O1: Understands and uses technology
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

### Target for O2: Develops leadership for the profession
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

### Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

### Target for O4: Engages in scholarship
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

### Target for O5: Understands foundations of education
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.
Target for **O6: Develops a professional identity**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

Target for **O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

**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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination (O: 3, 4, 5, 7)**

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

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

**Target for O3: Demonstrates research expertise**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O4: Engages in scholarship**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O5: Understands foundations of education**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Target for O7: Develops an extended knowledge base**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

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

**Improve Post Completion Jobs**
Improve the quality of the positions students accept upon graduation from the program.

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*
*Implementation Description: Monitor student completers and mentor them through the job search process.*
*Responsible Person/Group: All IT Faculty*
*Additional Resources: none*
*Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)*
### Increase Number of Program Completers
We will monitor and try to increase the number of doctoral graduates per year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Engages in scholarship
  - 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
  - Engages in scholarship
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We shortened the program form 66 to 60 hours, eliminated the cognate, and increased the number of research hours required.
Responsible Person/Group: All Faculty
Additional Resources: none

Revise Standards
The Association for Educational Communications and Technology is in the process of revising professional standards in the field. As our standards are based on these we will need to review and possibly revise our standards once their revision is complete.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
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?
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?
Based on assessment data and as per our action plan we shortened the Ph.D. program by six hours. We believe that this will help improve time to completion rates. Additionally, we increased the number of research hours students now complete. We believe this will enhance the research abilities of students and their research productivity. We also admitted a larger cohort of students in order to increase program size as specified in our action plan. We instituted a one hour research seminar that every student takes every semester prior to being admitted into candidacy. We will use this seminar to monitor the students’ progress more closely.

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 changed the length of the program and instituted a more cohort oriented approach. We also instituted a 1 hour research seminar students take every semester. We will monitor students through this seminar to get a finer grained analysis of their progress.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 International Business MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives Measure 1 Understanding of International Business Environment – Critical Success Factor Analysis Fails to meet standards = 1. The student cannot sufficiently distinguish critical success factors, align major resources with these factors, and construct logical cause-effect relationships. Meets standards = 2. The student can identify most critical success factors, and generally align most factors with firm's major resources. Exceeds standards = 3. The student captures almost all critical success factors, tightly aligns resources with these factors, and effectively compares the firm's position in a thorough manner. Measure 2 Understanding of International Business Environment – Identification of Viable Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot set out clear, viable alternatives for action based on critical success factors in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generate some viable alternatives that are aligned with the critical success factors in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student generates clear and well-supported viable alternatives of action that a grounded in the critical success factors of the environment. Measure 3 Understanding of International Business Environment – Impact on Competitor Actions and Reactions Under the Alternatives Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot clearly illustrate of explain how a competitive action will be responded to by rival firms in the environment. Meets standards=2. The student can generally set out the likely competitive responses to strategic moves in the environment. Exceeds standards=3. The student clearly sets out the impact of the alternatives on the competitors in the environment and incorporates it into the overall analysis and decision

SLO 5: Complete Analyses Goal 3
Case analysis or a final paper that shows how business decisions are subject to international dynamics by demonstrating functional area knowledge in the context of international environment Measure 7 Extend Functional Skills in International Operations Fails to meet standards=1. The student cannot sufficiently distinguish between domestic and international contexts. Meets standards=2. The student is able to recognize at least two functional areas and integrate them. Exceeds standards=3. The student can fully capture the implications of four or more functional area decisions.
Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/O 7: Complete Analyses Goal 4

- 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: 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. M.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 Measure 11 Extended Work Experience Monthly internship report Non Pass: The student fails to file his/her monthly internship report, or files incomplete reports with missing sections. Pass: The student files his/her monthly internship report and provides details on a) foreign business experience, b) detailed observations of the foreign culture, c) description of the tasks and responsibilities undertaken. Exceed: The student files his/her monthly internship report and provides details on and comparison of a) foreign business experience, b) cultural differences, c) how he/she integrated concepts learned in class to real-life cases. Measure 12 Extended work Experience Cumulative internship report Non Pass: The company/supervisor fails to file a cumulative internship report, 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: M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use. M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations 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. 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 MB students pass one of the three measures on their first attempt. 90% of MB students pass one of the three measures on their second attempt.
**O/O 12: Target Levels Goal 6 (M: 12, 13)**

90% of students should pass each outcome/objective with "Pass" criteria. 10% of students should pass each outcome/objective with "Exceed" criteria.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Measures (O: 1)

- M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis
- M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives
- 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)

- M.1: Critical Success Factor Situation Analysis

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

#### M 3: Measure 2 (O: 1)

- M.2: Identification of Viable Strategic Alternatives

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

#### M 4: Measure 3 (O: 1)

- M.3: Impact of Competitor Action and Reaction to Analyze the Success of Viable Alternatives

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

#### M 5: Measure 4 (O: 4)

- M.4: Explicit identification of criteria, by which the students will conduct this analysis, the dataset they will use.

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

#### M 6: Measure 5 (O: 4)

- M.5: Interpreting the data in order to arrive at recommendations

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

#### M 7: Measure 6 (O: 4)

- M.6: Delineation of country level, industry level, and from firm level variable to conduct the analysis

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

#### M 8: Measure 7 (O: 6)

- M.7: Case analysis or a final paper that shows how business decisions are subject to international dynamics by demonstrating functional area knowledge in the context of international environment

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

#### M 9: Measure 8 (O: 8)

- M.8: There are three assessment methods, either one should be met. Completion of foreign language requirement at a foreign institution Or Passing an examination approved by the GSU IIB Department Or Sit for an examiner as determined by IIB

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

#### M 10: Measure 9 (O: 10)

- M.9: Team Assessment: Ability to bring multiple views/perspective to problem solving, and demonstrate individual performance when functioning in the team.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

#### M 11: Measure 10 (O: 10)

- M.10: Faculty Assessment: Ability to drive towards consensus in the presence of diverse perspectives, and demonstrate that the student has improved the team's performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

#### M 12: Measure 11 (O: 12)

- M.11: Faculty assessment of monthly internship report

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

#### M 13: Measure 12 (O: 12)

- M.12: Faculty assessment of cumulative supervisor/company report

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Update Assessment Plan

In order to attract more students the program has been modified in terms of format and focus. We are working to develop a new assessment plan in light of these program revisions.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: In coordination with the Assistant Dean for Assessment, a committee consisting of faculty teaching in the program is engaged in the development and implementation of the assessment plan with the intention of collecting the first assessment data for this cohort in Spring 2013.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Leigh Ann Liu, Program Faculty, Tracy Widman

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 entire assessment process is being revised. The delivery format of the program was modified to be a cohort, lock-step program instead of a flexible enrollment program. Previously, the flexible format and the low enrollment in the program provided obstacles to assessing the program with any confidence in the results. The new format and a slight change in the focus of the program resulted in a multiplicative larger entering class. The new format and the slight change in focus requires modifications to our objectives, measures, and targets.

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.

Small number of students in each required course (often times only one or two students) and the absence of any individual, non-course specific program requirements combined with the random sequencing of courses by students created data collection obstacles. When data was collected, it was from such a small number of students who commonly had not attempted all course requirements that the data was rightly found to be of minimal and questionable use. Changing the program to a cohort format will ensure that students have completed the coursework in the prescribed sequence, allowing for more confidence and validity in the data collected. The larger number of students in each required course will result in our having more than one or two data points for each measure.

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2011-2012 Journalism BA

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Communication is firmly committed to the goals of academic excellence, strong research programs and international relevance set forth in the Georgia State University’s Strategic Plan. The Department encompasses multiple professional, creative and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making and understanding meaning. As an academic unit, the Department is committed to cultivating a deeper appreciation of the creative and intellectual traditions of communication by providing students with critical thinking and media literacy skills, enhancing students’ oral, written and visual communication processes through participation in cutting edge scholarly and artistic programs and collaborating with and enhancing the local, state, regional, national and global communities related to communication. Note: The Department has about 1,400 undergraduate majors, about 840 are Journalism majors.

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 1: Research and evaluate info. (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Normal 0 false false false MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communication professions in which they work
SLO 2: Understand history/role of pro communicators (M: 1)
Demonstrate an understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communications

SLO 3: Understand diversity relating to communications
Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications

SLO 5: Ethically pursuing truth, accuracy, fairness
Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity

SLO 8: Write correctly and clearly (G: 3)
Write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communication professions, audiences and purposes they serve

SLO 9: Critically evaluate own/others' work
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
Apply basic numerical and statistical concepts

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Understand history/role of pro communicators (O: 2)
Assessment based on multiple choice test drawn from standardized tests for journalism majors. See document repository
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O2: Understand history/role of pro communicators
Students are expected to pass a multiple-choice test on journalism history and roles of professionals with a minimum of 70%

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
Students achieved an average of 71.6% on multiple choice test

M 2: RESEARCH COMPETENCY (O: 1)
Students were asked to assess the veracity of two statements and provide two sources to support for their decisions
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target for O1: Research and evaluate info.
70% of Students were expected to complete assignment successfully.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
71.6% of students were able to complete assignment successfully.

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

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
align outcomes with goals
Normal 0 false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Revise/increase number of goals to align all eleven learning outcomes with a goal.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Assessment Reconfiguration
Current assessment protocols need to be revised to ensure that assessments truly reflect student achievement. The program will need to standardize assessment tools and rubrics for each outcome, as well as create systems whereby students understand the assessment process and rubrics that will be used to assess achievement.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Journalism Faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Increased analysis of secondary sources
Students should be given the opportunity to assess the validity of ‘facts’ drawn from sources by seeking to check those facts against third party data—governmental, academic or proprietary. Students should be required to rate the validity on a standard scale to be established by the class where assessment in taking place.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Journalism History and Professionalism
Students should be required to have understanding of a minimum of 20 historical events that shaped modern journalism. Students should be required to identify 10 key elements that demonstrate professionalism in the field of journalism.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relation of (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Understand history/role of pro communicators | Outcome/Objective: Understand history/role of pro communicators

Responsible Person/Group: Instructors of journalism history courses

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2011-2012 Law

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Georgia State University College of Law is committed to providing a high quality legal education in its full time and part time, day and evening programs. In order to fully prepare students for professional lives as practicing attorneys or professionals making other uses of their professional knowledge and skills, the College of Law uses a variety of teaching methodologies, including the case study method, the Socratic method, lectures, seminars, writing workshops, and clinical education. The College of Law seeks to produce students whose knowledge, performance and behavior exemplify the best of the legal profession. In addition to taking classroom courses, students are encouraged to participate in our two live-client clinics, the Tax Clinic and the HeLP Clinic. The Tax Clinic helps clients resolve issues with the IRS. The HeLP Clinic helps clients who come to the clinic with a variety of legal problems related to health problems. The Tax Clinic works closely with the IRS, while the HeLP Clinic works closely with Egleston Hospital and Atlanta Legal Aid. We also encourage students to engage in significant pro bono activities related to skills they develop in the College of Law. As of Spring 2007, 701 students are enrolled in our JD program. In the academic year 2006-07, beginning with Summer 2006 and ending in Spring 2007, 212 students earned J.D. degrees from the College of Law. Ten of those students earned joint degrees; a breakdown follows: JD/MPA - 2; JD/MBA - 7; JD/MPA - 2; Other - 1.

Since the issuance of the Carnegie Report evaluating legal education in the United States, the College of Law has been undergoing a long-term rigorous review of our entire curriculum. In year one, every member of the College faculty was required to read the entire Carnegie Report and participate in "book club" sessions held on weekend days at faculty members' homes. In year two, the Faculty Curriculum Committee was charged with studying our entire curriculum, with an eye to suggesting changes responsive to the Carnegie Report. A student representative was appointed to serve on the Committee, as well. By the end of the year, the Committee had made a series of findings and proposals, and presented them to the faculty. In year three, the faculty held a day-long retreat to consider the Committee's proposals. The retreat, attended by nearly every faculty member, revealed that there were still some wrinkles to be ironed out in the proposals. As a result, significant changes were not approved at the retreat. Nevertheless, there was a consensus that the faculty was committed to moving forward to making substantial changes in our curriculum, primarily those addressed to students' writing skills. All agree that the current required RWA I and RWA II classes do a good job of improving students' writing skills. At the same time, we recognize that many students come into law school with such deficient writing skills that we need far more than two semesters of first year courses to bring them to a "practice-ready" skill level.

**Goals**

**G 1: Basic proficiency in legal writing**

Any accredited law school graduate, whether she practices law in a traditional sense or not, needs to be an effective communicator. 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.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Basic proficiency in objective legal writing (M: 2, 2)**

The primary vehicle via which all students must demonstrate writing proficiency occurs in the required RWA I and II courses. All law students must take and pass these courses in order to graduate; indeed, they must do so in order to take any elective courses. In the Fall (RWA I), the objective is to have the students master the art of "objective writing." Students are first provided with a hypothetical legal scenario and "canned" research, already developed by the entire RWA faculty. Students must first produce a "closed memo," in which they objectively describe the issue, the relevant existing law, and their assessment of how a court would resolve the issue. The hypothetical is a "balanced" one, meaning that there are generally equally good arguments to be made that the relevant law supports one result or the other. The student must learn to identify and effectively present the different possible interpretations of the law, and the varying results at which courts might arrive. The memo is written as if a new law associate is presenting the memo to a senior law firm partner who needs to know whether or not to take on a client's case. In the course of writing their memos, students receive constant feedback, both written and oral, from their RWA instructors. The final product is graded using a highly specific grading rubric.
SLO 2: Basic proficiency in advocacy legal writing (M: 2)

In the Spring (RWA II), the objective is to have the students master the art of “advocacy writing.” This differs from RWA II in two primary respects. First, the students are no longer able to rely upon any “canned research.” For this semester, they rely almost entirely upon research they develop on their own. The research skills are those learned in both RWA I and II, as well as in Legal Bibliography, a course taught by law librarians, second, the product the students must produce for RWA II is a legal brief. A brief is a document presented to a court for the benefit of one party to a lawsuit. Thus, unlike the memos which are intended to present objective descriptions of the law, the brief 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.

Other Outcomes/Objectives

O/0 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 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 practicing lawyer. Second, we want students to become comfortable with self-editing, so that they are capable of both writing good quality papers, but also improving upon them the second or later time around. Third, we want all students to write better final exams (just as they will later write better letters, memos, briefs, and all manner of legal documents) than they would write without the intervention.
Target for O4: xxx

The goal is to have all students demonstrate their proficiency in research and legal writing at the same time. This assessment is made via the "legal writing requirement," pursuant to which each student must produce one substantial paper during law school which means specific criteria for length, sophistication and quality. For every such paper, the student must submit multiple drafts to the supervising professor before turning in the final product. No student may graduate from the College of Law without satisfying this requirement.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Managerial Science BBA
As of 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Managerial Sciences seeks to provide its undergraduate majors with a rich understanding of fundamental principals in general management, human resource management, operations management, entrepreneurship, and the concepts that underlie the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations, as well as the skills to use this understanding effective in organizations of all types.

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. In the 2011 - 2012 cycle it was revised.

Goals

G 2: Functional Expertise
All BBA graduates in the Department of Managerial Sciences will have an understanding of the principles, tools, and best practices in one of the Department's four discipline areas: Business Analysis, Entrepreneurship, Human Resources, and Operations Management.

G 3: Decision Making Skills
All BBA graduates in the Department of Managerial Sciences will be effective critical thinkers.

G 1: General Management Knowledge and Understanding
All BBA graduates in the Department of Managerial Sciences will understand the concepts that underlie the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations and the processes through which these concepts shape organizational effectiveness.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Student Performance for All Areas (G: 1, 3) (M: 1)
All BBA graduates in the Department of Managerial Sciences will be able to effectively use the concepts and tools of the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations in the identification and analysis of managerial problems, and in making recommendations for action on those problems.

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.

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

SLO 2: Student Performance in their Functional Concentration (G: 2, 3) (M: 2)
All BBA graduates in the Department of Managerial Sciences will be able to effectively use the concepts and tools in their area of concentration, Business Analysis, Entrepreneurship, Human Resource Management, or Operations Management, in a highly effective identification and analysis of problems in that area, and in making recommendations for action on those problems.

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.

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

SLO 3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making (G: 3) (M: 1, 2)
All students in any MGS undergraduate track need to develop critical thinking skills for problem solving in their track. At the time of their completion of the degree, students in their chosen functional track will show their ability to apply critical thinking techniques in addressing issues and problems that they are likely to confront as managers.

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Skills in General Management (O: 1, 3)**

The MGS BBA Rubric #1 captures the student’s skill level in performing identification, making application, doing analysis and supporting recommendations with respect to the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations in addressing problems in management. The MGS BBA Rubric #3 captures the student's general use of critical thinking aspects of their work.

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

**Target for O1: Student Performance for All Areas**

Students will average a 2.8/3.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #1. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Papers were selected from the three different 4000-level CTW classes in the Managerial Sciences Department for assessment. The average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.5, 2.5, 2.4 and 2.1 respectively. These means were below the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 1.0 was 13, 17, 17, and 23 respectively. All of these were above the goal of 10 percent or less. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 2.0 or 1.0 to be 53, 43, 43, and 63 respectively. All of these were above the goal of 40 percent or less.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making**

Students will average a 2.8/3.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #3. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Papers were selected from the three different 4000-level CTW classes in the Managerial Sciences Department for assessment. The average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.13, 2.63, 2.43 and 2.33 respectively. These means were below the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 1.0 was 10, 13, 30, and 27 respectively. All of these were above the goal of 10 percent or less except the first one, which just met the goal. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 2.0 or 1.0 to be 30, 43, 43, and 53 respectively. All of these were above the goal of 40 percent or less except the first one, which met the goal.

**M 2: Skills in the Student's Concentration (O: 2, 3)**

The MGS BBA Rubric #2 captures the student’s skill level in performing identification, making application, doing analysis and supporting recommendations with respect to the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of organizations in addressing problems in management. The MGS BBA Rubric #3 captures the student's general use of critical thinking aspects of their work.

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

**Target for O2: Student Performance in their Functional Concentration**

Students will average a 2.8/3.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #2. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Papers were selected from the three different 4000-level CTW classes in the Managerial Sciences Department for assessment. The average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.56, 2.86, 2.73 and 2.36 respectively. All but one of these means were below the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 1.0 was 17, 7, 10, and 17 respectively. One distribution met the goal of 10 percent or less and another exceeds it. Two dimensions had distributions that failed to meet the goal. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 2.0 or 1.0 to be 40, 16, 26, and 53 respectively. Two distributions exceeded the goal of 40 percent or less and another met it. Only on goal had a distribution that failed to meet the goal.

**Target for O3: Critical Thinking in Decision Making**

Students will average a 2.8/3.0 on each of the four skill dimensions of the MGS BBA Rubric #3. On no skill dimension will more than 10% of students score a 1.0, and on no skill dimension will more that 40% of students score a 2.0 or lower.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Papers were selected from the three different 4000-level CTW classes in the Managerial Sciences Department for assessment. The average scores on the four components of the rubric were 2.13, 2.63, 2.43 and 2.33 respectively. These means were below the desired average of 2.8 on each component. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 1.0 was 10, 13, 30, and 27 respectively. All of these were above the goal of 10 percent or less except the first one, which just met the goal. The distributions showed that the percentage of students on each the four components of the rubric were with a 2.0 or 1.0 to be 30, 43, 43, and 53 respectively. All of these were above the goal of 40 percent or less except the first one, which met the goal.

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.

Challenging Courses
Evaluate the rigor and challenge of the Department's threshold course for majors, MGS 4000.

Emphasis on Conclusions and Recommendations
Review of the results in the initial use of the three inter-related rubrics for the 2011-2012 cycle showed that these were the two weakest area of student performance on their critical thinking in general and their application to managerial sciences dimensions as well as their area of concentration. The new assessment committee will begin working with all instructors on ways to develop better skills in these areas across the MGS cirriculum.

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 MGS Department has totally overhauled its assessment process under its new Chair. For the 2011 – 2012 cycle new rubrics were developed to align better with the goals and learning outcomes of the department. At the end of the cycle a department level committee was formed with representative of each of the discipline areas in the MGS Department. This Committee was charged with beginning the “closing the loop” process with the 2011-2012 results. This committee will also revise the initial rubrics included in this report as needed and work to establish a culture of assessment in the department.

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 weak results in critical thinking processes in general and in the specific areas looked at in the assessment will lead to an initial thrust to emphasize drawing conclusions and making recommendations.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Department of Marketing at Georgia State University at the BBA level is to 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 organizations and to describe and analyze the qualitative and quantitative pros and cons of alternative solutions.

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 and analyze key marketing problems (G: 1) (M: 1)**
Students will be able to identify and thoroughly analyze a marketing organization's competitive situation.

**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 departmental assessment of student learning is based on case analyses, class discussion and group projects. Because group projects are no longer acceptable as measurements of performance for the purposes of this report, case analysis is used for assessing learning with respect to content and analytical skills. Class discussion (contribution) is used to assess communication skills performance. For the 2009-2010 assessment, we used scores on students' analysis of a case entitled "Nundies." The case requires students to assess the marketplace conditions for a new product entry, develop pricing strategy, conduct a break even required share analysis, critique a proposal for product introduction, recommend a go/no go decision, justify their recommendation and offer alternative courses of action (if deemed necessary). Cases are graded via a rubric comprised of several items. Student performance on each item is scored on a 100 point scale.

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

#### Target for O1: Identify and analyze key marketing problems
An average score of 85% for relevant scoring on 2 items on case analysis rubric Exhibits a solid understanding of the marketplace situation and issues facing Advance Materials. Exhibits good insight into the into the introductory program that Advanced Materials has used to market Nundies. For the 2010-2011 Reporting Period (15 Points) Thoroughly evaluates the pros and cons of the alternative proposals that have been identified for "Nundies" Employed both qualitative and quantitative information in the analysis. (15 Points) Total possible points for this item = 30 Target score average = 25.5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average score on this measure was 25.5 out of 30 possible point. This was 84.03%, of total possible points. Out of 73 usable case analyses (across three sections of MK 4900): 23 students (31.5%) were above target. (27+) 30 students (41.1%) were at target (24-26) 23 students (31.5%) were below target (< 26.0) Because nearly 3 out of 4 students were at, or above, target, we consider the goal to have been met.

#### 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 = 15 Target average score = 12.75

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
The average score on this measure was 10.89 out of 15 or 72.1% Out of 73 usable case analyses; 16 students (22%) were above target. (90%+) 12 students (16.4%) were at target. (80%-90%) 43 students (59%) were below target. (< 80%) This aspect of marketing analysis continues to be a problem. Despite the addition of a required course in Marketing Metrics. We
Increased Class Discussion

Typically, there are 5 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. 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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Out of a total of 73 usable case analyses: 20 students (27%) scored above target (90%+) 24 students (33%) scored at target (80% - 90%) 29 students (40%) scored below target (< 80%) Looking at the data, it appears that there is an association between scores on the metrics assessment and scores on the marketing recommendation assessment. This makes intuitive sense because grades on a student's marketing strategy recommendation must be supported by qualitative and quantitative data. Thus, a lack of quantitative analysis will affect the quality of one's recommendation. Since a clear majority (60%) of students have scored at or above target, and considering the link between this item and the item scoring their quantitative skills, we consider this target to have been met. As long as we assess student learning in this (linked) manner, we expect that an improvement in the former will probably lead to improvement in the latter.

Target for O4: Clear concise writing

An average score of 85/100 on 4 items that assess clear, concise writing/presentation. Total points = 30. Target score is 25.5 Organization/Coherence: Logical, coherent structure guides the reader smoothly through the document. Good use of headings, sub-headings and paragraphing (5) Writing Style: Uses precise and accurate language. Sentences are well structured, varied and writing is concise and focused. (10) Mechanics: Diligently proof-read for spelling, punctuation and usage errors (5) Data Presentation: Graphs/Tables are well composed, properly labeled, appropriate and relevant. (5)

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Out of 73 usable case analyses: 23 students (32%) scored above target. (90+%) 33 students (45%) scored at target (80%-90%) 17 students (23%) scored below target (< 80%)

We consider this target to have been met.

Target for O5: Oral communication

Average of 85/100 total points for in class case discussion.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Out of 78 usable records: 24 students (31%) scored above target (90%+) 29 students (37%) scored at target (80% - 90%) 15 students (23%) scored below target (< 80%) With the majority (68%) scoring at or above target, we consider this target to have been 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
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

Measure: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
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)

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

Measure: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
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)

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 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: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Measure: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
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)

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

Measure: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools
Outcome/Objective: Logical and feasible recommendations/solutions
Implementation Description: Requirement for Marketing Metrics has been implemented.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
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’s 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

Recommend increased emphasis on Metrics in Curriculum
We will continue to recommend a systematic emphasis on metrics throughout the undergraduate curriculum. We strongly urge all faculty to include at least basic metrics in their course planning so that students have adequate exposure to these items before entering our metrics and capstone classes. Even where students know the mechanics of calculating certain key metrics, they are not always able to see the connection between data found in a case and the proper metric to apply, nor how to employ the data in developing strategy and supporting recommendations.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Case Analysis Write Up | Outcome/Objective: Accurately Employ Marketing Metric Tools

Implementation Description: Discuss in committee. Issue a department wide memo. Include in next department meeting. Assign members of the UCC to track implementation across the curriculum
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 have made no substantive changes in the process. Beginning with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, we plan to discuss whether our target metrics for assessment are too stringent. To that end, we will seek feedback from other departments in the Robinson College of Business regarding how they set measurement goals.

**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 impact that differs from previous years. We are meeting several of our measurement targets, other than that for Marketing Metrics. Based on the results we have observed this year, we will seek feedback from the faculty on improving our students’ proficiencies in metrics. One suggestion is to incorporate at least some basic metrics into all required undergrad courses prior to students taking our Metrics and Capstone classes.
Georgia State University  
Assessment Data by Section  
2011-2012 Marketing MS  
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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 MS in Marketing Program is designed to provide the in-depth theoretical and applied training needed to excel in a leadership position in Marketing. The MS in Marketing Program extends the students' previously acquired basic business and marketing skills by developing advanced technical and analytical competency in a selected area. The MS Program, therefore, allows students to distinguish themselves as marketing specialists capable of making decisions in an increasingly complex marketing environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Target for</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 6:</td>
<td>Attention to customer satisfaction.</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7:</td>
<td>Attention to customer loyalty</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>O3: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 7 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8:</td>
<td>Student defines the necessary information</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9:</td>
<td>Student correctly interprets information collected</td>
<td>Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
<td>O4: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information</td>
<td>A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 9 Rubric to the common case assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication of Assessment Results**

Provide each faculty member who teaches classes to our MS students with the results of the assessment. These results, including the outcomes/objectives, measures and grading rubrics for each criterion, will communicate to the faculty what the program is striving to achieve. This information in combination with the assessment results will guide faculty in knowing what areas need or would benefit from additional emphasis.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Application of Segmentation Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Attention to customer loyalty | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Impact of Competition | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Solution Consistent with analysis | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions
- Measure: Student correctly interprets information collected | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Student defines the necessary information | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and Interpret Relevant Information
- Measure: Viable Target Markets/Positioning | Outcome/Objective: Identify Marketing Problems and Opportunities

- Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

**Evaluate current assessment case.**

Evaluation of the current case being used to generate the assessment material. Specifically, we need to gauge whether or not this case provides sufficient emphasis on customer loyalty and customer satisfaction.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Attention to customer satisfaction | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate a Customer/Client Orientation
- Measure: Realistic implementation plan | Outcome/Objective: Ability to Fashion Marketing Solutions

- Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
- Responsible Person/Group: MS Coordinator (Bruce Pilling)

**Update Assessment Plan**

In order to attract more students the program has been modified in terms of format and focus. We are working to develop a new assessment plan in light of these program revisions.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: In-Progress
- Priority: High

**Implementation Description:** In coordination with the Assistant Dean for Assessment, a committee consisting of faculty teaching in the
Program is engaged in the development and implementation of the assessment plan with the intention of collecting the first assessment data for this cohort in Spring 2013.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Bruce Pilling, Program Faculty, Tracy Widman

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 entire assessment process is being revised. The delivery format of the program was modified to be a cohort, lock-step program instead of a flexible enrollment program. Previously, the flexible format and the low enrollment in the program provided obstacles to assessing the program with any confidence in the results. The new format and a slight change in the focus of the program resulted in a multiplicative larger entering class. The new format and the slight change in focus requires modifications to our objectives, measures, and targets.

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 small number of students in each required course (often times only one or two students) and the absence of any individual, non-course program requirements combined with the random sequencing of courses by students created data collection obstacles. When data was collected, it was from such a small number of students who commonly had not attempted all course requirements that the data was rightly found to be of minimal and questionable use. Changing the program to a cohort format will ensure that students have completed the coursework in the prescribed sequence, allowing for more confidence and validity in the data collected. The larger number of students in each required course will result in obtaining more than one or two data points for each measure.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Mathematics & Statistics Assessment of Core

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.”

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

1 Use placement testing to help determine appropriate entry into the quantitative literacy program; and,
2 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 2011-2012 - 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 1113 in the fall
and spring, partly by Matth2211 (Fall). Many Math2211 instructors reported the inability to access the quiz result report
receiving the following error: An unexpected system exception has occurred. Most instructors were unwilling to pull the data by
hand as this is an extremely time consuming.

**Target for O2: Translation**

Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Our goal of response rates of 50% were met by Math1070, Math 1111 and 1113 in the fall and spring. Many Math 2211
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. Some
instructors also did not send the data to the coordinator.

**M 2: PostQL Success Rates (O: 1, 2)**

We can see from the tables above, the “Betty and Wilma” problem is more difficult by students than the “Ducks and Cows” problem.
The most common error is the conversion of a decimal hour to minutes. MML which gives partial credit on this problem for the correct
number of hours. But, uLearn would mark this completely wrong if either part is incorrect. The results of the “Coin Toss” problem are
positive, since probability is a prominent subject in elementary statistics Math1070. As can be seen for both Fall semester 2011 and
Spring semester 2012 the success rate increases from less than 70% on the pre QL's to above 70% on the Post QL. This gives clear
evidence that Math 1070 helps the students improve their quantitative reasoning for these types of concepts. Though probability is
not a topic covered in four of the five classes, an improvement on this question is clear at the end of the semester. Further analysis
needs to be done in order to determine if the basic problem solving skills that are developed during the class or the diagram for the
probability question that led to this improved student performance on this question for Math1070 students. It is interesting to note that
the two classes that had formal Problem Solving Activities (Math1111 and Math1113) often outperformed students in Math2211.

Though probability is not a topic covered in Math1113, it is clear to see an improvement on this question. As students complete the
Problem Solving Activities (in Math 1113) during the semester, it is possible students might have developed analytical abilities to
solve those QL problems and their performance shows an improvement at the end of the semester. From the tables we find that in
more than half cases students are reaching the success rate of 70% on these activities. In addition, we have seen improvement in the
performance of students from the Pre- to the Post QL tests. In particular, we see the improvement of Math1070 compared to that
of Math1070 last year. Since we adopted a new model, Math1101 has not reached the success rate of 70% in most cases. There is a
big room for the improvement. Our department had a target of 50% response (these are voluntary quizzes) and this target was met in
Math 1070, 1111, 1113 both semesters. If we try the same teaching model of Math111, Math1113, Math1070 for Math1101, the
success rate will reach 70%. It was hoped that using the “course coordinator” course would help these response rates, but too often
the quizzes did not “drop” down to the individual instructor classes and so had to be manually uploaded.

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

**Target for O1: Computation**

Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**Target for O2: Translation**

Targets for the QL quizzes: • 50% response rate • 70% success rate

**M 3: Class Summary Tables (O: 1, 2)**

Looking at the data by class makes it easier to determine improvement levels of the students. Student performance similar from Fall
to Spring.

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

**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
**Mission / Purpose**

Mathematics is one of the great unifying themes in our modern culture. It is a language, a science, an art form, and a tool of tremendous power. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, in its courses for both majors and non-majors, seeks to introduce students to this vast area of knowledge and to show them how mathematics can be used to solve problems. The overarching goals of any program in mathematics are that mathematics instruction should (from MAA's Source Book for College Mathematics Teaching, Schoenfeld, 1990): Provide students with a sense of the discipline of mathematics. Develop student's understanding of important concepts in core areas of mathematics. Develop student's ability to explore problem situations in a range of settings, at several levels of difficulty, and with a variety of methods. Help students to develop a mathematical point of view – perceive and represent structure and structural relationships. Help student's to develop the ability to read and use mathematical literature and reference material.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Mathematics BS**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

**G 1: Problem-solving**
Students will learn to solve practically important problems

**G 2: Knowledge of the discipline**
Students will gain broad knowledge of the discipline

**G 3: Positions in the discipline**
Students will be prepared for positions in the discipline

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 3:** Technology (G: 1) (M: 4)
The ability for the students to use technology to either solve concrete mathematical problems or present their results.

**SLO 5:** Ability to consult and understand the specialized literature in their major (G: 2) (M: 1)
The ability of the students to consult a mathematical journal and identify a scientific article that addresses their needs; the ability to summarize the main points of the work consulted.

**SLO 7:** Mathematical proofs (G: 3) (M: 2)
The ability to read, analyze, write and present mathematical proofs, which represent the foundation of mathematics.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Review project (O: 5)**
Review project designed to measure the students' ability to professionally evaluate articles published in mathematical journals in their fields.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O5: Ability to consult and understand the specialized literature in their major**
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 required to write a detailed mathematical review of that article.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Fall 2011: There were five (5) students taking the course. Each of them gave two presentations throughout the semester, including one 30-minute presentation on a chapter from the textbook and one 30-minute presentation on a published paper written by undergraduate students. Most students did well on these presentations. Almost all the students read the materials carefully before the presentations and asked the instructor if they have questions. Almost all the presentations were enthusiastically prepared and well organized. All of the five students in fall 2011 received at least 12.5 (out of 15) in these two presentations. Spring 2012: The students in Math 4991 were first given a lecture by our science librarian Kathy Werner on how to access GSU library and use JSTOR to search for literature in mathematics and statistics. The students were required to select an article from the Mathematical Monthly, write a report on the article and do a in-class presentation on the subject. The students were also taught how to write a scientific paper, which improved their ability in appreciating and understanding a mathematics paper. The student final reports were submitted first, then feedback was given to the students before their final in class presentations on the paper review. All fifteen (15) students accomplished both the written report and in class presentation beautifully. Those final presentations amply demonstrated their grasp of the topics and papers of their choice.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Fall 2011: There were three projects on solving applied problems given to students in Math 4991 in the semester. The first project asked them to write proofs. All projects have 15 as the highest possible points. Among five students, one received 15, three scored 11-13, and one got 9. The second project was a computational project that requires using Maple. All five students did very well and received 15. The last project was writing a research paper of at least 5 pages. All five students in fall 2011 did reasonably well and received scores 12.5-15. Spring 2012: The first set of lectures in Math 4991 was designed to show the students how to best state a mathematical theorem and how to write mathematical proofs. The in class examples were from number theory and geometry and algebra. The students then had to choose two theorems, one out of the textbooks and one from another 3000 or 4000 level mathematics courses, to proof as their first project. The report should include an introduction to each of the theorems before the theorem statements and proofs. Correctness and clarity were the main criteria for the proofs. After receiving the feedback on their written report, they had to present the proofs to one of their theorems in class, each having 25 minutes. All fifteen students in spring 2012 did quite well in both.
Technology Projects designed to measure the student ability to use Mathematica, Matlab, or Maple for solving mathematical problems of general interests, 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Fall 2011: Math 4991 course was taught in a classroom with computers and computer projectors. Students used technology Maple to solve mathematical problems, and used LaTeX to write papers. They used PowerPoint or LaTeX Beamer to give presentations. Among all 5 students in fall 2011, all but one student could use Maple well; all students could write in LaTeX.

Spring 2012: The students were strongly encouraged to write their first report on theorem proofs with LaTeX. 11 out of 15 students mastered LaTeX, some even showed expert level skills by programming LaTeX to generate figures. The second project was designed to teach the students to use Matlab to numerically integrate difference equations and plot trajectories and phase diagrams. All but one students (who was missing class due to family reasons) learned to use Matlab and turned in beautiful reports on the project. The students were required to use Beamer, or Keynote, or Powerpoint to make slides for their final presentation on mathematical paper reviews. Out of 15 students, more than half of the students used Beamer, and 2 used keynote (with LaTeX equation editor), and the rest used Powerpoint for their slide presentation.

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

#### Engagement of the Undergraduate Mathematics Committee

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
- **Implementation Description:** AY11-12
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2012
- **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.
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 (Key Assessments), 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

M 2: 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.

### Target for O1: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### Target for O2: Diverse Learning Environments

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### Target for O3: Dispositions

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### M 3: Portfolio 9 (O: 4)

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### Target for O4: Student Learning and Assessment

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### M 4: Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11 (O: 2, 3)

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### Target for O2: Diverse Learning Environments

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

### Target for O3: Dispositions

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2011-2012 academic cycle marks the fifth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Project Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the 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 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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 third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
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 to continue monitoring 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 to continue monitoring student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Key Assessment)</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11</td>
<td>Diverse Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Key Assessment)</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11</td>
<td>Dispositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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)
Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11 | Outcome/Objective: Diverse Learning Environments
Responsible Person/Group: Iman Chahine

Continue to monitor degree program
Continue to monitor degree program
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11 | Outcome/Objective: Dispositions
Responsible Person/Group: Iman Chahine

Continue to monitor degree program
Continue to monitor degree program
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | Outcome/Objective: Diverse Learning Environments
Responsible Person/Group: Iman Chahine

Continue to monitor degree program
Continue to monitor degree program
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Standard 3 and 8 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards
Responsible Person/Group: Iman Chahine

Continue to monitor degree program
Continue to monitor degree program
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards
Responsible Person/Group: Iman Chahine

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?

All completers met or exceeded target; no changes were made to the degree 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.

All completers met or exceeded target; no changes were made to the degree program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** How will you use your findings from this year? 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**

**2011-2012 Mathematics Education Online MEd**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the M.Ed in Mathematics Education 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 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 students.

---

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates strong content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)**

Students in M.Ed. in Mathematics Education (online program) 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 to implement successful instructional 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 M.Ed. in Mathematics Education Program (Online) 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 M.Ed. in Mathematics Education Program (Online) 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 (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Portfolio section "Content" (O: 1)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which includes a narrative and supporting 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 and the supporting artifacts.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Every student successfully met the requirement for this standard. 86% of the students satisfied the requirement and 13% exceeded the standard.

**M 2: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning" (O: 2, 3)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which includes a narrative and supporting 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 and the supporting artifacts.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the expectations of this objective. 20% of the students exceeded the expectations by achieving 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 practice.

*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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students meet the expectations of this objective by achieving 3 or 4 points out of 4 for each section of the rubric.

**M 4: Portfolio Section "Teacher Preparation and Connections" (O: 2)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which includes a narrative and supporting 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 and supporting artifacts.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students met the expectations of this objective. 20% 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 in the rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - 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 requirements. 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): 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.

- **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 MEd. in Mathematics Education (Online)
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

### 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio section "Content" | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates strong content knowledge
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
**Action Plan: Microteaching Video**

All students met this requirement. Clear instructions are 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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?

No change has been done in the assessment process. With the release of new Common Core State Standards, learning outcomes, measures and targets will be revised to align with CCSS-Math.

**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 extend 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 the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2011-2012 Mathematics Education--TEEMS MAT

(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**

**O/O 1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14)**
The teacher candidate demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge in Mathematics with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

**O/O 2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs (G: 2) (M: 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15)**
The teacher candidate possesses a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students

**O/O 3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners (G: 3) (M: 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15)**
The teacher candidate creates a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

**O/O 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn (G: 2, 3) (M: 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15)**
The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.

**O/O 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator (G: 2, 4) (M: 5, 9, 10, 16)**
The teacher candidate demonstrates an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For this standard 100% of candidates demonstrated adequate proficiency and above. Plan to maintain procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 2: INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio (O: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met and exceeded this expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 3: INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio (O: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met and exceed this expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 4: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio (O: 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the candidates have met this expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 5: INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio (O: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in live text for Standard 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates have met the overall expectations of this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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 2011-2012 - Target:** Met

90% of candidates have met this expectation.

### 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**

100% of candidates have met this expectation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Met

100% of candidates have met this expectation.

**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 2011-2012 - Target:** Met

90% of candidates have met and exceeded this expectation.

**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 2011-2012 - Target:** Met

90% of candidates have met the expectations.

### M 8: INTASC Standard 8 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 8.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
90% of candidates have met and exceeded this expectation.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
90% of candidates have met the expectations.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the candidates have met this expectation.

M 9: INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio (O: 5)
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.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of candidates have met the expectation.

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 live text 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
90% of candidates have met the expectations.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the candidates have met this expectation.

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.
setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of the candidates have met this expectation.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will pass the GACE content Tests [#022 &amp; #023]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of candidates will meet the target of successfully completing 5 content courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

**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

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met this expectation.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met the expectations.

**M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates have met this expectation.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met and exceeded this expectation.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met the expectations.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
90% of candidates have met the expectations.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the candidates have met this expectation.

M 15: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning (O: 2, 3, 4)
Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
90% of candidates have met this expectation.

Target for O3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
90% of candidates have met the expectations.

Target for O4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the candidates have met this expectation.

M 16: KA#6: Dispositions (O: 5)
Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of candidates have met the overall disposition requirements.

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: N/A
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 [Key Assessment] | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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
Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs
- Measure (Key Assessment): KA#1: Georgia Content Test | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
- Measure (Key Assessment): KA#2 Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
- Measure (Key Assessment): KA#3 Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
- Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs
- Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge | Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs | Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
- Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4: Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
- Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs | Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment): 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio | 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 5 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

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio | 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty
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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): 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

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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio | 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): 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

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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
  | Demonstrate 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

Maintain and Modify syllabi
Maintain admission criteria and advisement to candidates on taking appropriate courses and working collaboratively as a cohort. In the methods courses, we have collaborated with the mathematicians form the College of Arts and Sciences to teach a module of content.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
  Measure (Key Assessment): KA#1: Georgia Content Test | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
  Measure (Key Assessment): KA#2: Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

Implementation Description: Maintain and modify syllabi
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs

Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor activities.
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator.
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs

Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor activities.
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator.
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners

Implementation Description: Maintain and Monitor Activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

Implementation Description: Maintain and monitor activities.
Responsible Person/Group: Program Faculty and coordinator.
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): KA#4: Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

Implementation Description: Maintain and Monitor Activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator.
Additional Resources: N/A
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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#3 Planning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs

Implementation Description: Maintain and Monitor Activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): KA#6: Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

Implementation Description: Maintain and Monitor Activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

Implementation Description: Maintain and Monitor Activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

Implementation Description: Maintain and Monitor Activities
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty and coordinator
Additional Resources: N/A

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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.
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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio  
  | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn

**Implementation Description:** Maintain and Monitor Activities  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty and coordinator  
**Additional Resources:** N/A

**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 2011-2012 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio  
  | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Maintain and Monitor Activities  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty and coordinator  
**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?**
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. However, they continue to work on this with their mentor teachers and mathematics coaches.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What assistance might you need to address those areas?**
While there is still room for improvement in all areas, two areas are of immediate concern: (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. In the year 2011-2012, Mathematics educators from campus-site and school-site and a mathematician planned to collaborate in the methods courses. During this current year 2012-2013, they have collaborated in teaching modules of mathematics in the methods courses to develop pre-service and in-service teachers pedagogical content knowledge. The mathematics educator of the methods courses have also collaborated with the educator for inclusion throughout the program and methods courses in facilitating and monitoring the teachers' plan for inclusiveness of diverse learners. This implementation is working very well. We will monitor the progress and analyze the benefits at the end of the academic 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?**
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. Our plan to collaborate has been executed and this current academic year 2012-2013, implementation of the collaboration is in progress.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report?


The impact of the data obtained from assessment findings has been positive. The pedagogy courses in the program will be revised for greater impact. Though we continue to modify the courses based on feedback, the impact remains positive. As planned in the year 2011-2012 for the current year 2012-2013, mathematics educators and mathematicians collaborated in teaching a module of mathematics in the methods courses to build the pedagogical content knowledge of the teacher candidates. This implementation will be monitored, assessed, and report on next year. The progress is good so far.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 3:** How will you use your findings from this year? 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**

**2011-2012 Mathematics MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**

Department of Mathematics and Statistics’ Mission Statement Mathematics is one of the great unifying themes in our modern culture. It is a language, a science, an art form, and a tool of tremendous power. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, in its courses for both majors and nonmajors, seeks to introduce students to this vast area of knowledge and to show them how mathematics can be used to solve problems. Graduate education should deepen and intensify that knowledge, preparing its graduates to enter society as creative, scientifically literate citizens.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/O 3: Demonstrate quant reasoning and prob solving. (M: 1, 5, 8, 9, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates should demonstrate advanced quantitative reasoning and problem solving ability. This includes numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Demonstrate numerical competency. (O: 3, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate numerical, combinatorial and statistical competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M 2: See connections across fields. (O: 5)** |
| Students have the ability to see connections 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: Explain ideas to nonspecialists. (O: 2, 5)** |
| Students show the ability to explain ideas to nonspecialists. |
| Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project |

| **M 7: Develop a mathematical intuition. (O: 5)** |
| Students should develop a mathematical intuition about “how things work” in one or more field within the discipline. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

| **M 8: Draw conclusions from data. (O: 1, 3, 4)** |
| Students show the ability to draw conclusions from data, and to develop an appropriate approach to solving problems. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

| **M 9: Show the ability to solve problems. (O: 3)** |
| Students should be able to identify, analyze and solve the statistical problems. |
| Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project |

| **M 11: To formulate research hypothesis. (O: 1, 3)** |
| Students should be able to formulate research questions and/or formulate hypotheses. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

| **M 13: Know the update knowledges in statistics. (O: 5)** |
| Students should be able to apply the most up-to-date information and knowledges in the field of statistics. |
| Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other |

| **M 15: Show effective written communication. (O: 2)** |
| Students should be able to write technical reports or articles. |
| Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project |

| Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha) |
| Evaluation at thesis defense. |
For each thesis student, the thesis committee will evaluate all seven measures of achieved student program outcomes on a 5 point scale.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of final exams for each semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Thesis advisor for each student.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

Based on the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment, we redesigned the thesis/non-thesis project assessment form and encouraged the graduate faculty to provide more guidance to the students in the process of writing their theses. We noticed some improvement in the overall quality of the theses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

Mathematics/Statistics: MS Thesis/Non-thesis Assessment Fair Good Very Good Excellent Outstanding 1. Is the thesis/project clearly written and well organized? 5 2 Comments: Most of the theses/projects are clearly written and well organized. But some of them still need improvement 71% 29%. What is the main contribution of the thesis/project research? 1 4 2 Comments: 29% of the theses/projects proposed novel mathematical/statistical methods. But most of the theses/projects were based on simulation and data analysis results 14% 57% 29% 3. Does the candidate have comprehensive knowledge on the thesis/project research? 2 5 5 Comments: Majority (84%) of the students have comprehensive knowledge on the thesis/project research. 16% 42% 42% 4. Is the thesis/project technically sound and the main result justified? 5 2 Comments: Majority of the theses/projects had sound results. But some of the theses/projects results still need simulation/theoretical justifications. 71% 29% 5. Are the results in the thesis/project published or publishable in a research journal? 3 2 2 Comments: 58% of the results in theses/projects are publishable in research journals after some revisions. 42% 29% 29% 6. What is the overall quality of the thesis/project? 0 5 2 Comments: The overall quality of the theses/projects is very good to excellent. 71% 29% 7. Thesis/Project committee’s recommendation: [ Pass / Fail ] 7 passes Comments: This assessment is based on 7 observations of thesis/Project defense results in 2012 Summer semester, 2012 Spring semester and 2011 Fall semester. The observed data indicate that the overall quality of the MS theses/projects in statistics is very good to excellent. But some improvements like the publication rate are still needed. Graduate Director: Zhongshan Li and Gengsheng Qin Date: 11/4/2012

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

We believe that the assessment measures used this year mainly based on the theses/non-theses projects are quite effective. We intend to continue to use these measures to assess the quality of theses/projects. We also plan to use feedback from a core course in the MS program, Math 8200, to assess student achievement from another perspective. We expect to have continued improvement in student learning outcomes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

2011-2012 MBA/MHA and Concentration in Health Administration MBA

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 prepare a leader's level of future healthcare/business leaders. The flagship double degree MBA/MHA program is accredited by the AACSB and CAHME (The Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education), the MBA is ranked 7th and MHA is ranked 34th nationally (USNEWSWR, 2009). The mission is to prepare graduates to assume managerial and leadership positions in health sector organizations through • A leading-edge curriculum that integrates business and health care knowledge. • The engagement in scholarly inquiry related to the improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of health care services and the health care system, and • Providing and promoting professional service to the academic and health care communities.

**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.

---

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Provide CAHME specified competency areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This consists of the 4 domains, 26 competencies for CAHME.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Competency in Business skills and knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the business competency in the MBA/MHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Competency and Knowledge of the healthcare environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This competency deals with the healthcare sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Competency in Leadership knowledge and skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This competency is in the area of communication, motivation, empowerment, group participation and leadership, change management, and physician and other clinical relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Competency in professionalism knowledge/skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency in the areas of self-awareness and confidence; self-regulation and personal responsibility, honesty and integrity, public service, and life-long learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Develop real world experience in the HA field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This competency is to ensure that MBA/MHA students have real world experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: GPA of each HA student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA of each HA student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Percent CAHME educational content provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent CAHME educational content areas provided in specified courses and administrative residencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Instructors and SEIP ratings for HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Student evaluation of HA program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation of HA program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of student knowledge areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor evaluation of residency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 7: Assessment of residents by HA faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of residents by HA faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 8: Student assessment of residency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment of residency experience/learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Assurance of competencies
During AY 2010 the HA faculty will be mapping competencies based on the HLA model to specific course content of MHA and MBA courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** By the start of next academic year, a comprehensive mapping of all HLA-based competencies will be mapped to all MHA and MBA courses  
**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Pat Ketsche, Dr. Andy Sumner, and all other HA faculty/staff

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

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2011-2012 Mental Health Counseling MS**  
*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

**Mission / Purpose**
Based on our commitment to diversity, advocacy and the belief that change is possible, the mission of the 60 credit hour, Mental Health Counseling Masters of Science Program in the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services is to prepare competent professionals to deliver effective, culturally sensitive, and empirically based mental health services to diverse populations within a wide array of counseling settings.

**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.
### 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

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.

#### 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

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.

#### 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

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.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

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.

---

**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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All Mental Health Counseling students successfully completed a suicide assessment exercise in CPS 8470: Crisis Intervention.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assessment of development in practicum/internship experiences 2011-12
The Clinical Mental Health Faculty will meet every semester 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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Assessment of development in practicum/internship experiences 2012-13
The Clinical Mental Health Faculty will meet every semester 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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Development of Internship Sites and Supervisors
Program will conduct ongoing evaluation and development of practicum and internship sites and supervisors. The evaluation will be based on site visits, intern evaluations, and feedback from university supervisors. Development of onsite supervisors will be achieved through peer consultation and professional development and CEU workshops.

Monitor faculty and site supervisors
Monitor faculty reports and encourage site supervisors to conduct the department Form 1015 in 10 areas of skill implementation while encouraging site supervisors to conduct skill evaluations in the practice of counseling.

Program Evaluation and Development 2011-12
Mental Health Counseling Program faculty (core and affiliated) will meet annually to discuss the current status and future direction of the Mental Health Counseling program. Current academic and programmatic issues will be discussed and faculty will design future directions for curriculum development.

Program Evaluation and Development 2012-13
Mental Health Counseling Program faculty (core and affiliated) will meet annually to discuss the current status and future direction of the Mental Health Counseling program. Current academic and programmatic issues will be discussed and faculty will design future directions for curriculum development.

Program faculty will maintain and monitor 2011-12
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes.

Program faculty will maintain and monitor 2012-13
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Middle Level Education (LA and SS) TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty, 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, 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: 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 of pedagogical content knowledge opportunities in Language Arts and Social Studies content area planning and instruction, 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 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 (Key Assessments), 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The GACE pass percentage was 100%. GACE scores are not broken up by student name so an individual analysis of scores is not possible.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not demonstrated (1 pts) Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Subject Specific Content/Concepts 14 8 0 0 0 3.64 4 0.48 Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) 11 11 0 0 0 3.50 4 0.50 Content Connections 7 14 1 0 0 3.27 3 0.54 Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge 14 8 0 0 0 3.64 4 0.48 Subject Specific Content/Concepts GA-GSTEP-1 14 (63%) 8 (36%) Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) GA-GSTEP-1 11 (50%) 11 (50%) Content Connections GA-GSTEP-1-7 (31%) 14 (63%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge GA-GSTEP-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 14 (63%) 8 (36%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not demonstrated Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR) One student (4%) met this standard at the partially demonstrated level. All other students successfully met this objective.

**M 3: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 0 0 0 17 4.85 5 0.36 Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 0 0 0 18 4.90 5 0.30 Multiple Modes and Approaches 0 0 0 0 20 5.00 5 0.00 Technical Soundness 0 0 0 1 19 4.95 5 0.22 Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 0 0 0 19 5.00 5 0.00 Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 3 (15%) 17 (85%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 2 (10%) 18 (90%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 20 (100%) Technical Soundness 1 (5%) 19 (95%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 19 (100%) 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not demonstrated (1 pts) Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Subject Specific Content/Concepts 14 8 0 0 3.64 4 0.48 Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) 11 11 0 0 3.50 4 0.50 Content Connections 7 14 1 0 3 2.73 3 0.54 Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge 14 8 0 0 3.64 4 0.48 Subject Specific Content/Concepts/Concepts GA-GSTEP-1 14 (63%) 8 (36%) Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) GA-GSTEP-1 11 11 (50%) 11 (50%) Content Connections GA-GSTEP-1 7 17 (31%) 14 (63%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge GA-GSTEP-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 14 (63%) 8 (36%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not demonstrated Not Observed or 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 strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**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.

**M 4: Clinical Practice (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**

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 both an elementary and 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, 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 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 (recital, exhibit, science project)

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 0 0 0 1 21 4.83 5 0.47 Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 0 0 0 2 22 4.92 5 0.28 Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 0 0 1 23 4.96 5 0.20 Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 0 0 0 6 18 4.75 5 0.43 Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 0 0 1 22 4.79 5 0.82 Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 2 (8%) 21 (87%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 2 (8%) 22 (91%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 23 (95%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 6 (25%) 18 (75%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 22 (91%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary
M 5: Effects on Student Learning (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)

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: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Mean Mode Stdev

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O1 Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O2 Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Effectively</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Not Able to Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O3 Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Effectively</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Not Able to Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not Demonstrated (1 pts) Not Able to Rate (NATR) (0 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O4 Effectiveness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Effectively</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Not Able to Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Rubric: Analysis of Student Learning

Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 0 1 7 14 4.43 5.0 92 Alignment with Learning Goals 1 0 2 3 17 4.52 5.0 97 Interpretation of Data 1 0 1 3 18 4.61 5.0 92 Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning 1 0 1 4 17 4.57 5.0 92 Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 14 (60%) Alignment with Learning Goals 1 (4%) 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 17 (73%) Interpretation of Data 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 4 (17%) 17 (73%) 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Rubric: Analysis of Student Learning

Unacceptable (1 pts) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 0 1 7 14 4.43 5.0 92 Alignment with Learning Goals 1 0 2 3 17 4.52 5.0 97 Interpretation of Data 1 0 1 3 18 4.61 5.0 92 Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning 1 0 1 4 17 4.57 5.0 92 Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 14 (60%) Alignment with Learning Goals 1 (4%) 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 17 (73%) Interpretation of Data 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 4 (17%) 17 (73%) 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 used to assess students' professional dispositions.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Exceptional (4 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Marginal (2 pts) Unacceptable (1 pts) Mean Mode Stdev EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.77 4.02 POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will join in meaning; establishes rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner 17 5 0 0 3.91 4.02 EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bas...
rather than can ted or won ted 22 0 0 4.00 4.00 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 21 1 0 0 3.95 4.01 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 22 0 0 4.00 4.00 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 21 1 0 0 3.95 4.01 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-2.2 22 (100%) 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 not or won't GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 22 (100%) 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 21 (95%) 1 (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 GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 22 (100%) 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 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Exceptional Acceptable Marginal Unacceptable These are two sets of data, one from the midpoint and one from the final assessment of dispositions.

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

Strengthen Pedagogical Content Knowledge
The majority of our students demonstrated effective and/or adequate pedagogical content connections, however at least one student fell below the acceptable target level. Faculty will assess the program via a scheduled program assessment in the Fall of 2012 to assess the presence/strength of pedagogical content knowledge and connections and determine if further curriculum needs to be developed in order to promote PCK and connections within the program coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice | Outcome/Objective: Professional Community Oriented Educator
- Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge Demonstrated in Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: UATL Faculty
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?
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?

Faculty have not made significant changes in the assessment system since last year’s report. We continue to focus on using the system in place to benefit student 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 faculty are currently developing a plan to assess and make any alignment changes necessary in the curriculum and coursework with regards to state and national standards to include classroom management, technology, globalization, and universal design. We continue to respond to data collected, student feedback and academic scholarship to refine and improve our program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
n/a

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: n/a
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

n/a

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
How will you use your findings from this year? 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
2011-2012 Middle Level Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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 mathematics 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 mathematics 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 mathematics 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 students.

SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills (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: Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, parents, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

SLO 4: Impact on Student Learning (G: 3) (M: 4)
Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings
M 1: Content Knowledge Assessment (O: 1)
The measure for content knowledge is the student's score on the Content section of the Midpoint Evaluation of Student Teaching.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: Content Knowledge
100% of students will score at the level of "Adequately Demonstrated" or higher on all elements of the rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Effectively Demonstrated (4 pts) Adequately Demonstrated (3 pts) Partially Demonstrated (2 pts) Not demonstrated (1 pts) Not
Strengthening knowledge of professionalism

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.

Target for O2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target was met with only one student (2%) not meeting the "acceptable" rating. For the Design for Instructions assignment, the target was met, although there were 2 (4%) students with scores below the "acceptable" rating. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Rubrics, the target was met as only 1.6% of candidate ratings suggest a need for improvement. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

M 3: Professional Dispositions (O: 3)

The measure for professional dispositions is the student's score on the Dispositions Rubric at the End of Student Teaching.

Target for O3: Professional Dispositions

95% of candidates will score at the level of "Acceptable" or higher on all elements of the rubric at both the midpoint and endpoint disposition assessments.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

On the midpoint dispositions rubric 100% of candidates demonstrated an "acceptable" or "exceptional" rating on all elements of the rubric. On the endpoint dispositions rubric 96% of candidates demonstrated an "acceptable" or "exceptional" rating on all elements of the rubric. This finding indicates that our candidates possess the dispositions needed to have empathy, positive view of others, positive view of self, authenticity, and meaningful purpose/vision. We will continue to review dispositions due to their impact on student achievement.

M 4: Impact on Student Learning (O: 4)

The measure for impact on student learning is the Narrative concerning Impact on Student Learning in the student's e-portfolio.

Target for O4: Impact on Student Learning

100% of students will score at the level of "Acceptable" or higher on all elements of the rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

This target was partially met with 93% of students scoring at the "acceptable" or higher rating.

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

Additional support in professionalism

Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty; field experiences director
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Strengthening knowledge of professionalism

While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between...
Impact on Student Learning

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.

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

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
Projected Completion Date: 09/2012

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

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

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.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator in conjunction with methods course instructors

Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Impact on Student Learning

Our goal was to ensure that 100% of teacher candidates score at the "acceptable" rate on their impact on student learning. Overall in the program, we had 93% of students to score at the "acceptable" rate. Two students (7%) scored at the "developing" rate. We will work to implement an action plan that differentiates instruction for teacher candidates who rate at the "developing" and below category.
Implementation Description: The TEEMS Team (coordinator, professors, university supervisors, and mentor teachers) will work closely together to monitor students' performance in monitoring middle grades students' performance in course work and Practicum and will provide more directive support for those candidates who do not meet early 'acceptable' ratings.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

Responsible Person/Group: Coordinator of the TEEMS Math/Science Program, TEEMS Math/Science Course Instructors, University Supervisors, and Mentor Teachers

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?
Our major CTW accomplishments this year were improving in content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge, and professional dispositions. Last year, we worked on meeting the goals in content knowledge. We were successful in this 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?
Students improved in critical thinking from entry level to exit class. This was demonstrated through their midpoint and final evaluations.

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 program is still in need of development in the area of "impact on student learning." We are working towards an integrative approach with this area.

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 CTW on our program has been the data analysis/and reflection that allows us to make our program even 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?
We have changed the curricular map and targets to better support student 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.
We have made changes to the content within classes. The data has helped us to notice gaps that need further addressing. An example of these changes is the implementation of classroom management within each course. As a unit, we are mapping out what aspect of classroom management should be discussed in which class. This curricular mapping will be beneficial to students and will help with program alignment.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
We used the previous year's assessment to note the changes that we should make in content knowledge. We also used the data to determine what aspects of the program we should keep.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
We have learned that we have been effective in training new teachers, but that there is always room for improvement. We are specifically working on training the new teachers on the impact that they have on student learning.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will use the data to make programmatic changes and updates to how we teach students about their impact on student learning. Course offerings and practicum experiences will focus on this element. We expect that all students will meet the goals for this area in the upcoming year.

Georgia State University
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Mission / Purpose
The mission of the BSE program in Middle Level Education is to prepare teachers to teach in two of the following areas in grades 4-8: Reading, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.

**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 Informed 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.

**SLO 5: Candidates Demonstrate a Positive Impact on Student Learning. (G: 3) (M: 5)**
Candidates use a variety of teaching methods and assessment tools to measure and reflect up their impact on their students’ learning.

**Measures (Key Assessments), 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Of the 47 students assessed, 16 students (35%) scored at the level of 3 (adequately demonstrated) and 31 students (65%) scored at the level of 4 (effectively demonstrated). Thus, 100% of the students scored at the level of 3 or higher on this measure.

**M 2: Teacher Work Sample Rubric (O: 2)**
Candidates demonstrate their ability to plan, implement, and reflect upon a wide range of instructional methods through the Teacher Work Sample project. They are evaluated via the Teacher Work Sample 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 "3" (Acceptable) or higher on all rubric components related to planning; at least 80% with a score of "4" (Proficient) or higher; and at least 70% with a score of "5" (Exemplary) or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
See attached documents. 100% of the students scored a "3" or higher in the areas of contextual factors, and learning goals. 99% of the students scored a "3" or higher in assessment, design for instruction, and planning. We did not meet our target.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

98% of the students scored a "3" or acceptable. 2% of all students scored a "1" or unacceptable.

### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of students scored at a level of acceptable or higher on all elements. At least 78% scored at a level of "Exceptional" or higher.

### M 5: Teacher Work Sample - Analysis of Student Learning (O: 5)

Students document the effects of their teaching on student learning through their work on the Teacher Work Sample project. A rubric is used to assess the students' work.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

#### Target for O5: Candidates Demonstrate a Positive Impact on Student Learning.

100% of students will score at the level of Acceptable or higher on all elements of the rubric. At least 90% will score at the level of Proficient or higher on all elements. At least 75% will score at the level of Exemplary or higher on all elements.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

See attached document. Only 90% of students scored at a level of Acceptable or higher. In reviewing the results for the 2011-2012 academic year, we realized that a target of 100% for this large a group may be unrealistic. We are adjusting our target to 95% at the level of acceptable.

### 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure (Key Assessment)**: Teacher Work Sample - Analysis of Student Learning
- **Outcome/Objective**: Candidates Demonstrate a Positive Impact on Student Learning.

**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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure (Key Assessment)**: Teacher Work Sample 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): 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.

**95% is the level of acceptable**
In reviewing the results for the 2011-2012 academic year, we realized that a target of 100% for this large a group may be unrealistic. We are adjusting our target to 95% at the level of acceptable.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Teacher Work Sample Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Plan, Implement, and Reflect on Instruction Methods

**95% of students will score a “3” or acceptable.**
The current number of 100% is unrealistic because of our growing BSE student population. 95% is a more realistic expectation.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Teaching Evaluation Rubrics | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Create Meaningful Learning Experiences

**Increase Students’ Impact on Student Learning**
We will focus more in our methods courses on ways to help our students aware of ways to increase and measure student learning.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Teacher Work Sample - Analysis of Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Demonstrate a Positive Impact on Student Learning.

**Revise target**
In reviewing the results for the 2011-2012 academic year, we realized that a target of 100% for this large a group may be unrealistic. We are adjusting our target to 95% at the level of acceptable.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Teacher Work Sample - Analysis of Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Demonstrate a Positive Impact on Student Learning.
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty
Additional Resources: None

**Revise target**
We will revise target.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure (Key Assessment): Teacher Work Sample - Analysis of Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Candidates Demonstrate a Positive Impact on Student Learning.

**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 assessment vehicle currently used for students is the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). The TWS contains the following components: 1. contextual factors, 2. learning goals, 3. assessment plan, 4. design for instruction, 5. instructional decision making, 6. analysis of student learning, and 7. reflection and self-evaluation. The Teacher Work Sample Project was developed by The Renaissance TWS Group, a consortium of teacher preparation institutions that are using teacher work samples as a tool for instruction and performance assessment of teacher candidates and are committed to promotion and development of work samples through sharing of information, materials, expertise, and research.

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.
Overall, our students are performing well in all categories of Assessment Planning, Contextual Factors, Design for Instruction, and Learning Goals. Most of them have scored beyond just a "3" or acceptable. Here are the specifics:
1. Assessment Plan: 80% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "alignment and learning." 2. Contextual Factors: 80% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "knowledge of characteristics of students." 3. Design for Instruction: 80% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "lesson and unit structure." 4. Learning Goals: 82% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "use of variety of instruction." 5. Resources and Use of Technology: 88% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "resources and use of technology." 6. Learning Goals: 92% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "significance, challenge and variety." 7. Alignment with Local State and National Standards: 93% of our students scored a "5" or exemplary in "alignment with local state and national standards." We expect to see these numbers increase further as the B.S.E. programs continue to enhance instruction and procedures.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? 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 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 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. 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 interviews would 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 out of total (as posted 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 1. Results by language for Spring 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of students interviewed</th>
<th>Percentage of interviewed students</th>
<th>Average Four—range average</th>
<th>Number and percentage that needs improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>16/91</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.1 Middle (GOOD)</td>
<td>4/91 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8.5 Middle (GOOD)</td>
<td>2/28 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>13/180</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>OPTIMAL 0/180 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Results by language and by Spanish level for Spring 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of students interviewed</th>
<th>Percentage of students interviewed</th>
<th>Average Four—range average</th>
<th>Number and percentage that needs improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2001 16/51</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>8.1 Middle (GOOD)</td>
<td>4/51 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2001 7/29</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>8.5 Middle (GOOD)</td>
<td>2/29 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2001 39/168</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>8.7 Middle (GOOD)</td>
<td>10/168 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2002 23/116</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>8.9 Middle (GOOD)</td>
<td>3/116 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

**Target for O1: ORAL COMMUNICATION**

MCL wants to see 75% of its students score x and at least 30% of its students score x +Y

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Our findings are attached, see spreadsheet. We found that X is true.
### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Lower Division Spanish instructors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Oral Communication

The Department of Modern and Classical Languages (MCL herebyforth) 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.

2012 Update (By Oscar Moreno) In 2009, the Learning Outcome Committee determined that all three languages --French, German, and Spanish-- would adopt a similar assessment tool and that the results would be shared. In 2010, 2011, and 2012, all three languages have followed the same data collection guidelines and a single coordinator (Dr. Oscar Moreno, the group leader) is now charged with storing and analyzing the data. The group leader, assisted by the other two language coordinators, will produce a final report --covering 2010 to 2012-- to be submitted in March 2013 to the Department's Learning Outcome Committee.

<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>Meetings will start promptly during the Spring 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Oscar Moreno. assisted by Dr. Solange Bonnet (French) and Dr. Robin Huff (German).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A faculty meeting for review of findings and planning a course of action

During Fall 2011 a meeting with faculty from all languages will take place (date to be determined) in order to review and discuss the results and findings. The WEAVE reporter, also the LOA group leader, will then suggest to focus on the following: 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.

<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>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>12/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Oscar H. Moreno, MCL Undergraduate Studies Committee with assistance from MCL’s LAFL (Linguistics Applied to Foreign Languages), a newly formed group of MCL faculty members with interest and expertise in the teaching and learning/acquisition of foreign/second languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spring 2013 follow-up

At the end of Fall 2011, it was determined that the sample of student interviews --for the assessment of oral communication-- would be increased up to an ideal 25% of the target population and that Span 2002 would add for confirmation of the tendencies observed in Span 2001 until then: the interviews conducted until that semester showed that all three programs--French, German, and Spanish--were effective, with an average in all three languages of 'GOOD performance', to mean that, on average, the students served by these programs were indeed making adequate progress toward developing oral/conversational skills in the target language and that they were acquiring knowledge about the language and its related culture(s). It was also observed, however, that the assessment tool and the data collection procedure (mostly based on students volunteering for the interviews) might need improvement. In Spring and Fall 2012 improvement to the data collection procedure (reaching an ideal 25% of the student population) were implemented. The data collected during the 2012 academic year is currently being collected (in Spring 12 and Fall 12) and will be reviewed in Spring 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>The data from the French, German, and Spanish interviews in 2012 will be reviewed at a meeting with all three language coordinators and the members of the Undergraduate Education Committee in Spring 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Weave reporter and Spanish Coordinator Dr. Oscar Moreno, with the assistance of Dr. Solange Bonnet, French Coordinator, and Dr. Robin Huff, German 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?

In 2011, it was determined that, in general, the three programs involved --French, German, and Spanish-- were meeting the faculty expectations (i.e. allowing students to be able to use the language functionally as they faced native speakers of the target language or highly proficient speakers of the target language. However, a more representative sample of students appeared to be needed. Therefore, in 2012, an effort was made to collect information for about 25% of the student population in each language. The data for Spring and the Fall 2012 will be compared in Spring 2013 and the concerns about the assessment tool and data collection will then be addressed.

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 general conclusion out of the results obtained in 2010 and 2011 is that all three language programs --French, German, and French-- are indeed meeting the expectation of most students served with a functional command of the target language by the end of the Lower Division sequence. However, due to the data collection method, the reporting faculty also suspected that these results may have been somewhat inflated. In 2012, an effort was then made to collect information for about 25% of their student population per language. The data collection for 2012 is now in progress. In Spring 2013, the MCL faculty will review the data and, if the initial concerns are confirmed, some other form of assessment will be introduced that can supplement the current oral interview at the end of each semester. In all, as said, it may be stated at this time that all three languages are indeed working towards functional proficiency and that the program students are indeed largely reaching, albeit at a basic level, an ability to communicate in the target language after three semesters. Importantly, this is particularly believed to be the case when students take the Lower Division courses in a consecutive manner. A form of supplementary assessment will also have to include a record of student history in the program. If the assumption that consecutive semesters are in fact more effective than free registration (i.e. registering for the foreign language requirement courses whenever a student feels it necessary or appropriate), the Lower Division programs in French, German, and Spanish will need to ensure that consecutive semesters are promoted and that students are advised in that direction.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Multiple and Severe Disabilities MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the five concentrations in Multiple and Severe Disabilities (Autism, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education, Moderate, Severe, and Profound Intellectual Disabilities, 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 its respective areas (e.g., Special Education: General Curriculum, Special Education: Adapted Curriculum, Physical and Health Disabilities, Deaf/Hard of Hearing).

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 Exception 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% or more of students will score at or above a 3 out of 4 on the teaching sequence rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

With an N of 31 students, 84% scored at or above a 3 out of a 4 on the teaching sequence rubric. The range was 2 to 4. The mean score was 3.48.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

With an n of 28 students, 100% scored at or above a 3 out of a 4 on the pupil change project rubric. The range was 3.5 to 4. The mean score was 3.88.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

With an n of 29 students, 100% scored at or above a 3 out of 4 on the performance rubric. The range was 3.29 – 4. The mean score was 3.88.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

With an n of 29 students (and several students having done 2 Lesson Plans), 81 % scored at or above a 3 out of a 4 on the lesson plan. The range was 2 – 4. The mean score was 3.9
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**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:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Teaching Sequence
  - Outcome/Objective: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.
- **Implementation Description:** In progress
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **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):**
- **Implementation Description:** Some changes have occurred, but discussion is ongoing
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSD and BLD faculty

**Current data collection**
Most of the MSD students had no difficulty effectively planning for instruction and in those few instances that students had difficulty with a few indicators, remediation was given and students were then able to meet criteria. This indicator was scored as partially met due to the difficulty a few students had initially. Faculty will examine those areas and stress them more in their coursework. However, questions came up regarding how WEAVE data utilizes the Livetext data which is part of the NCATE and PAAR reports. MSD program faculty plan on examining the use of other modalities to capture student data. BLD is trying a new system based on class performance, grades, and comprehensive exams. MSD will examine effectiveness of BLD system and determine if this change would benefit MSD and WEAVE reporting data (to provide additional data, rather than repeating data in other reports).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Lesson Plan
  - Outcome/Objective: Effectively plans for instruction.
- **Implementation Description:** MSD faculty to meet to discuss results and current data system
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSD faculty

**Teaching sequence rubric and student eval**
The students who did not achieve a 3 out of 4 or higher, only missed certain parts of the assessment rubric. MSD will further examine the student performance and rubric to determine if changes need to be made in the way students are evaluated or in teaching sequence content. This will be part of the discussion on the way data is examined and utilized to determine if a change is needed to enrich the acquired data and provide additional information (rather than having repetition between data NCATE, PAAR, WEAVE).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Teaching Sequence
  - Outcome/Objective: Teacher demonstrates content pedagogy.
- **Implementation Description:** MSD will meet and examine student performance and evaluation measure
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MSD faculty

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Music Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that serves the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellence for all students.

**Goals**

**G 1: Humanities/Fine Arts Goal**
Students will effectively analyze the meanings of texts and/or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.
## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Evaluation of Performance (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will be able to provide critical evaluation of a specific musical performance including expression of musical insight into the pieces played.

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

## 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 assessed on, among other items, grammar and sentence structure, accuracy of musical terminology, and musical insight. Please refer to the uploaded rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O1: Evaluation of Performance
We expect 80% of the students enrolled in Music, Society and Culture to receive an acceptable rubric score on this single evaluation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
A sample of 55 students were chosen from a spring section of the course. Of the 55, 6 scored a 3 or 4 (unacceptable) on the rubric and 39 scored a 1 or 2 (acceptable). Thus 89% received an acceptable score.

## 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  
**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty who teach core

### Continued Refinement of Rubric
The instructors of Music, Society and Culture are being encouraged to refine the rubric to cover more points. As the target for this measure is being met consistently, we may consider adding a new or different measure in future cycles.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  Measure: Music Society and Culture | Outcome/Objective: Evaluation of Performance

**Implementation Description:** Meetings with the faculty who teach this course and the WEAVE Assessment Coordinator  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lara Dahl, Javier Albo  
**Additional Resources:** None at this time.

---

### Georgia State University

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Music Bachelors**  
(As of: 12/13/2016 04:41 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

### Mission / Purpose
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive, rigorous, and innovative academic program that is consistent with the urban context and mission of Georgia State University and to serve the pursuit of artistic, professional, and scholarly excellent through experiences of lasting value to all stakeholders.

### Goals

**G 1: Common Body of Knowledge**
All students will possess a common body of knowledge in music.

**G 2: Essential Competencies, Experiences and Opportunities**
All students will possess a set of essential competencies and will receive essential experiences and opportunities.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Performance (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students exhibit musical performance ability that demonstrates (1) their technical skills on a major instrument or voice, an understanding of repertory, (2) the ability to sight read with fluency, (3) keyboard competency and (4) growth in artistry through regular ensemble experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Musicianship Skills and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire (1) an understanding of the common elements and organizational patterns of music, (2) sufficient understanding of and capability with musical forms, processes, and structures to use this knowledge, and (3) the ability to place music in historical, cultural, and stylistic contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Composition (G: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: History and Repertory (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must acquire basic knowledge of music history and repertoires through the present time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Conducting (G: 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must be a competent conductor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Improvisation (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must acquire the skills to improvise at a rudimentary level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Conducting Proficiency (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student possesses conducting knowledge and proficiency as evidenced by results of the final conducting examination in Basic Conducting Class (MUS 2490).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Conducting**

We would expect that 80% of students to receive a rubric assessment of Outstanding on their last conducting assessment of the semester. Please refer to attached rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

16 students were enrolled in the course for Summer 2012. Of the 16, 9 received a rubric score of Outstanding on this assessment. This represents 56% of the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Repertoire Analysis (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs are reviewed for diversity of genres, eras, composers, and styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Piano Proficiency (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate piano proficiency through the rigorous piano proficiency examination given at the end of the piano sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Basic Improvisation Performance (O: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 score of 73 or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O6: Improvisation**

Each student in the Basic Improvisation course is required to do an individual improvisation project that is typically due three to four weeks after the midpoint of the semester. The instructor has developed a rubric for scoring this project. Our target is that 100% of the students will receive a 1 or 2.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the Spring 2012 semester 17 students were enrolled. Of those 14 received a 1, 1 received a 2 and 2 received a 4. We did not meet our target of 100% of students receiving a 1.

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

Periodic meetings will be held of the humanities (core) music faculty during the fall semester of 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
- 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
- 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
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Ensemble conductors, area coordinators, applied instructors
- Additional Resources: None
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Realignment of Goals

This year we modified our Outcomes to line up with those set by the National Association of Schools of Music, our accrediting agency. We therefore added new Outcomes for which we have not yet determined measures. We will create new measures and use them for the next cycle.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 07/2013
- Responsible Person/Group: Robert Ambrose
- Additional Resources: None

Georgia State University

Assessment Data by Section

2011-2012 Music Masters

As of: 12/13/2016 04:41 PM EST

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

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Georgia State University School of Music is to preserve, promote, and advance humanity’s rich and expanding tradition of artistic music-making through performance, composition, education, and research in accordance with the urban and global initiatives of the University.

Goals

G 2: Research Goal

Students will be inquisitive musicians who use primary and secondary sources to inform their music making and scholarship.

G 1: Performance Goal
Students will be emerging artists who perform with technical and expressive facility.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style (M: 1)**

Demonstrates advanced levels of repertoire knowledge, technique, artistry, and style appropriate to a diverse representation of composers, historical eras, performance practices, and interpretive guidelines

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

**SLO 2: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge (M: 2)**

Demonstrates research skills in music and advanced understanding of the literature and repertoire appropriate for his or her concentration

Relevant Associations: National Association of Schools of Music National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education GA Professional Standards Commission

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Recital Jury (O: 1)

Students present their recital program before a jury for approval to perform. Students are judged on technical and expressive facility. Data are from jury reports from students registered for MUS 8950 in Spring Semester.

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

**Target for O1: Repertoire, technique, artistry, style**

85% of students achieve satisfactory proficiency to be approved for their final recital on the first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

12 of 14 (86%) of students were approved for their final recital on the first attempt.

#### M 2: Bibliography Project (O: 2)

Students must present an exhaustive bibliography on a topic relevant to their concentration as part of MUS 8000 (Introduction to Graduate Studies). There are two such projects during the semester: the first is instructor guided, the second is independent. Data comes from assessments of the second project by students enrolled in MUS 8000 (Fall Semester).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Research and literature/repertoire knowledge**

85% of students receive a 3 or 4 on the project. Scale: 1. Not adequate. 2. Adequate, but below expectations. 3. Meets expectations. 4. Exceeds expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

40 of 43 students (96%) obtained a 3 or 4 on the project.

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

**Review Research Objectives and Measures**

Review the Research Objective and Measures for appropriateness.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies/Area Coordinators of Music History and Music Theory

**Revise Rubrics**

Revise current rubrics for recital jury.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Director of Graduate Studies/Area Coordinators

**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?

Not Relevant to Masters 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 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?

The assessment rubric has been modified to allow us to account not just for students who pass or fail the project or event being measured, but to subdivide the category of "pass" into those whose performance was 1) acceptable, but below expectations; 2) appropriate (met expectations); or 3) exceptional (exceeding expectations). We will provide data on the percentage of students who met or exceeded expectations. We have revised the outcomes and targets accordingly. We plan to reconsider the project of the Research Outcome, possibly replacing it with a project that better shows how students are prepared to conduct and evaluate research.

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 plan to track the new outcomes for another year before making specific recommendations about the educational program.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Neuroscience PhD
As of: 12/13/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the neuroscience doctoral program in the Neuroscience Institute at Georgia State University is to promote research and education in the set of disciplines that have a common interest in understanding the structure and function of the nervous systems of animals, including humans. The objective of the degree program is to provide comprehensive training in the neurosciences and professional development. This training is meant to prepare students for a variety of career paths involving research, teaching, and/or science advocacy.

Goals

G 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content
Develop expertise with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings in neuroscience and in their research specialty area.

G 2: Critical Thinking Skills
Use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and the scientific approach.

G 3: Communication and Collaboration
Be able to communicate scientific information and work effectively with peers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Neuroscience Theory and Content (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Apply knowledge from other scientific disciplines to the understanding of fundamental neuroscience principles. Use concepts in neuroscience to describe, explain, and evaluate phenomena and to generate new ideas.

SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Ask scientific questions and construct reasonable hypotheses. Establish a research focus that identifies and builds on primary interests in neuroscience. Practice scientific method and understand its limitations. Perform laboratory skills consistent with the requirements of their field. Use statistical reasoning routinely for evaluating research and develop appropriate applications of statistics and other analytical methods. Seek the most precise and parsimonious explanation. Use skepticism consistently as an evaluative tool. Formulate and test alternative explanations and models on the basis of evidence. Evaluate relevant content from a broader range of available resources; show refined and flexible use of published research. Create compelling arguments with attention to subtle meaning of content; anticipate and defend against criticism, adapt arguments for wide range of audiences.

SLO 3: Communication and Collaboration (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Communicate effectively in oral and written forms. Read and demonstrate an understanding of scientific literature. Critique and
analyze claims of others in a scientific context. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific terminology. Work effectively in group situations.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Qualifying Exam (O: 1, 2, 3)

Students write a research grant application and defend it orally to their committee members. Students are evaluated by their examination committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Four students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all four passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Four students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all four passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students pass their Qualifying Exam the first time they take it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Four students took the Qualifying Exam during this period and all four passed on their first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the Qualifying Exam.

#### M 2: Dissertation Proposal (O: 1, 2, 3)

Students write and orally defend a comprehensive plan of future research that details the rationale, methods, and procedures for the proposed dissertation research. Students are evaluated by the dissertation committee members using a form designed for that purpose (Milestone Evaluation Form- see Document Repository).

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Three students proposed a dissertation for the first time and all three were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Three students proposed a dissertation for the first time and all three were approved. Therefore, 100% of students had their proposals approved the first time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students have their dissertation proposal approved the first time they propose it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Three students proposed a dissertation for the first time and all three 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Neuroscience Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Four students defended a dissertation for the first time and all four were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their
dissertation defenses the first time.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Four students defended a dissertation for the first time and all four were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration**
Greater than 95% of students pass their dissertation defense the first time they defend.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Four students defended a dissertation for the first time and all four were approved. Therefore, 100% of students passed their dissertation defenses the first time.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 35 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 2.8% of the students.

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 35 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 2.8% of the students.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration**
The annual review indicates that there are serious concerns with less than 5% of the students.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
There were serious concerns with one out of 35 students. Therefore, there were concerns with only 2.8% of the students.

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

**No actions planned due to infancy of the graduate program**
This program was approved by the Board of Regents in November, 2009 and the first cohort of students was admitted in January, 2010. As this program is still new, no actions are planned at this time.

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

**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.
### 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)**
85% of students enrolled in NURS3610 will achieve a score of 74% or better according to the rubric on an evidence based practice paper. 85% of students enrolled in NURS3710 will achieve a satisfactory score according to the guidelines on an evidence based practice exercise on the first attempt.


### 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. 85% of US students scoring less than national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment will show an improvement on the exit Ctitical Thinking Assessment


**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 Reserarch 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.

grounded in the translation of current evidence into one's practice.

### O/O 6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (G: 3) (M: 7)

Graduates of the pre-licensure program will successfully complete the NCLEX with a first time pass rate of 85% or better.

**Relevant Associations:** The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential IX: Baccalaureate Generalist Nursing Practice: The baccalaureate-graduate nurse is prepared to practice with patients, including individuals, families, groups, communities and populations across the lifespan and across the continuum of healthcare environments.

### 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).

**Relevant Associations:** The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice, (2008). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing. Essential IX: Baccalaureate Generalist Nursing Practice: The baccalaureate-graduate nurse is prepared to practice with patients, including individuals, families, groups, communities and populations across the lifespan and across the continuum of healthcare environments.

### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

See CTW report submitted by CTW ambassador.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

See report filed by CTW ambassador.

#### M 3: Standardized critical thinking exam (O: 2)

Students in the nursing program will complete a standardized critical thinking exam in their first semester and the last semester of the nursing program. 85% of UG students scoring less than national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment will show an improvement on the exit Critical Thinking Assessment

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

For the summer 2011, 26 students took the critical thinking exam. 12 students exceeded the national average (46.15%). For fall 2011, 44 students took the critical thinking exam. 38 students exceeded the national average (86%). For spring 2012, 67 students took the critical thinking exam. 42 students exceeded the national average (62.7%). for the cycle, 137 students took the critical thinking exam. 92 exceeded the national average (67.15%)

#### M 4: Evidence based practice project (O: 3)

85% of students enrolled in NURS3610 will achieve a score of 74% or better according to the rubrick on an evidence based practice paper. 85% of students enrolled in NURS3710 will achieve a satisfactory score according to the guidelines on an evidence based practice exercise on the first attempt.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

For summer 2011, 29/33 (87%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the evidence based paper rubrick. For fall
For summer 2011, 29/33 (87%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the evidence based paper rubric. For fall 2011, 30/35 (85.7%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the evidence based paper rubric. For spring 2012, 38/41 (92.7%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the evidence based paper rubric. For the cycle, 97/109 (88.9%) achieved a score of 74% or better on the evidence based paper rubric.

M 5: Research Article Critique (O: 4)
All students completing NURS3500 will complete a research article critique as part of the course work in NURS 3500 and at least 90% will obtain a minimum of 74% of the possible points on the rubric.

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

Target for O4: Research Article Critique
90% of students completing NURS3500 will achieve a score of 74% or better on a research article critique.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For summer 2011, 11/13 (85%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research critique. For fall 2011, 53/53 (100%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research critique. For spring, 68/70 (97%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the research critique. For the cycle, 132/136 (97.1%) students achieved a score of 74% or better on the research critique.

M 6: Literature Search Activity Paper (O: 5)
All students enrolled in NURS 3500 will complete a literature search activity paper on a topic related to nursing. 90% of students will obtain at least 74% of the possible points the literature search activity as measured by the rubric.

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

Target for O5: Literature Search Activity
90% of students achieve at least the minimum score of 74% on the literature search activity paper.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For summer 2011, 13/13 (100%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the literature search activity. For fall 2011, 53/53 (100%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the literature search activity. For spring 2012, 68/70 (97%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the literature search activity. For the cycle, 134/136 (98.5%) students achieved at least a score of 74% on the literature search activity.

M 7: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (O: 6)
85% of the graduates of the undergraduate nursing program who take the NCLEX will pass on the first attempt.

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

Target for O6: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate
85% of graduating nursing students will pass the NCLEX on the first attempt.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For summer 2011, 24/26 (92.3%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt. For fall 2011, 44/45 (97.8%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt. For spring 2012, 62/65 (95.3%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt. For the cycle, 130/136 (95.6%) of graduates passed the NCLEX exam on their first attempt.

M 8: Exit Survey (O: 7)
85% of the graduating seniors who complete the exit survey will indicate that they felt satisfactorily to excellently prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O7: Exit Survey
85% of the graduating seniors who complete the exit survey will indicate that they felt satisfactorily to excellently prepared to "integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of individuals, families, groups, or the community" (program outcome).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For summer 2011, 100% of the graduating seniors felt they were satisfactorily prepared or better, 80.1% of the graduating seniors indicated they felt good or better and 38% indicated they were excellently prepared. For fall 2011, 95% of the graduating seniors indicated they felt satisfactorily prepared, 83.7% indicated they felt good or better, and 25% indicated they were excellently prepared. For spring 2012, 97.7% indicated they were satisfactorily prepared, 77% indicated they felt good or better, and 9% indicated they were excellently prepared. For the cycle, 97.3% indicated they were satisfactorily to excellently prepared to integrate knowledge of self, science, and the humanities when providing nursing care of 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 the 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  
**Implementation Description:** This is the end of the next academic year.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON  
**Additional Resources:** None at this time

---

**CTW NURS 2080**

NURS 2080 will develop clearer objectives related to this writing project. Consistent graders for each student's paper will be initiated Fall 2009. All graders will meet in the beginning of the semester to discuss issues noted the previous semester. One instructor will review all papers for a consistent numeric grade.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** By the end of Fall 2009 semester, these changes will be in place.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty assigned to NURS 2080  
**Additional Resources:** None at this time

---

**CTW NURS 4600**

We will continue to monitor the CTW assignment in NURS 4600 for continued achievement of target goal.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Continue to monitor for this academic year.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Nursing faculty assigned to teach NURS 4600  
**Additional Resources:** None at this time

---

**Evidence Based Practice**

The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON with guidance from the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) will continue to monitor this measure. Course instructors in NURS 3610 and NURS 3710 will be instructed to continue to require this writing assignment. Bases on the reasons the course instructor gave for student's failure the following areas will be studied: 1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment 2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment. 3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly. 4. Students do not comply with the APA format 5. English is not the student's primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee along with input from the UPC  
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The UPC  
**Additional Resources:** None at this time

---

**Exit Survey**

This question on the exit survey will be worded when the survey is revised the next time. It is the opinion of The Program Evaluation...
and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON that the graduates may not understand the intent of this question on the current survey. The committee will evaluate if the question(s) need clarification, or if there are too many variables, and the graduates may not understand what is being asked. Additionally by grouping the variables, if a student feels lacking on one variable, but not the others, they may answer negatively because of the one area lacking, and the other areas may not be lacking. The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will assess the questionnaire.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Exit Survey | Outcome/Objective: Exit Survey

Implementation Description: this is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program
Additional Resources: None at this time.

Literature Search Committee
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the literature search activity.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Literature Search Activity Paper | Outcome/Objective: Literature Search Activity

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON The course administrator for NURS 3500
Additional Resources: None at this time.

NCLEX First Time Pass Rate
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON along with the Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program will continue to monitor the first time pass rate of graduating seniors. Graduates are encouraged to notify the school of NCLEX success.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

Implementation Description: This is the end of the academic year
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Associate Director of the Undergraduate Program
Additional Resources: None at this time.

Research Article Critique
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON will continue to monitor this goal. The faculty teaching NURS 3500 will be included in the discussion r/t this measure and informed about the significance of continuing to require the article critique.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Research Article Critique | Outcome/Objective: Research Article Critique

Implementation Description: This is the end of the next academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2010
Responsible Person/Group: The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee of the BFLSON Course administrators of NURS 3500
Additional Resources: None at this time.

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 year's 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

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: Course faculty will continue to stress the importance of critical thinking through writing.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator of NURS2080 in conjunction with the UG program coordinator
Additional Resources: none
Critical thinking exit activity
The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee along with the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) will determine a method to ensure students take this exit activity seriously. This standardized test is currently associated with NURS4610.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam

Implementation Description: A grade associated with NURS4610 will encourage students to seriously consider this exam.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010

Evidence Based Paper Success
The faculty member responsible for this target identified the following reasons why students are not successful achieving the minimum score on this assignment. 1. Students do not follow directions for the assignment. 2. Students do not use an approved evidence based source for the assignment. 3. Students plagiarize; fail to cite correctly. 4. Students do not comply with the APA format. 5. English is not the student’s primary language, and therefore they have difficulty writing. The faculty member will consult with the Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee and the Undergraduate Program Committee to identify a mechanism to achieve this target.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Evidence based practice project | Outcome/Objective: Evidence Based Practice

Projected Completion Date: 10/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Administrator NURS3610 and NURS3710 The Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Committee Undergraduate Program Committee

NCLEX pass rate assessment
While the target of 85% was achieved, 89.29% was a drop from the previous year. The undergraduate program committee along with the undergraduate program coordinator, will explore the characteristics of those students who were unsuccessful to determine if any curriculum or advisement changes need to occur.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate | Outcome/Objective: NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

Implementation Description: see above
Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate program committee undergraduate program coordinator
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Standardized critical thinking exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Exam

Implementation Description: Added weight and attention to the exit activity will be implemented by the course administrator.
Projected Completion Date: 10/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator along with consultation from the UG program coordinator.
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: CTW NURS 2080 | Outcome/Objective: CTW

Implementation Description: The course administrator, a relatively new faculty member, has met with the UG program coordinator and discussed ways to improve the student's attention to this activity. Continued monitoring will take place with results submitted and evaluated every semester.
Responsible Person/Group: Course administrator and UG program coordinator.
Additional Resources: none

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Evidence based practice project  
*Outcome/Objective:* Evidence Based Practice

**Implementation Description:** Changing the assignment to reflect a more real world approach

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Course administrators for NURS3610 and NURS3710 along with the UG program coordinator  
**Additional Resources:** none

### 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.

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

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* NCLEX First Time Pass Rate  
*Outcome/Objective:* NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** NURS4610 course administrator  
**Additional Resources:** none

### Action plan to include revised measurement

Will change measurement to more accurately reflect progress of students. New measure will be: 85% of UG students scoring less than national average on the entrance Critical Thinking Assessment will show an improvement on the exit Critical Thinking Assessment

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Standardized critical thinking exam  
*Outcome/Objective:* Critical Thinking Exam

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** UG Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** none

### Revised target

The target will be revised to more accurately reflect the students accomplishments in the area of Evidence Based Practice. the new target will read: 85% of students enrolled in NURS3610 will achieve a score of 74% or better according to the rubrick on an evidence based practice paper. 85% of students enrolled in NURS3710 will achieve a satisfactory score according to the guidelines on an evidence based practice exercise on the first attempt.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Evidence based practice project  
*Outcome/Objective:* Evidence Based Practice

**Responsible Person/Group:** CA of NURS3610, CA of NURS3710  
**Additional Resources:** none

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2011-2012 Nursing MS**  
(As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST)  
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

### 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Professional Commitment (G: 1, 4, 7) (M: 1, 9, 10, 11)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice (G: 3, 4, 7) (M: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4, 8) (M: 2, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice (G: 4, 6, 7, 8) (M: 1, 2, 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (G: 4, 8) (M: 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 7: Participation in Research (G: 7, 9) (M: 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Science, Etc.) (G: 1, 7) (M: 8, 12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice (G: 4) (M: 2, 4, 6, 9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Practice in Specialty Area (G: 4) (M: 4, 6, 9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates (90%) of the master's program will be practicing in their area of specialization by one year post-graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 10: Scholarly Productivity (G: 1, 9) (M: 7, 10)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni survey results will be involved scholarly activities [participation in research (25%); publications (15%); presentations at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
professional meetings (50%) by 5-years post-graduation.

**SLO 11: Professional Membership (G: 1, 5, 6) (M: 11)**
Alumni survey results (1-, 3-, and 5-year graduates) will report membership in professional nursing organizations (80%).

**SLO 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (G: 4, 5, 6) (M: 8, 12)**
At the end-of-program, 80% of the students will indicate that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Analyze Various Approaches to Nursing Practice (O: 1, 2, 5)**
At end-of-program, 80.4% (51/41) of students will indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of analyzing various approaches to nursing practice.

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

**Target for O5: Analysis of Various Approached to APN Practice**
In the end of program evaluation, 80% of the students will indicate that they met or exceeded the objective of analyzing a variety of approaches used in the practice of nursing.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
In the end of program evaluation, 80% (n=41/51) indicated that they met or exceeded the objective of analyzing a variety of approaches used in the practice of nursing.

**M 2: Legal and Professional Issues in Practice (O: 2, 4, 5, 9)**
100% of the students enrolled in clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical practice as evidenced by the successful completion of the clinical practice portion of the courses.

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

**Target for O2: Legal and Professional Issues in Advanced Practice Nursing**
100% of the students enrolled in the clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of the students enrolled in the clinical courses demonstrated evidence of ethical and legal practice in the clinical setting as determined by successful completion of the clinical courses.

**Target for O9: Demonstration of Caring Nursing Practice**
The end of program evaluation will indicate that 85% of the students will report that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
In the end of program survey, 82% (n = 42/51) indicated that they met/exceeded the objective of demonstrating caring in nursing practice.

**M 3: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice (O: 3)**
At the end of the program, 70.5% (36/51) of the students met/exceeded the program objective that they evaluated concepts and theories in nursing as a basis for advanced nursing practice. Benchmark not meet; action plan to be established.

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

**Target for O3: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice**
85% of the graduating students will report that they met/exceeded the objective of evaluating concepts and theories related to advanced practice nursing.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
71% (n = 36/51) of the students completing the end of program survey indicated that they met/exceeded the expectations of evaluating concepts and theories related to advanced nursing practice.

**M 4: Demonstration of Caring in Nursing Practice (O: 4, 5, 9, 9)**
At end-of-program, 82.4% (42/51) of the students indicated that they demonstrated caring in nursing practice.

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

**M 6: Collaboration in Provision of Care (O: 6, 9, 9)**
At end-of-program, 77% (39/51) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of collaborating with the client, family, community, and others for the purpose of improving health. Benchmark not met consistently for the current and past cycles; action plan under development

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

**M 7: Participation in Research (O: 7, 10)**
At the end-of-program, 75% (38/51) indicated that they were well/very well prepared to implement evidence-based practice; 68% (34/50) indicated that they agreed/strongly agreed that they were prepared to engage in research to support and improve nursing practice. Benchmark not meet for past cycles; action plan to be developed.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 8: Integration of Knowledge (Self, Sciences, Etc.) (O: 8, 12)**

At end-of-program, 80% (41/51) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective for integrating knowledge of self, science, and the humanities in their advanced nursing practice experiences.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**M 9: Practice in Specialty Area (O: 1, 9, 9)**

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 10: Scholarly Productivity (O: 1, 10)**

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 11: Professional Membership (O: 1, 11)**

We have previously reported alumni data. Next cycle pending. Interpretation and recommendations will follow.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 12: Influences of Socio-political Forces on Healthcare (O: 2, 8, 12)**

At the end-of-program, 69% (35/51) of the students indicated that they met/exceeded the program objective of analyzing the influence of socio-political forces on health, healthcare delivery, and healthcare providers. Benchmarks not meet; action plan under development.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

---

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

**Action Plan Development Following Master's Program Evaluation**

An action plan will be developed at the completion of the full evaluation of the master's program in December 2010.

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

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

- Measure: Practice in Specialty Area |
  - Outcome/Objective: Practice in Specialty Area

- **Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director for Academic Affairs; Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Action Plan Development Following Master's Program Evaluation**

We will be developing an action plan following the completion of the full evaluation of the master's program that should be completed in December 2010.

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

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Associate Director for Academic Affairs Faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Using Theories in Advanced Practice Nursing**

An action to be taken regarding this objective will be determined during the process of evaluation of the master's program—clinical specialties taking place during the academic year (2020-2011).

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

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

- Measure: Theory as a Basis of Nursing Practice |
  - Outcome/Objective: Theory as a Basis for Nursing Practice

**Implementation Description:** To be determined

**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)
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing is to create a premier multicultural learning community that produces leaders, clinicians, scholars and researchers who exemplify nursing excellence and enhance healthcare delivery in Georgia and beyond. The Byrdine F. Lewis School of Nursing will be nationally recognized for innovative, responsive, educational nursing programs focused upon diversity, urban healthcare, and vulnerable populations. The School will be noted for expert practitioners, community partnerships, and leading-edge research.

Goals

G 1: Research Implementation
Plan and implement nursing research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

G 2: Theory Utilization
Link theory and research to the promotion of health in vulnerable populations.

G 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations
Analyze health promotion issues in vulnerable populations.

G 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry
Explore, develop, and apply diverse modes of inquiry to the discipline of nursing.

G 5: Scholarly Activities
Complete scholarly activities such as grant submission, presentations at regional and national meetings, submission of an article for publication in a refereed journal, etc.

G 6: Completion of PhD Program
Students will successfully complete requirements for graduation with a PhD in nursing.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Research Implementation (G: 1, 6) (M: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9)
100% of the graduating students will plan and implement research that is socially relevant in the 21st century.

SLO 2: Theory Utilization (G: 2) (M: 2, 3, 4)
90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NURS 8040 Theory Construction course.

SLO 3: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (G: 3) (M: 1)
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.

SLO 4: Application of Diverse Modes of Inquiry (G: 1, 4) (M: 1, 3, 5)
90% of the doctoral students will successfully complete the NURS 8035 Qualitative Research Course in which they apply skills of collecting qualitative data.

SLO 5: Application of Quantitative Research Methods (G: 4) (M: 3, 5)
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.

SLO 6: Submission of Manuscripts for Publication (G: 5) (M: 6)
30% of the students who have completed the core courses will submit manuscripts, either independently or co-authored by faculty, for publication.

SLO 7: Submission of Research Proposal for Funding (G: 1, 5) (M: 7)
30% of the students who have completed their comprehensive examinations will submit proposals for funding to support their doctoral dissertation research.

SLO 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (G: 5) (M: 8)
50% of the students who have completed the core courses will submit abstracts, either independently or co-authored with faculty, for scholarly presentations at professional nursing meetings.

SLO 9: Completion of the PhD Program (G: 6) (M: 3, 9)
80% of the doctoral students admitted to the nursing doctoral program will successfully complete the requirements for graduation.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Health Promotion in Vulnerable Populations (O: 3)
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.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 1: Qualitative Research Implementation (O: 1, 4)
85.7% (n=6) of the doctoral students successfully implemented a pilot qualitative research study and analysis during NURS 8012 Qualitative Research Methods.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 2: Theory Utilization (O: 2)
In Spring 2009 seven (100%) of the doctoral students enrolled in NURS 8035 Theoretical and Philosophical Foundations successfully explored theories related to research in their area of interest..
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 3: Socially Relevant Research Implementation (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 9)
Three doctoral students successfully implemented socially relevant research projects and graduated in 2008-2009.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 4: Theory Utilization 2 (O: 2)
100% (n=6) successfully completed the NURS 8012 Theory Construction requirements.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

M 5: Application of Quantitative Research Methods (O: 1, 4, 5)
Nine (100%) doctoral students successfully completed NURS 8050 Quantitative Research Methods I in Fall 2008. Eight (88.9%) of the students successfully completed NURS 8051 Quantitative Research Methods II in Spring 2009.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 6: Manuscript Submission (O: 6)
Of the 22 students who have completed their core courses, four (18.1%) have reported submitting manuscripts for publication.
Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback

M 7: Grant Application Submission (O: 1, 7)
Of the 22 students who have completed their core course, five (22.7%) have reported submitting grant applications for research funding. To date, four have received funding.
Source of Evidence: Honors and awards outside the institution

M 8: Presentations at Professional Meetings (O: 8)
Of the 22 students who have completed core courses, 18 (81.8%) have reported presenting oral or poster abstracts at professional meetings.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

M 9: Completion of PhD Program (O: 1, 9)
In Fall 2009, we had a total of 53 students. In Spring 2009, 30 students were enrolled in core courses, eight were taking comprehensive examinations, and fourteen were completing dissertations. One student withdrew from courses (personal reasons) and two students completed their dissertations.
Source of Evidence: Existing data

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Nutrition BS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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.
### 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 (NJTR 4950). It is completed in stages, with two revision cycles. Originally, the paper was a group assignment completed by students in groups of 4-5 students. For 2010, the assignment was changed to an individual research paper since the group paper failed to identify individual progress from junior year to senior year. Students wrote the paper based on their primary research question. The paper had one revision prior to formulation of the final paper. Two components of the evaluation rubric are used for this evaluation: rationale and content. Each of these is evaluated on a scale of basic (0-2), proficient (4), and mastery (6). 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 80% or above.

The target for content is all students meet or exceed proficiency (4) with a mean class score of 80% or above.

These targets are set without benefit of baseline data because this is the first year of implementation.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

22 of the 25 students received greater than 80%. 10 of the 25 students received 90% or higher.

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 popula

The expected mean score for the junior class is 75%, and the expected mean score for the senior class is 85%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

90% of the students receive at least 85% or better on total possible participation points for class discussion on the marketing section of the management case study assignment. 90% of the students receive at least 80% or better on the HR case study.

Target for O6: Demonstrate science understanding

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

Expanded evaluation of writing

Although students exceeded the target, we realize that this is only one measure and does not show progression from their entry to graduation. The rubric might have been compressed for grading purposes and might not evaluate the full range of performance. In the upcoming academic year we will apply the rubric to two courses, a junior course NUTR 3600 and the senior course NUTR 4950. The rubric will be revised for use in both courses. The evaluation process will entail selecting a random sample (30-35% of the class) of final papers from NUTR 3600 and conducting a paired comparison of those papers with papers from NUTR 4950 the following year. These comparisons will be made by a team of faculty evaluators who will not have access to the rating form completed by the instructors of these two courses. Data will be used to improve assignments and progression of assignments.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice

Implementation Description: Begins Fall semester 2009 with NUTR 3600 (juniors) and ends Spring semester 2011 (seniors) for the first cycle.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2009
Responsible Person/Group: DPD Director
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Scientific and Evidence Base of Practice: Integration of scientific information and research into practice

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.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Discipline-specific Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and popula
90% of the students receive at least 85% or better on total possible participation points for class discussion on the marketing section of the management case study assignment. 90% of the students receive at least 80% or better on the HR case study.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Discipline-specific Critical Thinking | Outcome/Objective: Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and popula

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Operations Management MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
Operations Management (OM) focuses on the management of resources, capabilities and processes that produce and deliver the goods and services for consumer markets. OM can play a critical role in enhancing a company's competitive position by providing superior products and services. The Operations Management MS program is offered for the purpose of developing an in-depth knowledge base regarding operations, logistics and supply chain management.

Goals
G 1: Depth of OM study
The primary goal of the MS Concentration in Operations Management program is to develop students who have an in-depth knowledge relative to operations, logistics and supply chain management. Secondarily, an understanding of the use of the tools and techniques available for correcting and measuring key performance indicators. Examples are inventory turns, days of inventory available, working capital measures, Operating efficiency, Productivity, ROI, TQM and Six sigma.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Develop a Strategic View of OM (M: 1, 2, 3)
The ability to analyze and evaluate alternative operations tactics and strategies for a given business environment and to identify the appropriate capacity, facility capabilities & locations, product & service design, organizational design and process technology choices as related to the operations function of the organization.

SLO 2: Develop Decision Making Abilities (M: 4)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE The Student will 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.

SLO 3: Develop an Environmental/substantiality Viewpoint (M: 5)
Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE The student will 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

SLO 4: Become a Strong Team Member (M: 6)
The student will 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.

SLO 5: Student Objective
Student outcomes deal with the students’ ability to recognize an operational problem, state the problem, analyze the cause and effects of the problem, establish viable criteria for evaluating alternatives, develop viable alternatives using the concepts, principles and tools of operations, analyze the alternatives against the weighted criteria, select the appropriate alternative, evaluate the hurdles for the selected alternative and implementation.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Re reasoned Analysis (O: 1)
Evaluation of individual MS student’s case and/or homework analyses will be completed. The individual work will be integrative in nature and will occur in the MGS 8710 course.

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

Target for O1: Develop a Strategic View of OM
Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM

- Target: Meets standards

Measure 1: Meets standards

- Measure 2: Meets standards

Measure 3: Meets standards

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Student findings reflect a 90% 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 2: Integration of Recommendations (O: 1)

Normal 0 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 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 2 Integration of recommendations The student is 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Student findings reflect 75% to 80% understanding the importance of integrative thinking in their group project assignments. We should be able to focus more on this aspect of the project and improve this learning objective.

M 3: Performance (O: 1)

Normal 0 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 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 3 Performance The student is not able to identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are not able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are not able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student is able to identify critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students are able to analyze or understand how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment. The student excels at identifying critical success factors of an OM application. The students are able to easily assess performance through an assessment of available resources and capabilities. Students excel at analyzing or understanding how the firm's operations process performance is affected by the competitive environment.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Student findings reflect 75% to 80% understanding the importance of integrative thinking in their group project assignments. We should be able to focus more on this aspect of the project and improve this learning objective.

M 4: Critical Thinking (O: 2)

Normal 0 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Homework assignments, case analysis and group project results reflect good to excellent decision making capabilities

M 5: Environmental Impact Evaluation Skills (O: 3)

Normal 0 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

Leaning Objective 1: Strategic View of OM Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 1: Measured Analysis The student is not able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student cannot determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student is able to complete a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student can determine the effect that firm specific dimensions have on a selected topic. The student exceeds at completing a reasoned analysis by identifying and studying a firm's OM application both within the firm or industry. The student exceeds at determining the effect that a firm's specific dimensions have on a selected topic.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

The students met the standard at the rate of 75% to 80%, while 20% to 25% of the time they exceeded the standard. The short fall by some students (groups) to attain the "Exceed" standard is due to a lack of adequate understanding and use of the process analysis tools; steady state analysis, activity cycle time, system cycle time, process capacity, bottleneck analysis, critical path analysis and other process metrics. The written portion of their homework, case summaries and group project reports was at the "Exceed" level of our rubric. Further emphasis must be placed on the process analysis and supply chain improvement.
80% of students should pass each outcome/objective with a faculty evaluation of 2 on the Rubric. Leaning Objective 3: Develop a Environmental/Substantiality Viewpoint Fail Fails to meet standards=1 Meet Meets standards=2 Exceed Exceeds standards=3 Measure 5 Environmental Impact Evaluation The student is not able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an understanding of the environment impact of OM decisions or are able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution. The student is able to complete and deliver a project that shows an excellent understanding of the environment impact of OM or are easily able to contribute their functional expertise to the solution.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

All professors are looking at ways to improve the awareness of the environmental impact and sustainability of logistics and supply chain management. There are any number of ways we can engage students in this subject matter and the majority of it will be done through case analysis and education in class lectures.

**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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Results indicate a partial meeting of this objective. At best we are seeing 60% to 70% of our students developing strong team skills.

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

#### A strategic view of OM

With respect to the first learning outcome, to develop a strategic view of OM, two actions will be taken:  
- In MGS 8710, add a homework assignment to ask students aspects in which companies use operations management knowledge from a strategic perspective. Evaluate after next offering.  
- In MGS 8710, add a case about operations making significant difference for a company' long term growth. Evaluate after next offering.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **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, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8770 we will ask students to add more decision making analysis in their group project. Evaluate after next offering.  
- In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8770 we will add several new measures in supply chain and revenue management analysis in accordance with the business environment: increased globalization. Evaluate after next offering.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Continued implementation will be needed for evaluation.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Team Membership

With respect to the third learning outcome, to become a strong team member, two actions will be taken:  
- Incorporate into teaching material for In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 lessons on effective teams.  
- Require team members in the group project of In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740 and 8760 and 8770 to create a team charter indicating an emphasis on the importance of cooperation and fairly distributed individual contributions. 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:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Operations Management Faculty Members
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

#### Changes to course syllabi

We will meet in the summer 2012 to discuss appropriate changes to course syllabi and ensure that all instructors are using the same
rubric measuring device.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Meeting scheduled July 2012 with all instructors involved in teaching In MGS 8710, 8730, 8740, 8760 and 8770 for the purpose of making necessary changes to course syllabi.
Responsible Person/Group: Yusen Xia and Walter Wallace

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Organizational Change MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 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) (M: 7)
Outcome/Objective 6: Recommend an appropriate OD intervention strategy and plan.
**SLO 7: Recognize OD Consulting Opportunities (G: 4) (M: 8)**
The MS-Organizational Change graduate will be able to recognize OD (Organization Development) consulting opportunities that occur in the midst of managing their day-to-day work, 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 to the existing structure, processes, metrics, employee roles, etc. within their sphere of influence. Related Measures OD Consultant Notebook in MGS 8450

**SLO 8: Apply OD Consulting Skills (G: 4) (M: 9)**
Demonstrate ability to apply OD Consulting skills learned in class. Related Measures Course project in MGS 8450

### 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. The capstone 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.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
Average percentile for M.S. students was 55.8%. 50% of M.S. students reached the 60th percentile.

**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. The capstone 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
Average percentile for M.S. students was 44.2%. 33% of M.S. students reached the 60th percentile.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Average faculty rating of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale. 100% of students met or exceeded the target.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Average faculty rating of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale. 100% of students met or exceeded the target.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Average faculty rating of 1.88 on a 3.00 scale. 75% of M.S. students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

### 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 2011-2012 - Target:** Partially Met

Average faculty rating of 1.88 on a 3.0 scale. 75% of M.S. students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

### M 7: OD Recommendations (O: 6)

**Inclusion of and appropriateness of recommendations and the rationale behind them.**

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

**Target for O6: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurements will be done by applying the Measure 6 Rubric (Table 3) to randomly selected project reports.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Partially Met

Average faculty rating of 1.92 on a 3.0 scale. 75% of M.S. students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

### M 8: Reflect on Own OD Effectiveness (O: 7)

**Ability to respond and to think reflectively about their own effectiveness and the effectiveness of others employed in the role of (internal or external) OD Consultant.**

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

**Target for O7: Recognize OD Consulting Opportunities**

A 2.0 average on the OD Consultant notebooks. Measurement will be done by applying the Measurement 7 Rubric (Table 3) to randomly selected OD Consultant Notebooks.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Met

Average faculty rating of 1.75 on a 3.0 scale. 72% of M.S. students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

### M 9: Organizational Change Project (O: 8)

**Demonstration of OD Consulting skills in the OD/Change Management Project (Group Assignment)**

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

**Target for O8: Apply OD Consulting Skills**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 8 Rubric (Table 3) to randomly selected team evaluations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Partially Met

Average faculty rating of 1.88 on a 3.0 scale. 75% of M.S. students met or exceeded 2.0 on all criteria.

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

#### Additional Methods of Creating Value

MGS 8430 instructors will add an additional in-class activity on the topic of dividing value. Evaluate after next offering.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Created Value in Capstone Negotiation | **Outcome/Objective:** Create Value in Negotiation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** Leadership Development Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepare Leadership Development Plan
  - **Measure:** Leadership Self-Assessment | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepare Leadership Development Plan
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** MGS 8420 instructors
Continue to gather data
Because data in this cycle was from only one student, we will continue to collect data.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Reflect on Own Coaching Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Continue to gather data
Because data in this cycle was from only one student, we will continue to collect data.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Coaching Scenario Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Continue to Gather Data
Because data in this cycle was from only 3 students, we will continue to collect data.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Leadership Self-Assessment | 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.

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

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

Add Coaching Example to Class Session
Add a discussion in class of an additional example. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8425 instructors

Add creating value planning session
Provide an additional exercise in which students work together in small groups for a planning session before the creating value negotiation occurs.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Created Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Create Value in Negotiation

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MGS 8430 instructors

Additional Dividing Value activity
Add an additional in-class activity on the topic of dividing value. Evaluate after next offering.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Divided Value in Capstone Negotiation | Outcome/Objective: Divide Value in Negotiation

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** MGS 8430 instructors

**Allocate coaching feedback time**

Continue to offer students opportunities to receive feedback for deeper reflection concerning the coaching roles. Devote in-class time to discussing the team coaching experiences that drive the entries that are turned in for the coaching log book.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Coaching Scenario Assignment | Outcome/Objective: Recognize Coaching Moment
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

**Change In-Class OD Example**

Change the example illustrated in the in-class discussion to a more complex example and add an additional 20 minutes allotted to the class discussion.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Reflect on Own OD Effectiveness | Outcome/Objective: Recognize OD Consulting Opportunities
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

**Expand In-Class Discussion of Making OD Recommendations**

Continue the current approach, adding an additional 30 minutes to the in-class discussion. Re-evaluate after next offering.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: OD Recommendations | Outcome/Objective: Recommend Intervention Strategy and Plan
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

**Re-Write Instructions for Change Project**

Re-write the written instructions for the assignment. Add a discussion of the consequences of not participating equally in the group project.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure: Organizational Change Project | Outcome/Objective: Apply OD Consulting Skills
- Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

**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 year ago, we did a major re-orientation of our assessment outcomes, measures, and targets. Therefore, this year, we have been gathering data and have made no changes to the outcomes, measures, or targets until we have reviewed data from this major re-vamping. In the coming year, we anticipate that we will fine-tune the phrasing of some of the targets. For example, saying that we have a target of 80% of students meeting a threshold seems to us as a better program-level assessment than the current phrasing which implies that we target having 100% of students meet the threshold. We did have some targets that were met in this cycle; if the targets are again met in the next cycle, we anticipate progressing toward a focus on additional 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.

We revised the curriculum to include a greater focus on Leadership. We added courses to the required core in Leadership Coaching (MGS 8425), Power in Organizations (MGS 8435), and Leading Work Teams (MGS 8440). Because of the change in focus, we have also changed the name of the program from "Organizational Change" to "Leadership and Organizational Change." This change in curriculum also changes the credit hours in the program to being 60% required core and 40% elective. (Previously, it was 40% required core and 60% elective.) This change was a conscious effort in order to focus more student time on the elements that are the more central goals of the program.
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.

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 (PF520 Capstone Course) (O: 1, 2)
In PF520 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 PF520 itself.

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

Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to all mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
Average of 1.5 on each of the criteria in the sample of mock exams. Have 50 percent of 1s, which does not meet goal of less
Target for O2: Technical expertise-major financial planning areas
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to all mock exam results in each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
Average of 1.5 on each of the criteria in the sample of mock exams. Have 50 percent of 1s, which does not meet goal of less than 20 percent of 1s. See action plan below.

M 2: Financial Plan prepared in PFP 8520 (capstone) (O: 4)
In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a financial plan, acquiring a new client and preparing a comprehensive plan on that client. This client is discussed in the class.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O4: Integrate technical financial planning concepts
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to all Financial Plans submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
No criteria has a result below 2. Criteria one through three have average of 2.5. Weakest result is in criteria number 4 (development of client action plan), which has an average of 2.0. See action plan below.

M 3: CFP® Exam (O: 1)
The CFP® Exam is administered three times each year. Many of the program’s graduates take this examination and the CFP Board of Standards reports the results to the Program Director. This examination tests competence to become a CFP certificant. The percentage of our graduates passing the examination will be compared to the national average to assess mastery of the technical and analytical skills necessary to practice as a financial planner. The long-range passing percentage for program graduates will be kept and compared with the most recent performance of the graduates and the national performance averages. Each year, the Program Director will analyze the data received from the CFP Board. The Program Director also will use his or her best efforts to monitor the frequency, bases, and nature of any disciplinary action taken by the CFP Board against any graduate of the program and will report the results of this monitoring effort.

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

Target for O1: Technical expertise - overall
CFP® Exam pass rates for PFP program students and graduates will be higher than the national average.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Pass rate for 2008-2012 of 75 percent exceeding national average of 60%. Meets goal.

M 4: Planner File prepared in PFP 8520 Capstone Course (O: 3)
In PFP 8520 Advanced Studies in Personal Financial Planning (capstone course), each student prepares a file of supporting data and analyses, including an analysis of client fit in support of his/her financial plan.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O3: Identify a good client-planner fit
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE FOUR RUBRIC to all Planner Files submitted during each 4-year evaluation period.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Average of 2.0 on criterion number 1. Average of 2.5 on criterion number 2. See action plan below.

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
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
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
Implementation Description: Implementation of this plan is ongoing and will remain so until determined by Assessment Committee.
Projected Completion Date: 01/2014
Responsible Person/Group: MSPFP Program Director

Reinforce strategies to improve client implementation
Strategies will be reinforced 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
Implementation Description: This implementation plan remains ongoing.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MSPFP Program Director

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
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
Projected Completion Date: 01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Conrad Ciccotello

Emphasize quizzes by functional area prior to comprehensive exam
Emphasize quizzes given by functional area prior to comprehensive exam. Continue to examine quizzes for more complete assessment of performance by area.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Mock CFP Exam (PFP 8520 Capstone Course) | Outcome/Objective: Technical expertise - overall | Technical expertise-major financial planning areas
Projected Completion Date: 01/2013
Responsible Person/Group: MSPFP Program Director
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 has remained the same. The standardized professional exam that students take (CFP) provides a clear quantitative benchmark for the program. The capstone class procedures are well established as to the preparation for the 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.

These changes are captured in the action plan. In summary, we plan to emphasize quizzes given by functional area prior to comprehensive exam. Continue to examine quizzes for more complete assessment of performance by area. Reinforce strategies to improve client implementation in PFP 8520. Focus role play exercises on implementation issues. Improve identification of client fit through focused guest practitioner interactions (including role play and clinical analysis) that emphasize client selection and retention.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Philosophy Assessment of Core
As of: 12/12/2016 04:41 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
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. Outcomes 1 and 2 and Measures 1 and 2 are relevant to Phil 1010.

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. Outcomes 3 and 4 and Measures 3 and 4 are relevant to Phil 1010.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: 1010 Objective 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions (G: 1) (M: 1)
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 2: 1010 Objective 2: Argument Evaluation (G: 1) (M: 2)
All students who take Phil 1010 should be able to critically evaluate the arguments of others.

**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: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking (G: 2) (M: 3)
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.

**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).

### SLO 4: 2010 Objective 2: Content (G: 2) (M: 4)
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.)

**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).

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: 1010 Measure 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions (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 (ii) identifying premises and conclusions.

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

**Target for O1: 1010 Objective 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions**
Our target is that the average 1010 student's ability to identify premises and conclusions is assessed a 2.25.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For this 2011-2012 cycle, average 1010 student's ability to identify premises and conclusions was assessed a 2.75.

**M 2: 1010 Measure 2: Argument Evaluation (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 (iv) critically evaluating the arguments of others.

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

**Target for O2: 1010 Objective 2: Argument Evaluation**

Our target is that the average 1010 student's ability to critically evaluating the arguments of others is assessed a 2.25.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 1010 student's ability to critically evaluating the arguments of others was assessed a 2.75.

**M 3: 2010 Measure 1: Critical Thinking (O: 3)**

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

**Target for O3: 2010 Objective 1: Critical Thinking**

Our target is that the average 2010 student's ability to think critically and effectively is assessed a 2.25.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 2010 student's ability to think critically and effectively is assessed a 2.54.

**M 4: 2010 Measure 2: Content (O: 4)**

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: 1. Mastery of content knowledge, more particularly, any of the following: (i) have a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics (What is real?) (ii) have a basic understanding of central problems in epistemology (What do we know?) (iii) have a basic understanding of central problems in ethics (What should we do?) (iv) have a basic understanding of how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems. (v) have a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target for O4: 2010 Objective 2: Content**

Our target is that the average 2010 student's knowledge of content is assessed a 2.25.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 2010 student's knowledge of content was assessed a 2.58.

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

**Improving 1010**

In response to student and instructor feedback, the text for Phil 1010 is being substantially revised and a new version will be used in Fall 2010.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Rainbolt/Dwyer

**Improving 2010**

Improving 2010 The Department now allows a great deal of variety in the many sections of Phil 2010, both in terms of content taught and in terms of the assessment mechanisms used in the courses. We also have a variety of people teaching the courses--we have tenured and tenure-track professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, as well as visiting instructors, and in some cases GTAs. We currently have a policy that sets certain multiply-realizable requirements (for example, while some metaphysics must be included in the course, it is up to the instructor whether to teach about free will, the mind-body problem, or the existence of god; they can teach about other topics in metaphysics as well, as long as they teach about one of these). Given feedback from many majors who took 2010 early in their career at GA State, from outside reviewers, and from faculty who regularly teach the course, the Undergraduate Committee is currently in the process of revising this policy. We hope that the revised policy will help us to improve student learning in this course. One way we will foster this result is to significantly curtail (while not completely eliminating) the ability of non-regular faculty to choose the topics and readings they use.
**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 (all of which is based on our judgments and experience), and also consider the limitations of that data. 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):**

1: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 1.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student has a demonstrated ability to: provide a fair and accurate explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to their own theses, present an insightful and compelling argument, and consider 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 own theses, present a reasonably compelling argument, and consider possible objections. However, work done by such students is not original, in that it does not go much beyond what was said in class and in the readings, and/or does not develop some important points fully enough. 2: When we indicate that we think students are doing work scored at a 2.0 for philosophical skills, we intend this to mean that the student 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 4.0 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 or 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 well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis, with varied sentence structure and a few grammar and spelling mistakes. They may have been self-edited, but do not read like a first draft. 1: Papers assessed at a 1.0 for writing have a well-organized structure that follows from a clear thesis, with varied sentence structure and some organization of paragraphs, but overall do not flow. They contain a few grammar or spelling errors and read like a first draft. 0: Papers assessed at a 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.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** Eddy Nahmias
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: Finished
Priority: High

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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: 1010 Measure 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions & Outcome/Objective: 1010 Objective 1: IDing Premises & Conclusions

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 the 2010-2011 cycle, we had 4 factors evaluated in Phil 1010: 1. Students’ ability to recognize arguments 2. Students’ ability to distinguish premises from conclusions 3. Students’ ability to distinguish arguments and subarguments 4. Student’s ability to evaluate arguments. Members of the Department’s Assessment Committee suggested that (A) #1 was unworkable given how Phil 1010 is taught and students tested and (B) that #3 was really only a component of #4 and did not need to be separated. Departmental discussion lead to consensus about both so that we now score only: 1. Students’ ability to distinguish premises from conclusions 2. Student’s ability to evaluate arguments.

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 added courses at the 3000 level to improve the ability of students exiting 2010 to progress to more difficult classes.
SLO 1: B.A. Objective 1: Critical Thinking (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate the ability to (a) read critically with comprehension and (b) think critically.

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).

SLO 2: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 2)
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.)

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).

SLO 3: B.A. Objective 3: Written Communication (G: 1) (M: 3)
Students who earn the B.A. in Philosophy will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and critically.

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).

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 2.75 and the average 4990 student's critical thinking ability was assessed a 3.21. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's critical thinking ability was assessed 2.54. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.54, progressing students at 2.75, and finishing students at 3.21. This progression suggests the program is successfully helping students to improve their critical thinking skills.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.6 and the average 4990 student's content knowledge was assessed at 3.44. Moreover, in Phil 2010, the student's content knowledge was assessed a 2.58. Thus, we see introductory students at 2.58, progressing students at 2.6, and finishing students at 3.44. This progression suggests the program is successfully helping students to improve their content knowledge, especially at the higher levels.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In this 2011-2012 cycle, the average 3000 student's written communication ability was assessed a 2.88 and the average 4990 student's written communication ability was assessed a 3.11. This progression suggests the program is successfully helping students to improve their written communication skills.

**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
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: Finished
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: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: BA Measure 2: Content
- Outcome/Objective: B.A. Objective 2: Content Knowledge
Responsibility Person/Group: Andrew Jason Cohen

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: Finished
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

Responsibility Person/Group: Andrew Jason Cohen

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 streamlined data collection, recognizing that fewer students take Phil 4990, so reducing the number of papers from those classes used in the assessment process. We also altered the system so that the instructors teaching Phil 3000 and Phil 4990 provided the assessment scores for content knowledge. This vastly improves our reporting of student 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.
We do not anticipate any major changes at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:  Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
We’ve refined our assessment process and added some courses (esp. at the 3000 level).

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?
The following evidence speaks clearly: CRITICAL THINKING WRITING CONTENT Phil 2010: 2.542.58 Phil 3000: 2.752.882.6 Phil 4990: 3.213.113.44 It seems clear that the Department's teaching is effective.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We will monitor our program, but expect to continue our successful work.
Mission / Purpose
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 M.A. 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/modern 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 M.A. 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the 2011 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the 2011 calendar year, M.A. students received, on average, an assessment of 3.6 on their philosophical skills.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

For the 2011 calendar year, we had 12 MA graduates apply to PhD programs. All but two were accepted to at least one school (one who was not was accepted to six top law schools an enrolled in what is arguably the best university for law and philosophy together). One of the 10 accepted into PhD programs was accepted into 7 top schools. Another was accepted 3 others schools and 4 others had 2 acceptances. The acceptance rate is thus 83% for those who applied. We take this as clear indication that our grad students are learning philosophical skills and content. (Eleven graduates did not apply to PhD programs; one was accepted into 5 J.D. programs and is pursuing that career path; another is also pursuing that path. In addition, one is in a Psychology master's program, several are teaching, and one is a monk.)

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: 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 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 an insightful and 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 to be: provide no coherent explanation of the philosophical positions and distinctions that are relevant to the class topic or even to offer a unified topic. Typically, they assert views but make virtually no attempt to defend those views; they often indicate a lack of understanding of the assignments. Content 4: Students or papers assessed at a 4.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate an exemplary understanding of all of the texts discussed in the course, including subtle points that many miss. 3: Students or papers assessed at a 3.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate a good understanding of most of the texts discussed in the course, but miss subtle points. 2: Students or papers assessed at a 2.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate a limited understanding of some of the texts discussed in the course, but miss not only subtle points but even basic points from some of the texts. 1: Students or papers assessed at a 1.0 for their content knowledge demonstrate lack of understanding of the basic points of most of the texts discussed in the course. 0: Students or papers assessed at a 0 for their content knowledge seem not to have any understanding of the basic points of the texts discussed in the course.

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.

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.

**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.

---
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**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: 97 graduate students were enrolled in the Doctor of Physical Therapy program in Fall of 2012. Thirty-five doctors of physical therapy graduated in August of 2012.

---

**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 status. 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 Demonstrate integrity in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, other health care providers, students, other consumers, and payers.
  o Demonstrate professional behavior in all interactions with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, other health care providers, students, other consumers, and payers.
  o Expressively and receptively communicate in a culturally competent manner with patients/clients, family members, caregivers, practitioners, interdisciplinary team members, consumers, payers, and policy makers.
  o 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
  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 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 patient/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)
  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 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)
  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 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)
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 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.

### SLO 6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism (G: 6, 7) (M: 1, 2, 6)

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.

### SLO 7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence (G: 1, 2, 4, 7) (M: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)

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.

### SLO 8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning (G: 2, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

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.

**SLO 9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice (G: 2, 3, 5) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

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

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: Professional Behaviors (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9)
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Based on performance criteria #3, #6 (Accountability, Professional Development): #3 Accountability Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.8- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.3- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 9.7- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate 
#6 Professional Development Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.5- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 12.5-Advanced Intermediate; 2014 (3rd semester): 8.5- Intermediate |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on performance criteria #2, #12 (Professional Behavior, Plan of Care): #2 Professional Behavior Class 2012 (9th semester): 18- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.3- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 10.2- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate. #12 Plan of Care Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- Entry Level; 2013 (6th semester): 12.3- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.3- In between Advance Beginner and Intermediate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on performance criteria #2 (Professional Behavior): #2 Professional Behavior Class 2012 (9th semester): 18- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.3- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 10.2- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on performance criteria #2, #6 (Professional Behavior, Professional Development): #2 Professional Behavior Class 2012 (9th semester): 18- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.3- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 10.2- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate. #6 Professional Development Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.5- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 12.5-Advanced Intermediate; 2014 (3rd semester): 8.5- Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on performance criteria #4 (Communication): #4 Communication Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.6- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 12.9- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 9.1- Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism**

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #3 (Accountability): #3 Accountability Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.8- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.3- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 9.7- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Based on performance criteria #5 (Cultural Competence): #5 Cultural Competence Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.9- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.7- In between Advanced Intermediate and Entry Level; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 9.2- Intermediate.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

**Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

**Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

**Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty**

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past...
Target for **O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for **O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for **O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for **O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for **O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for **O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for **O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**  
90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

90% first time pass rate; 100% ultimate pass rate.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

35 graduates of the 2010 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 671.66 compared to the national mean of 647.72. 34 graduates of the 2011 class scored 91% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 660.32 compared to the national mean of 651.50. At the time of this report 29 graduates of the 2012 class scored 100% for first time testing for the State Boards of Physical Therapy examination. Mean score was 670.59 compared to the national mean of 653.07. Ultimate pass rate over the past three years is currently at 99% as compared to 89% nationally.

M 3: Clinical Skills (O: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)


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

Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on performance criteria #7 (clinical reasoning): Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2 - Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.8- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.4- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate.

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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on performance criteria #6, #7 (professional development, clinical reasoning): #6 Professional Development Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.5- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 12.5-Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 8.5-Intermediate. #7 Clinical Reasoning Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.8- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.4- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate.

Target for O10: Professional Pratction Expectation: Education

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on performance criteria #14 (Educational Intervention): #14 Educational Intervention Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.5- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 12.3- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.8- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate.

Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation

Clinical instructors will assess students’ professional behaviors at the completion of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th semesters. Students will score at or above advanced beginner performance, intermediate performance, and entry level performance on Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) performance criteria, respectively that relate to professional behavior.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on performance criteria #1, #8, #9, #10, #11, #13, #14, #15, #17, #18 (Safety, Screening, Examination, Evaluation, Diagnosis & Prognosis, Procedural interventions, Educational interventions, Documentation, Financial resources, Direction and supervision of personnel): #1 Safety Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.9 - In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.4- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 10- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate, #8 Screening Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.8- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.1- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate, #9 Examination Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.86- Advanced Intermediate Class 2014 (3rd semester): 8.24- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate, #10 Evaluation Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.7- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.3- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate, #11 Diagnosis & Prognosis Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.7- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.4- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate.
M 4: Research Project (O: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Progressing over a two year period, student's engagement in a research project will result in 1) a manuscript for submission to a Target for and/or poster/platform for peer-review and presentation.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on performance criteria #1, #8, #12, #16, #17, #18 (Safety, Screening, Plan of Care, Outcomes Assessment, Financial resources, Direction and supervision of personnel): #1 Safety Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.9- In between Entry Level and Beyond Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 13.4- Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 10- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate. #8 Screening Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.8- In between Intermediate and Advanced Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.1- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate. #12 Plan of Care Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 12.3- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7.3- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate. #16 Outcomes Assessment Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.1- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.9- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 7- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate. #17 Financial Resources Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.1- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.6- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 6.7- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate. #18 Direction and supervision of personnel Class 2012 (9th semester): 17.2- Entry Level; Class 2013 (6th semester): 11.5- In between Intermediate and Advance Intermediate; Class 2014 (3rd semester): 6.9- In between Advanced Beginner and Intermediate.

M 4: Research Project (O: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met


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.

**Target for 05: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**


**Target for 08: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the period 2011-2012 all 3rd year DPT Students completed research projects under the direct supervision of faculty as required for graduation from the program. Results of this research included 18 poster or platform presentations and one accepted manuscript for publication. Manuscripts published: Sawyer, A.M., S.K. Martinez, and G.L. Warren. Impact of yoga on low back pain and function: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J. Yoga Phys. Ther. 2:120, 2012. doi:10.4172/2157-7595.1000120 Presentations at the 2012 American College of Sports Medicine meeting (San Francisco, CA): Brown, L.B., B.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met


Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education  

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met  


Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation  

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met  

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.
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 for each class.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2011-2012 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2013: 87% pass first time testing, mean score of 80 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 83 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2011-2012 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2013: 87% pass first time testing, mean score of 80 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 83 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2011-2012 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2013: 87% pass first time testing, mean score of 80 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 83 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2011-2012 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2013: 87% pass first time testing, mean score of 80 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 83 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the school year 2011-2012 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2013: 87% pass first time testing, mean score of 80 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the school year 2011-2012 comprehensive testing results include: Class of 2012: 83% pass first time testing, mean score of 84 Class of 2013: 87% pass first time testing, mean score of 80 Class of 2014: 97% pass first time testing, mean score of 83 After remediation all students achieved a passing score which is required for program continuation.

Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

A survey instrument to assess 2012 graduate satisfaction with curriculum and clinical experience accreditation criteria. Scoring based on scale from 3-1 (3= Well met, 2= Met, 1= Not Met). Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
### Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O6: Professional Practice Expectations: Altruism
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations
Our program expectation is for our graduates to score the curriculum and clinical experience criteria as met or well met >90%

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.
2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 curriculum criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 99%. 2012 graduates of the DPT program ranked 80 clinical experience criteria based on accreditation requirements as met or well met at 97%.

### M 7: Employer Survey (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Employers of GSU DPT graduates 2009-2011 were surveyed and asked to grade the competence of the graduates on a scale from 5 to 1 (Strongly Agree- Strongly Disagree) on the following characteristics: Communication, Cultural competence, Professionalism, Critical thinking. They were also asked if our graduates would rank in the top 10% of their employees.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

#### Target for O1: Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O2: Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O3: Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O4: Professional Practice Expectations: Professional Duty

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O5: Professional Practice Expectations: Communication

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O7: Professional Practice: Cultural Competence

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O8: Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O9: Professional Practice Expectations: Evidence-Based Practice

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.

#### Target for O10: Professional Practice Expectation: Education

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O11: Patient/Client Management Expectation**

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O12: Practice Management Expectations**

Our program expects a overall employer survey score to equal or exceed 4 (agree) and >80% response for employee rank of 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer survey revealed 11 responses with an average score of 4.3 on all criteria. 91% scored graduates in the top 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**


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

**Assistant to ACCE**

A Graduate Assistant has been assigned to the ACCE and has been ample to assist in all duties of the position.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Division Head
- **Additional Resources:** Budget considerations

**Core Faculty Positions**

By the end of Spring 2013 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:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Division Head

**Opening Faculty Clinic**

By the end of Spring 2013 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 and Board of Regents January 2012.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Division Head
- **Additional Resources:** Site Determination Clinic Director Finances for start up
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $50,000.00 (one time)

**Student Evaluation Tool**

Develop an advanced student evaluation tool to monitor each students progress as it related to required accreditation criteria and expected outcomes which will be linked with each class and established objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Survey</td>
<td>Patient/Client Management Expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Management Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice Expectation: Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice Expectation: Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice Expectation: Clinical Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice Expectation: Compassion/Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice Expectation: Altruism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice Expectations: Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice</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?
Based on measurement criteria all outcomes for the program were achieved despite only one component of the action plan being accomplished.

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 students continue to score above mean average of national testing upon graduating. We are planning to develop a new measurement tool to allow for improved outcome measures for all criteria with our students throughout the program as to better understand program strengths and/or weaknesses to address advanced learning including critical thinking.

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 are planning to develop a more detailed outcome tool to monitor our students progress through the program including linking all outcomes to current classes and related objectives. This will allow us to identify program strengths and or weaknesses and more importantly assist the students with any specific areas which are in deficit and in need of improvement.

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 has been a good tool to maintain a pulse on the program and the outcome of our students immediate and future success. The established outcomes allow the faculty to reflect back on future needs and/or improvements to consider for the program and student learning. Our current accreditation body requires an annual update on program status which is assisted with this process through our established program objectives and outcome measures.

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 changes this year. Future changes include: Develop an advanced student evaluation tool to monitor each students progress as it related to required accreditation criteria and expected outcomes which will be linked with each class and established objective.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational 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 will be one of continuation of a program that is strong in relation to the outcome of our students. As an advanced measurement tool is put in place, we will look forward to the opportunity to further benefit the advancement of our students learning experience. We are considering a curriculum change more in relation to timing of graduation and not effected by the results of this assessment.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
Last years assessment and results were crucial in demonstrating program effectiveness in measuring outcomes of our students in relation to our recent accreditation visit and subsequent re-accreditation status. Based on this 10 year accreditation assessment we learned that we need to better organize how we measure the outcome of our students current progress and transition through the program. The accreditation team felt we had the appropriate measurement tool in place but better organization and planning to demonstrate the use and implementation was recommended and will be implemented.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
We have a strong program that continues to assist in producing a qualified entry level physical therapist which is our ultimate goal. In consideration of our accreditation process we also realize that we can do a better job organizing, planning and implementing outcome measures to evaluate our students and program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Our current findings will serve to remind our program and faculty of the areas we are successful in and to continue maintaining this high standard. Our goals to improve the program are in hiring faculty for our two open positions, open the approved faculty clinic which will serve to advance student critical thinking skills, and implement a more detailed and organized outcome tool to monitor student and program success. All of these goals should serve to further strengthen and improve the programs status including our most important goal of graduating competent physical therapists.
## 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. One 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No data reported in this cycle.

### 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 have achieved. A student who gets the same post-test score as pre-test score has a normalized gain of 0.00. A student who scores a perfect post-test will have a gain of 1.00. A student who increases their score from 30% to 65% will have a normalized gain of 0.50 since their increase was half of their maximum possible increase. Most introductory physics courses show average normalized gains of about 0.25. Courses which integrate interactive engagement techniques often do better. Average normalized gains of 0.40 or higher are labeled in the literature as moderately successful and gains of 0.70 are extremely successful (and rare). The target set for our courses is to improve to moderately successful range of 0.40 or higher.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

For Fall 2011 and Spring 2012, Phys1111K students scored an average of 23% on the pre-test and 41% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.24. Phys2211K students scored an average of 35% on the pre-test and 56% on the post-test. The average normalized gain was 0.32.

M4: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

For the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012, students in Phys1112 scored 32% while students in Phys2212 scored 36%. However, there are still 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.

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 IMPACT (Improving Physics & Astronomy Curriculum & Teaching) group so that critical thinking remains a significant factor in the consideration of curricular or pedagogical changes.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Multiple Choice Questions on Astronomy Final Exams
- Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking

Implementation Date: September 30, 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms/Department Assessment Committee

Phys1111/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, Phys1111 and Phys1112, 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.

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

Implementation Date: Revisions and redesign will be worked out over the course of the 2011/2012 academic year. Revised course content and new laboratory portion will be implemented in the 2012/2013 academic year.
Projected Completion Date: 04/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

Astr1010/1020 New Assessment

A assessment for the new Area D outcome for the Astr1010/1020 courses will be completed and implemented. First assessment data should be forthcoming in Spring 2013.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Brian Thoms

**Lab/lecture changes in Phys2211/2212**
In 2012-2013 we will plan changes to Phys2211/2212 classes to improve student learning. We will seek funding for significant changes.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
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?

We have assessed the new Area D outcome in core physics classes for the second time. The assessment process in core astronomy courses is not functioning and needs to be revised. The transition to assessing the new outcomes was not completed. Revision of the astronomy assessment procedure will be completed in the next cycle. In addition, it has become clear that the timing of our physics assessments in electricity and magnetism results in assessment being done before some material is completed. This is particularly true in Phys2212. In the next cycle we will determine the extent of the problem and devise a solution for more accurate assessments.

**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 standard assessment instruments in physics core courses are below our targets and are behind benchmarks established for successful reformed courses. We are examining changes to our courses, particularly in Phys2211/2212, the introductory calculus based physics sequence. In the next cycle we will work on planning course changes.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2011-2012 Physics BS**
*(As of 12/12/2016 04:42 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.

**SLO 10: Critical thinking through writing (G: 2) (M: 4)**
Students in Phys4900 Research Project course write a long research report over the course of the semester. They write the report in sections with feedback from instructor and other students followed by revisions. The final report is evaluated using the physics CTW rubric.

### 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 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. 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 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Not reported in this cycle.

**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 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Met

Eleven physics majors completed Phys4700, Electricity Magnetism, in the Fall 2011 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 3.6 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 3.0 out of 5.0.

**Target for O3: Statistical & Thermal Physics**
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

Not reported in this cycle.
### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Twenty three physics majors completed Phys3401, Modern Physics I, in Fall 2011 semester. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluation for their knowledge and understanding of core principles in this area was 4.0 out of 5.0. The average evaluation for their ability to use mathematics to solve problems in this area was 4.3 out of 5.0.

### M 2: Laboratory Reports in Advanced Physics Lab (O: 5, 7, 8, 9)
Physics Majors are also required to take a junior-level laboratory course, Phys3300 (Advanced Physics Laboratory). This course is designed to bring the student from the level of the introductory physics labs (where goals and procedures are mostly given to them) up to a level where they are prepared to do a Research Project (more independent and open-ended project, collaborating with graduate students and professors in a research lab). The development of critical thinking skills and appropriate written communication (lab notebooks and lab reports) are emphasized. In this lab course the students work both independently and collaboratively. They also use computers and other specialized laboratory apparatus. The outcomes are assessed by the instructor by rating each student on each outcomes with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty and have been placed in the Document Repository and linked below.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### Target for O5: Scientific Collaboration
Target performance is an average score of 4.0 out of 5.0 where 4.0 corresponds to substantial understanding and 5.0 corresponds to mastery. See attached rubric for more detailed information.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported in this cycle.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
Three physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2011-2012. According to the criteria given above, the average evaluations were 3.7 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
Three physics majors were assessed for Senior Research projects, Phys4950, in 2011-2012. 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.
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
- Scientific Collaboration | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
- 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 Phys2900 in Spring 2010.

**Projected Completion Date:** 04/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Brian Thoms

---

**Curriculum Evaluation**

Physics BS Curriculum will be re-evaluated in light of assessment data. New courses are needed (such as Relativity and Computational Physics). Some change to math preparation requirements has been proposed as has introduction of new upper division lab courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** Medium

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014

**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?

In 2011-2012, our capstone research requirement was in transition from the one credit hour Senior Research (Phys4950) to the three credit hour Research Project-CTW (Phys4900). The amount of research required along with the writing involved was increased.

The new research project was assessed using the CTW rubric which focuses on critical thinking as expressed through the written research report. This transition is continuing and in 2012-2013 we expect a larger number of students completing the Research project.

**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 assessment data shows us that we are doing pretty well in the research outcomes but not as well in some content areas. However, since we are lacking data in some required courses we have difficulty drawing conclusions. In the coming year we will be making an increased effort to collect assessment data in these classes.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Physics MS**

(As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST)

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Coming Soon

---

**Goals**

G 1: 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.

**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.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**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.

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

**Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology**

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

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Target Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O2: Motivations and Implications of Research</td>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3: Scientific Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4: Scientific Communication</td>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5: Physics &amp; Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills</td>
<td>Target performance is 4.0 out of 5.0 maximum for each learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 5: Astronomy Committee Research Paper (O: 2, 3, 4, 6)**

Physics M.S. with Astronomy Concentration (non-thesis option) students work in close collaboration with their research committee throughout the course of their M.S. program. Students write a research paper which is reviewed by a committee of faculty members. The learning outcomes related to the research paper are assessed by the committee at the completion of degree requirements by rating each student on each outcome with a score scaled from 1 to 5. The criteria for these scores are set by the assessment committee in consultation with the faculty which is part of the Astronomy MS Committee Evaluation Form.

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

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

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

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

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

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

**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.

**Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking**

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

**Target for O4: Scientific Communication**

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

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

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

**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
  | Scientific & Research Technology | Scientific Communication
- Measure: Astronomy Committee Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
  | Scientific & Research Technology | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
- Measure: Astronomy Qualifying Exam | Outcome/Objective: Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills
- Measure: Physics Advisor | Outcome/Objective: Collaboration in Scientific Research
  | Scientific & Research Technology | Scientific Communication
- Measure: Physics Committee Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
  | Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking
- Measure: Physics Presentation and General Examination | Outcome/Objective: Motivations and Implications of Research
  | Physics & Astronomy Knowledge and Math Skills | Scientific Communication | Scientific Critical Thinking

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

---

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Physics PhD
(Accepted: 12/12/2016 04:42 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 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)

Normal 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

No results were reported for this 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.

### Target for O4: Scientific Communication

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

### Target for O6: Scientific & Research Technology

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

## 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.

### Target for O3: Scientific Critical Thinking

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

### Target for O4: Scientific Communication

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

### Target for O5: Physics Knowledge and Math Skills

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

## 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.

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

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

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

**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 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:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **Measure:** Physics Knowledge and Math Skills | **Scientific Communication** | **Scientific Critical Thinking**
- **Measure:** Committee Evaluation of Doctoral Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Motivations and Implications of Research
- **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
- **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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Political Science Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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 duties of citizenship and maintenance of stable and 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 curriculum courses.

**G 3: Communication Skills**
The department seeks student learning in oral and written communications.

**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.
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.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Please see attached report of learning outcomes in both POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 FY 2011-2012.

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).

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 student’s 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report of learning outcomes in both POLS 1101 and POLS 2401 Analytic Skills FY 2011-2012.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Please see attached report of learning outcomes in POLS 2401 Communications Skill FY 2011-2012.

**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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Political Science BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

286 students took POLS 3800 in the Fall and Spring Semesters of 2011-2012. 14 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 69.0% of our students scored a 2 (competent). 33.2% scored a 1 (Developing) 1.4% scored a 0 (Absent). On the Formulation of Testable Hypothesis assignment 62.6% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 34.3% scored a 1 (Developing) 2.8% scored a 0 (Absent). Percentage figures are rounded off. On the Analysis of Data/Facts assignment 58.7% of our students scored a 2 (competent), 38.5% scored a 1 (Developing) 2.8% 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 - 4.50; POLS 3400 - 3.90 and POLS 3140 - 3.65.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

On the effective formulation of the research question portion of the rubric (items 1-3) the scores were as follows 1. Identification of question or issue - 29.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 59.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 11% scored 1-2 (Developing). 2. Consideration of assumptions and/or context - 23.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 58.5% scored 3-4 (Competent) 18.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). 3. Formulation of a testable hypothesis - 18.3% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 64.6% scored 3-4 (Competent) 18.3% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the effective collection and use of data portion of the rubric (items 4-5) the scores were as follows 4. Collection and presentation of facts/data - 32.9% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 51.2% scored 3-4 (Competent) 15.9% scored 1-2 (Developing). 5. Analysis of facts/data - 26.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 59.8% scored 3-4 (Competent) 13.4% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the Integration and synthesis of other perspectives - 26.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 54.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 18.7% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

On the Effective Presentation of Conclusions Skill On the POLS 3800 assessment rubric 63.6% of our students scored 2 (Competent), 33.9% scored 1 (Developing) and 2.4% scored 0 (Absent). On the Presentation of conclusions skill on the POLS 4900 Assessment Rubric 25.2% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 55.4% scored 3-4 (Competent) 19.4% scored 1-2 (Developing). On the Integration and synthesis of other perspectives - 26.8% of our students scored a 5 (Sophisticated), 54.7% scored 3-4 (Competent) 18.7% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

In the period Fall 2011 to Spring 2012 187 students took POLS 3140. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge in this course during the period was 4.01

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 three of the five subject areas in political science, to wit, American Government, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration and Political Theory. Currently the only 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

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O5: Substantive knowledge -Global structures and processes

The department seeks a learning outcome score of three (3) or better in substantive knowledge of global political structures and processes.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

In the period from Summer 2011 to Spring 2012 225 students took POLS 3200. The learning outcome score for substantive
knowledge this course during the period was 3.50. In the period from Summer 2010 to Spring 2011, 215 students took POLS 3400. The learning outcome score for substantive knowledge this course during the period was 3.94.

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

#### Improved Advising
The Department of Political Science continues to prioritize improvements in undergraduate advising. Working in tandem with the A&S Office of Academic Assistance, Political Science has developed a system of assigning faculty advisors to all majors. Early and sustained interaction with advisees should yield improvements in students' ability to navigate the major, course selection, and exposure to extracurricular opportunities (internships, study abroad, and the like).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Additional Resources:** The Department's approved Action Plan (2008) provides for the hiring of a staff academic advisor. Funds for that position have not, however, been released.

#### Development of assessment tools
The department plans to devote resources to development of more sophisticated and nuanced assessment tools to be used to assess learning outcomes for this objective.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
- **Implementation Status:** On-Hold
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure:** Measure of substantive knowledge US structures and processes | **Outcome/Objective:** Substantive Knowledge- US structures and processes

- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors in American Politics and pre-law
- **Additional Resources:** Summer Money 2011
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $6,000.00 (one time)

#### Development of Assessment tools
The department plans to devote resources for assessment tools to allow for a more comprehensive assessment program for this outcome.

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

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

- **Measure:** Measure substantive knowledge global structures and processes | **Outcome/Objective:** Substantive knowledge - Global structures and processes

- **Implementation Description:** No action due to lack of funding
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Instructors in international and comparative politics courses
- **Additional Resources:** Summer money
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $12,000.00 (one time)

---

**Georgia State University**

### Assessment Data by Section

**2011-2012 Political Science MA**

*(As of 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST)*

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

#### Mission / Purpose
The Department of Political Science offers comprehensive programs leading to the Master of Arts degree. Covering all of the discipline's major fields - American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, 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, or Professional Political Practices. 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: Strong Analytical Skills**
MA candidates are skilled at analysis and possess analytical skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

**G 2: Deepening of Substantive Knowledge**
MA candidates are informed scholars with advanced substantive knowledge of the research literature in political science.

**G 3: Deepening of Method Skills**
MA students are knowledgeable researchers with demonstrable 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 demonstrate research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

#### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

#### SLO 2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature (G: 2) (M: 1)

Masters students demonstrate substantive knowledge of the research literature in their area of specialization.

#### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

#### SLO 3: Effective Reporting of Research Findings (G: 3) (M: 1)

Masters students demonstrate their ability to formulate research questions, synthesize such questions with appropriate literature, utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s), and analyze data so as to answer the question(s) and raise additional questions.

#### Strategic Plan Associations

2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
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).
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

### 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. Students are assessed as to the degree to which the thesis or non-thesis demonstrates the student's achievement of each learning goal; the scale ranges from 1, very little degree, to 5, very high degree of achievement.

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 appropriate, relevant research skills and methods.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Eleven thesis projects and five non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2011 through summer 2012), up from eight thesis projects and four non-thesis projects last year. These projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which the department’s stated learning objectives were met, ranging from 1, very little degree, to 5, very high degree. The department considers a score of 3.5 or higher on the relevant question(s) to indicate achievement of the objective. With respect to whether the project demonstrated research skills commensurate with the student’s area of specialization, all of thesis projects evaluated received a 3.5 or higher on this learning outcome goal. One non-thesis project was evaluated, and it did not meet this goal; this project received a score of a 3, indicating a solid level of research skills, but not a high or very high level of research skills.

#### Target for O2: Mastery of Relevant Research Literature

All completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects should demonstrate knowledge of the relevant research literature in the student's area of specialization.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Eleven thesis projects and five non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2011 through summer 2012), up from eight thesis projects and four non-thesis projects last year. These projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which the department’s stated learning objectives were met, ranging from 1, very little degree, to 5, very high degree. The department considers a score of 3.5 or higher on the relevant question(s) to indicate achievement of the objective. With respect to whether students demonstrated knowledge of the relevant research literature in their area of specialization, all but one of the thesis projects evaluated met the department's stated objective of receiving a score of 3.5 or higher. The one thesis project that did not meet this standard received a score of a 3, indicating a solid mastery of the relevant literature, but not a high or very high degree of mastery of the relevant literature. The one evaluated non-thesis paper project also did not meet the departmental target for mastery; however, this project did receive a score of 3, suggesting a solid mastery of the literature.
All completed and approved MA thesis and non-thesis projects should demonstrate the ability to write a professional research paper in the student’s area of specialization, including the ability to (1) formulate research questions, (2) locate those questions within the appropriate literature, (3) utilize appropriate research methods to answer the question(s); analyze data to answer the question(s), and (5) raise additional questions based on the student’s interpretation of his/her research findings.

Eleven thesis projects and five non-thesis projects were completed this year (fall 2011 through summer 2012), up from eight thesis projects and four non-thesis projects last year. These projects were evaluated by the respective thesis committees to determine the degree to which the department’s stated learning objectives were met, ranging from 1, very little degree, to 5, very high degree. The department considers a score of 3.5 or higher on the relevant question(s) to indicate achievement of the objective. To evaluate students’ ability to effectively report their research findings, five separate areas (each evaluated 1-5) are assessed, and then the results are averaged to create a composite score. Of the thesis and non-thesis projects evaluated, all of them met the department’s stated objective of averaging 3.5 or more on the learning outcomes scale. Among these theses were some that were described as among the best that faculty members had seen in their time at GSU, including three that received a perfect 5.

2-draft requirement

Last year we implemented a two-draft requirement for all non-thesis papers, requiring the first draft to be turned in just after mid-semester, at the same time as the defense date for thesis papers. Based, admittedly, on a limited amount of data, we think this has helped improve the quality of the non-thesis papers and will continue this requirement.

Pre- and post-tests for methods sequence

For next year, we plan to strengthen our assessment capacity for the graduate programs by implementing a pre-test and post-test for students in our required methods sequence, POLS 8800 (fall) and POLS 8810 (spring). 8800 teaches research design, while 8810 is intermediate applied statistics. Because we must do this in order, the first pre-test will be given in Fall 2010, and the first results will not be reported until June 2011. The Graduate Director will work with the instructors of these two courses to come up with appropriate pre- and post-tests and ensure inter-coder reliability. Normally the same person teaches 8800 on a regular basis, and the same is true for 8810.

"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.

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.

Elimination of Public Policy and Administration

The department voted last month to eliminate "Public Policy and Administration" as a major comprehensive exam and course
**Expanded required methods sequence**
Beginning in Fall of 2013, we have revised and expanded our research methods requirement to better train our students in research design and data analysis. We have already begun offering on an elective basis a new advanced quantitative methods course, as well as a qualitative research methods course, to better aid our students in learning the tools and methods necessary to answer their proposed research questions. Beginning in Fall 2013, all MA students will have to complete a three-course sequence: (a) a standalone research design course; (b) an introductory course on basic quantitative analysis; and (c) either an intermediate quantitative analysis course or a qualitative research methods course. We believe implementing this new sequence of courses will ensure that all of our students are able to demonstrate a high degree of mastery of the major research skills we wish to impart to all graduates of our program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2011-2012</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>Curricular changes have been proposed and adopted; necessary changes to the Graduate Catalog for 2013-2014 have been submitted and are pending approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Political Science Department; instructors for courses within required sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expanded required methods sequence**
Beginning in Fall of 2013, we have revised and expanded our research methods requirement to better train our students in research design and data analysis. We have already begun offering on an elective basis a new advanced quantitative methods course, as well as a qualitative research methods course, to better aid our students in learning the tools and methods necessary to answer their proposed research questions. Beginning in Fall 2013, all MA students will have to complete a three-course sequence: (a) a standalone research design course; (b) an introductory course on basic quantitative analysis; and (c) either an intermediate quantitative analysis course or a qualitative research methods course. By now offering a full semester of research design, we can better train our students to understand how to design a research project and identify and assess the relevant literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2011-2012</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 necessary changes to the curriculum have already been adopted and the necessary changes for the 2013-2014 Graduate Catalog have been submitted and are awaiting approval. Syllabi for the revised research design course have already been created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Political Science Department; instructors for POLS 8800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>Effective Reporting of Research Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Graduate office will stop accepting applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate office; graduate director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>Graduate director will assign advisors to incoming graduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>08/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate director; faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<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>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>A sub-committee of the graduate committee is currently leading the discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Completion Date:</td>
<td>11/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Graduate director; sub-committee of graduate committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>Effective Reporting of Research Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Resources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Review of Thesis and Non-Thesis Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective:</td>
<td>Effective Reporting of Research Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Resources:**

None
Expanded required methods sequence

Beginning in Fall of 2013, we have revised and expanded our research methods requirement to better train our students in research design and data analysis. We have already begun offering on an elective basis a new advanced quantitative methods course, as well as a qualitative research methods course, to better aid our students in learning the tools and methods necessary to answer their proposed research questions. Beginning in Fall 2013, all MA students will have to complete a three-course sequence: (a) a stand-alone research design course; (b) an introductory course on basic quantitative analysis; and (c) either an intermediate quantitative analysis course or a qualitative research methods course. We believe implementing this new sequence of courses will ensure that all of our students are able to demonstrate a high degree of mastery of the research skills commensurate with their area of specialization.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: The necessary classes have already been designed and added to the curriculum; the necessary catalog changes have been submitted for approval for the 2013-2014 Graduate Catalog.
Projected Completion Date: 08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: The Department of Political Science
Additional Resources: None; faculty capable of teaching these courses are already currently on the 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 major changes to the assessment process were made this past year. Rather, we focused on program changes targeted at improving student outcomes, such as revising and expanding our required methods sequence; this new sequence will be formally implemented in Fall 2013.

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 plan to implement a revised and expanded required methods sequence beginning in Fall of 2013. Students currently must complete a two-course methods sequence. The new required sequence will consist of three courses: (1) a stand-alone research design course; (2) a stand-alone introduction to quantitative analysis course and (3) a choice of either an intermediate quantitative analysis course or a qualitative methods course. We believe these changes will increase the training our students receive, and aid them in better achieving mastery of the necessary research skills we seek to impart to our students.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Political Science PhD
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(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of Political Science at Georgia State University recognizes that a research department at a research university needs a genuinely strong doctoral program. As such, the PhD program aims to provide students with a comprehensive grounding in the methodology and philosophy of social science as well as specific training in multiple fields and subfields of the discipline. The PhD program focuses on producing high quality researchers and teachers. The Department strives to develop graduates who are successful at publishing and teaching, and who obtain tenure-track positions in the southeast and nationally. The training students receive in seminars should equip them to pursue their own research, present it at conferences, and secure publication of their work. The program aims to provide doctoral students with varied opportunities to develop research records and skill sets attractive to potential employers.

Goals

G 5: Teaching Effectiveness
Doctoral candidates are effective teachers with the ability to teach courses in their primary field and sub-fields of the discipline.

G 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization
Doctoral candidates are effective researchers with a full understanding of the research enterprise, including the ability to critique others' work and to be a contributing scholar by producing original research.

G 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods
Doctoral candidates are effective researchers with a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to their research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.

G 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield
Doctoral candidates are knowledge scholars with demonstrable competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.
**G 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**
Doctoral candidates are knowledge scholars with demonstrable familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student’s major field of expertise.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)**
The student demonstrates familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student’s major field of expertise.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.
- 3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 2: Competency in Second Field or Subfield (G: 2) (M: 1)**
Students must demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).

**SLO 3: High Level of Competency in Research Methods (G: 3) (M: 2, 3)**
Students have a high level of competency in research skills appropriate to their research endeavors and a familiarity with a broad range of methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative approaches.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 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).

**SLO 4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization (G: 4) (M: 2, 3)**
Students have a full understanding of the research enterprise, including the ability to critique others’ work and to be a contributing scholar by producing original research.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
- 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).

**SLO 5: Teaching Effectiveness (G: 5) (M: 4)**
Students possess the ability to effectively teach courses in their primary fields and sub-fields of the discipline.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.6 Other efforts in support of Goal 3 (Leading Public Research University).
- 5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
- 5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive exam assessments (O: 1, 2)**
Based on the program’s learning outcomes, the lead reader for each field or sub-field doctoral comprehensive committee shall write an assessment of the degree to which the answers provided by the students indicate success in achievement of the outcomes.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**
The Department’s performance target is for all doctoral students taking comprehensive exams to pass those exams at the first sitting. If not, then the Department aims for students to pass the exams on their second and final sitting. Comprehensive exams test students’ knowledge of, at minimum, two fields in the discipline.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Comprehensive exams are offered twice a year; they were previously offered in December and May but we began...
implementing a move this academic year to offering the exams in September and February. Thus, exams were offered in December 2011, and then again in February 2012. This academic year, a total of 10 students took comprehensive exams, and 8 passed all three of their exams (80%). This represents a strong increase from last academic year's pass rate of 64%, and the pass rate from two years ago, which was 50%. Of those passing their exams, four passed on their first try. The other four passed on their second tries. One student received a "high pass," with the evaluation committee finding that the exam "demonstrates a real mastery of the literature, as well as the ability to apply theoretical literature and empirical examples in fruitful ways." However, two students failed exams. One failed for the second time, and the two exams the student retook both showed serious deficiencies; this student has since been terminated from the program. One potential thing of note is that this particular student returned after being gone for a number of years and their struggles likely reflected that separation. The other student who failed exams failed on the first attempt and went on in September of 2012 to pass their exams, receiving a "high pass" on one of them. Last year not only reflected a change in when comprehensive exams were offered but also in how they were administered and graded. Previously, students took a written exam and receive a grade on that exam, and if the exam was rated as at least a "pass," sat for an oral exam conducted by one member of each exam committee. The oral exam committee would then decide whether the student passed in total. The Department revised the process such that students, beginning in February, only sit for an oral exam if requested by a specific exam committee. In other words, students take a written exam and receive a grade of either high pass, pass, request an oral exam, or inadequate. This change means that rather than oral exams performing a rather perfunctory function (and faculty finding it rather difficult to rate a student as "inadequate" when they successfully passed their written examinations), they now are used when students' written exams are on the border between pass and fail, and provide an opportunity for the student to demonstrate orally their mastery of the literature as well as for the exam committee to closely question the student on this literature. Initial reports are that this system is working well.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Comprehensive exams are offered twice a year; they were previously offered in December and May but we began implementing a move this academic year to offering the exams in September and February. Thus, exams were offered in December 2011, and then again in February 2012. This academic year, a total of 10 students took comprehensive exams, and 8 passed all three of their exams (80%). This represents a strong increase from last academic year's pass rate of 64%, and the pass rate from two years ago, which was 50%. Of those passing their exams, four passed on their first try. The other four passed on their second tries. One student received a "high pass," with the evaluation committee finding that the exam "demonstrates a real mastery of the literature, as well as the ability to apply theoretical literature and empirical examples in fruitful ways." However, two students failed exams. One failed for the second time, and the two exams the student retook both showed serious deficiencies; this student has since been terminated from the program. One potential thing of note is that this particular student returned after being gone for a number of years and their struggles likely reflected that separation. The other student who failed exams failed on the first attempt and went on in September of 2012 to pass their exams, receiving a "high pass" on one of them. Last year not only reflected a change in when comprehensive exams were offered but also in how they were administered and graded. Previously, students took a written exam, received a grade on that exam, and if the exam was rated as at least a "pass," sat for an oral exam conducted by one member of each exam committee. The oral exam committee would then decide whether the student passed in total. The Department revised the process such that students, beginning in February, only sit for an oral exam if requested by a specific exam committee. In other words, students take a written exam and receive a grade of either high pass, pass, request an oral exam, or inadequate. This change means that rather than oral exams performing a rather perfunctory function (and faculty finding it rather difficult to rate a student as "inadequate" when they successfully passed their written examinations), they now are used when students' written exams are on the border between pass and fail, and provide an opportunity for the student to demonstrate orally their mastery of the literature as well as for the exam committee to closely question the student on this literature. Initial reports are that this system is working well.

**M2: Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations (O: 1, 3, 4)**

The members of each doctoral dissertation committee will individually provide to the Director of Graduate Studies a written assessment stating the degree to which the dissertation and its defense indicate success in achievement of the program's stated learning outcomes.

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

**Target for O1: Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field**

It is the Department's target that all successfully defended doctoral dissertations demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the student's major subfield, that all demonstrate a high level of competency in research methods appropriate to the discipline, that all demonstrate the ability to critique others' work, and that all demonstrate the ability to be a contributing scholar by producing original research. On a 5-point performance scale (with 5 representing the top performance level), the department seeks scores of 3.5 or better.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Six doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (from fall 2011 through summer 2012). Based on averaging the assessments completed by each student's dissertation committee members, five of the six 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. On the positive side, the two highest ranked dissertations (receiving scores of 5 and 4.9) were outstanding, and met or exceeded all of the department's learning goals. Two of the dissertations received an average score of 4 and were described as "clearly meeting the department's learning goals." The weakest dissertation received an average score of 3.5; however, the student was rated very highly as to his/her ability to teach and accepted a tenure-track job at a teaching oriented college. On the negative, the one dissertation that did not meet the department's goal received an average score of 2.7 from the three committee members. The dissertation was described as "minimally acceptable," and one committee member noted that "the student displayed somewhat limited willingness and/or ability to write a really strong dissertation."

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Six doctoral dissertations were successfully defended this year (Fall 2011 to Summer 2012). Five of the six dissertations met the department’s goal of a score of 3.5 or above on the assessment asking about the student’s ability to utilize the appropriate research methods. Three of the five students received a perfect score of 5, indicating a very high degree of competency in the use of research methods. One dissertation did not meet the department’s goal, receiving an average score of 2.7.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Six dissertations were successfully defended this year (Fall 2011-Summer 2012). Four of the six dissertations met the department’s stated goal of averaging 3.5 or higher on an assessment of the student's ability to demonstrate a full understanding of the research enterprise. Two students received a perfect score of 5, while two others received a score of 4, suggesting they have a high degree of understanding of the research enterprise. Two students did not meet the department’s stated goal, receiving scores of 3 and 2.7, respectively.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At least 10 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on student reports of last year’s accomplishments). These conferences range from small gatherings to the most prestigious (and competitive) in the discipline. For example, two of our PhD students presented a paper or poster at the 2011 American Political Science Association Convention, a conference with an acceptance rate well under 50% (including for faculty). Four students presented at the 2011 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, another highly prestigious conference in the discipline. 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. Seven of our PhD students were published this year, in a variety of outlets. Most notable, one of our students had a solo-authored paper accepted for publication in Comparative Political Studies, the top-ranked journal in the field of Comparative Politics, and a journal within the top 10 in the discipline. Numerous other students also submitted their work for publication in peer-reviewed journals. We also had a number of our students apply for grants. One student received a grant to attend the 2012 Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) Summer program while another was a Visiting Research Fellow at the Institute of Foreign Policy Studies in Calcutta, an autonomous research institute associated with the University of Calcutta.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At least 10 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on student reports of last year’s accomplishments). These conferences range from small gatherings to the most prestigious (and competitive) in the discipline. For example, two of our PhD students presented a paper or poster at the 2011 American Political Science Association Convention, a conference with an acceptance rate well under 50% (including for faculty). Four students presented at the 2011 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, another highly prestigious conference in the discipline. 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. Seven of our PhD students were published this year, in a variety of outlets. Most notable, one of our students had a solo-authored paper accepted for publication in Comparative Political Studies, the top-ranked journal in the field of Comparative Politics, and a journal within the top 10 in the discipline. Numerous other students also submitted their work for publication in peer-reviewed journals. We also had a number of our students apply for grants. One student received a grant to attend the 2012 Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) Summer program while another was a Visiting Research Fellow at the Institute of Foreign Policy Studies in Calcutta, an autonomous research institute associated with the University of Calcutta.

**Target for O4: Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization**

Doctoral students should present their work at at least one professional conference each year. Doctoral should students regularly submit work for publication and for grant competitions.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At least 10 doctoral students presented their work at professional conferences this year (based on student reports of last year’s accomplishments). These conferences range from small gatherings to the most prestigious (and competitive) in the
discipline. For example, two of our PhD students presented a paper or poster at the 2011 American Political Science Association Convention, a conference with an acceptance rate well under 50% (including for faculty). Four students presented at the 2011 Midwest Political Science Association Conference, another highly prestigious conference in the discipline. 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. Seven of our PhD students were accepted this year, in a variety of outlets. Most notable, one of our students had a solo-authored paper accepted for publication in Comparative Political Studies, the top-ranked journal in the field of Comparative Politics, and a journal within the top 10 in the discipline. Numerous other students also submitted their work for publication in peer-reviewed journals. We also had a number of our students apply for grants. One student received a grant to attend the 2012 Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) Summer program while another was a Visiting Research Fellow at the Institute of Foreign Policy Studies in Calcutta, an autonomous research institute associated with the University of Calcutta.

**M 4: Teaching Effectiveness (O: 5)**

Utilizing syllabi and data from student evaluations of graduate students teaching courses, the Director of Graduate Studies shall assess the competence of the doctoral graduate students in teaching courses.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target for O5: Teaching Effectiveness**

The Department wants all syllabi in courses taught by doctoral students to be in conformity with departmental, College, and University standards. The Department also seeks overall teaching effectiveness scores of at least 4.0 on Question 17 of the student course evaluations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The department finds that this goal was met this year. Twenty-three instructors taught a total of 40 sections in Fall, Spring and Summer of 2011-2012 (up from 13 instructors teaching 21 sections last year). This almost doubling of graduate student instructors reflects both the increase in incoming freshmen, necessitating more sections of both POLS 1101 and 2401, and the need for full-time faculty to teach our departmental CTW courses. Fourteen instructors taught 14 sections in fall 2011 (and a fifteenth taught the first six weeks of two upper-division courses while a professor was on maternity leave), fourteen instructors taught 16 sections in spring 2012 (including three upper-division courses), and seven instructors taught 10 sections in summer 2012. Seven instructors taught 18 sections of POLS 1101 (Introduction to American Politics) and thirteen instructors taught 19 sections of POLS 2401 (Global Issues). Ten of these 40 sections were over-100 students (an unfortunate increase in over-100 sections over last year in which only 6 were taught). More unfortunately, none of the sections taught contained less than 48 students (last year 9 sections were capped at 25 or less), and 20 of the sections contained between 60 and 75 students. Syllabi were examined by the 2401 and 1101 coordinators and found to be substantially in compliance with departmental, College and University standards. In addition, these coordinators have developed a set of common learning outcomes for 2401 and 1101. The average score for overall teaching effectiveness (question 17) was 4.5 for 1101 and 4.2 for 2401 (the relevant numbers were 4.4 and 4.3 last year); it ranged from 3.8 to 4.9 for 1101 and from 3.2 to 4.8 for 2401. These numbers are quite impressive for graduate instruction in introductory courses, and show clearly that our graduate students are providing high quality instruction. Indeed, instructors in nineteen of the 40 sections, almost half, received evaluations of 4.5 or higher. Nevertheless, several instructors received lower marks than we would like on question 17. That said, of the eight instructors receiving evaluations under 4.0, seven were teaching for the first time, and one of those moved from 3.2 to 4.2 the following semester, indicating that learning is happening. The department has also instituted an in-house teacher training course in May 2010 targeted to political science instruction. We believe this course has helped us maintain high teach standards, especially in the face of a greatly increased need for graduate student instructors.

**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:** Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field
- **Outcome/Objective:** High Level of Competency in Research Methods
- **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

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: Added to graduate catalog and enforced by graduate director and college graduate office.
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Faculty advisors
The department has decided to resuscitate our advisement program for incoming graduate students. This semester, all new graduate students were assigned a faculty advisor in their area who can provide them with advice until they can choose their own thesis or dissertation advisors.

- Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
- Implementation Status: Finished
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Graduate director assigns advisors
- Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Director

Methods Sequence Reform
The department plans to add a third course to the required methods sequence for PhD students. This is partially in response to data gathered through the assessment process that shows that some of our PhD students do not have adequate methodological skills. The specific details of the proposal are as follows:

1. The 8800 and 8810 requirements would be maintained as they exist now, such that students must take 8800 in their first semester and 8810 in their second. 2. PhD students (not MA students) would be required to take a third methods course, either “Advanced Quantitative Methods” or “Advanced Qualitative Methods”, as they prefer. 3. “Advanced Qualitative Methods” would be offered every other spring semester and could be taken at the same time as 8810. This sequence would allow students to take the course within two years of beginning the program. 4. “Advanced Quantitative Methods” would be offered every other fall semester and would have to be taken after completion of 8810. Students entering the program in the year it is not offered could take it the following fall. Those entering in the year it is offered would have to wait until the first semester of their third years to take the course. For this reason it would be better to offer the course every year, but if resources (or enrollment concerns) make that impossible, we can allow students in this position to go forward with comps at the end of their second year even without having taken the course. That way, their progress would not be slowed. 5. “Advanced Quantitative Methods” would cover the most commonly used statistical methods not fully discussed in 8800 or 8810, as determined by the instructor. These could include, for example, maximum likelihood estimation, duration models, panel models, and hierarchical models. The focus of the
course would be on giving students a practical, applied knowledge of these techniques. 6. “Advanced Qualitative Methods” would cover the most used qualitative techniques not fully discussed in 8800 and 8810, as determined by the instructor. These could include greater depth on case selection and process tracing as well as discussion of QCA, content analysis, elite interviewing, and other topics. 7. Students would be required either to complete a fourth methods course or to pass a foreign language exam, with students of comparative politics required to choose the latter option. 8. The new course would count as a methods course for the purposes of the distribution requirement, such that students would only need to complete courses in two other subfields of political science (IR, CP, AP, or Theory) to fulfill that requirement. This would allow students to fulfill the distribution requirement and the requirement to complete three courses per comp field without exceeding the required 30 hours of coursework and extending the length of the program. 9. Students wishing to take the comprehensive exam in methods would need to complete one methods course beyond the newly required course. Justification 1. The large majority of political science departments at peer and aspirational universities require three methods courses (see other attachment). 2. Methods training, whether qualitative or quantitative, is increasingly central to placing our graduates in tenure track positions. At the moment, many of our students are not adequately trained in the most common techniques. 3. While we do sometimes offer methods courses beyond 8810, these tend to cover very specific topics. As a result, these courses often have difficulty attracting enough students to make, and they still leave our PhD students with no formal way of learning many of the most common methodological approaches out there. Students have sought to plug these gaps in their education by taking directed readings (such as reminder’s multilevel modeling directed reading this semester, which was almost large enough to make as an actual class). As we all know, directed readings courses are time consuming for faculty and offer few rewards; implementing this proposal would likely reduce the demand for them while simultaneously expanding our coverage of methods. Our more specific methods courses could continue to be offered to allow students without foreign language skills to complete their fourth methods requirement and to prepare students for coping in methods. 4. At the moment, students who wish to expand their knowledge of methods (especially qualitative methods) are often forced to take courses at Emory. As a full service PhD granting department, we should be offering this training in-house. 5. There would be no concern about the new methods courses attracting enough students to make as they would be required. In addition, implementing the proposal would only require that we offer one new course per year. 6. In my conversations with current graduate students this semester, our limited methods offering was the single most common complaint I received.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We need a new faculty member to offer one of the courses, and we are hiring the position now. The 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

Teaching Course for Graduate Students
The department introduced a new teacher training course for our graduate instructors in May 2010. This course targets political science instruction and allows students multiple opportunities to practice their teaching, and we believe that it will further improve our already good graduate student teaching evaluations.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This course was introduced in May
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Rashid Naim is teaching the course.

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
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: See above
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Director of Graduate Studies

Creation Major Area Paper requirement
The Department voted to implement, beginning in Fall of 2013, a new requirement whereby students must write a “major area” paper in lieu of taking a third written sub-field comprehensive exam. The goal of this new requirement is to aid students in progressing from the comprehensive exam stage of the doctoral program to the dissertation stage. The Department believes that having students write a paper targeted at their dissertation topic area, and focused on identifying the major research questions, findings and gaps in the relevant literature, will serve as the necessary bridge to helping students design and write better dissertations.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure|Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations</td>
<td>Comprehensive Understanding of Major Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Enterprise and Professional Socialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Description: The Department voted on this change in August 2012, and the necessary changes to the graduate catalog have been submitted for the 2013-2014 Graduate Catalog.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Rashid Naim
Additional Resources: None

Implementation presentation requirement
The Department recently voted to require that all doctoral students present a paper at the GSU Political Science Graduate Student Conference by the end of their second year. This requirement is aimed at socializing doctoral students into the practice of preparing work for presentation, and then presenting that work publicly. The hope is that students will then revise these papers for presentation at a national conference and/or for submission to a peer-reviewed journal for publication.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Academic Program Question 1: Revision of required methods sequence

Methods teaching & lab assistants

Beginning in 2011-2012, we allocated at least one advanced graduate student with superior methods skills to serve as a methods teaching and lab assistant. These students hold weekly office hours in the Political Science graduate computer lab, and their job is to answer student questions about research methods, including data management, data analysis and the proper estimation techniques.

By providing additional support for students taking the required research methods sequence, our aim is to ensure all of our graduates have a very high degree of competency in utilizing the proper research methods.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Revision comprehensive exam process

In the middle of the academic year, the department changed how comprehensive exams were administered and graded. Previously, students took a written exam, received a grade on that exam, and if the exam was rated as at least a “pass,” sat for an oral exam conducted by one member of each exam committee. The oral exam committee would then decide whether the student passed in total. The Department revised the process such that students, beginning in February, only sit for an oral exam if requested by a specific exam committee. In other words, students take a written exam and receive a grade of either high pass, pass, request an oral exam, or inadequate. This change means that rather than oral exams performing a rather perfunctory function (and faculty finding it rather difficult to rate a student as “inadequate” when they successfully passed their written examinations), they now are used when students’ written exams are on the border between pass and fail, and provide an opportunity for the student to demonstrate orally their mastery of the literature as well as for the exam committee to closely question the student on this literature. Initial reports are that this system is working well.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Revision of required methods sequence

Beginning in Fall 2013, the Department has revised and expanded its required methods sequence to address concerns about the level of preparation and competency shown by our students with regards to research methods. Previously, all students were required to take a two-course sequence. Now, all doctoral students will be required to take a required four-course sequence: (1) a stand-alone research methods course and an introductory course on quantitative analysis; (3) an advanced quantitative analysis course; and (4) either an advanced quantitative analysis course or a qualitative methods course. The expectation is that increasing students’ training in basic research design and data analysis will lead to better quality dissertations.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
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 year, the coordinator for 1101 has developed a common set of learning outcomes for 1101 students, and ensured that all
1101 instructors are pursuing these outcomes; this already existed for 2401 and was found to be quite useful in ensuring consistency and a high level of quality across the different sections. In the coming academic year, we will be instituting a new 1st and 2nd year review process for all doctoral students. Currently, most of our assessments are done at the comprehensive exam stage and dissertation stage of the program. However, we believe that in order to increase the quality of our graduates, we need to assess their performance at earlier points in their graduate career. We will therefore begin evaluating all students at the end of their 1st and 2nd years as to their performance to date, with the intent of identifying any potential areas of concern.

**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 number of changes are in the process of being implemented. First, beginning in Fall 2013, the department is implementing a revised and expanded research methods sequence for all doctoral students. The aim of this revised sequence is to help our students meet the department's learning outcome goals for all successfully defended dissertations. Second, the department has revised the comprehensive exam process: students will now take two field written field exams (as opposed to three field exams or two fields and one sub-field exam) and then write a "major area" paper. The aim of this change is to help students move more successfully from the comprehensive exam stage to the dissertation stage of the program. Third, all students will now be required by the end of their second year in the doctoral program to present an original research paper at the GSU Graduate Student Conference. Fourth, we are instituting a 1st and 2nd year review process for all doctoral students to better monitor their progress through the program and ensure that all students are on-track and/or aware of potential concerns and areas for improvement prior to the taking of comprehensive exams.
### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (O: 1, 2)**  
Performance on assignments in Acct 8410  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  
**Target for O1: Financial reporting skills: Develop**  
Exam mean of 75%  
**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**  
NCI exam questions for the previous year had only 48% correct responses. For the current year, NCI exam questions reached 86.6% for correct responses.

**M 2: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop (O: 1, 2)**  
Performance on exam questions in 8410.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  
**Target for O2: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (Final)**  
Mean score of 80% or above  
**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**  
Action plan needs to be developed to replace the outdated, theoretical 8410 class that meets for 1 credit hour per semester over 3 semester, with a more robust, current course that is a regular 3 credit hour course per semester.

**M 3: Analytical Skills (O: 3, 4)**  
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  
**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**  
Exam mean of 90% or better  
**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**  
Mean score on exam questions was 81% on the question related to strengths and weaknesses of current and proposed financial accounting standards. Mean score on exam questions was 80% on the question related to why and how managers manage earnings (however, the how of managing earnings scored 74%). Mean score on exam questions related to the effect of accounting results on stock prices was 76%, up from 74% last year.

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**  
10/13/2008 Related Action Plan(s): (details in Action Plan Tracking) Assurance skills 2005-2006 0: Analytical skills (O:0) (Final)  
Performance on assignments in Acct 8700  
**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**  
Target was met on 4 of the 6 relevant questions in spring 2012, except for: (1) Interpreting the valuation implications from asset impairment (73%), and (2) analyzing profit margins and asset turnover (73%)

**M 4: Assurance Skills (O: 3, 4)**  
Performance on assignments in Acct 8610  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  
**Target for O3: Assurance Skills**  
The students performance on the midterm exam was 79 out of 100 points. Given the difficulty of the exam, this score is reasonable and comparable to the 2006 results (mean of 76 out of 100 points). In addition, in 2007 students completed a term paper on a subject matter that dealt with assurance services and related topics. Overall, the scores on the term papers were as expected.

**Target for O4: Analytical Skills**  
Exam question mean of 80% or better

**M 5: Communication Skills (O: 6)**  
At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  
**Target for O6: Communication Skills**  
At least 90% of students exited course with a B-level grade
M 6: Collaboration Skills (O: 5, 6)
Evaluation by student peers of contributions to team projects in Acct 8030 and Acct 8410
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O5: Collaboration Skills**
Instructor meeting with each student project group and with individual students to discuss progress on project and any problems with group interaction. Submission of group project on or before the deadline. Target Performance Level for Program: No unresolved complaints regarding the performance of a group member and all projects submitted with all group member names All group projects submitted on or before deadline

**Target for O6: Communication Skills**
Mean score on research project of 85% in Tx 8120.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
Scores improved, but not to the desired level.

M 7: Technology Skills (O: 7, 8)
Grading rubric used to evaluate the technology skills component of a group project in ACCT8410
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O7: Assurance Skills**
Target is mean of 85% on exam questions.

**Target for O8: Technological Skills**
A mean score of 80% or above on the technology skills component of the group project

M 8: Apply tax law: Apply tax law to individuals and entities (O: 8)
Apply tax law to individuals and entities. Target of mean of 85% on exam questions.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O8: Technological Skills**
Research Project Mean score of 85% or above for the class.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Mean score on research project was 88.57% for the spring 2012 students and 91.72% for the summer 2012 students.

**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:** Financial Reporting Skills - Develop
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Financial reporting skills: Develop
- **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
- **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
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Lucia Smeal
- **Additional Resources:** Faculty time

**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
- **Implementation Description:** 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
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 relationship between various theories.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/group: Siva Nathan

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 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
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-MBA, an out-of-class written assignment will be developed to afford students another way to demonstrate their mastery of tax rules.
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
Responsible Person/Group: Lucia Smeal

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
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Tad Ransopher

Apply concepts to financial statements in class teams
Use financial statements of fortune 500 companies to illustrate, explain, and understand the concepts of analysis.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analytical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Analytical Skills

Develop new course in new format to replace 8410.
Replace 8410 with a new course that is more topical, and is packaged as a regular 3 credit hour course per semester instead of being dispersed over 3 semesters.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Financial Reporting Skills - Develop | Outcome/Objective: Financial reporting skills: Interpret and Predict (Final)
Implementation Description: Implement new course.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan

Emphasize judgment in applying standards.
Class time will be spent emphasizing that accounting is not black and white, that there are grey areas that involve judgment in applying accounting standards, which leads to earnings management.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analytical Skills | Outcome/Objective: Assurance Skills
Implementation Description: Class time will be spent emphasizing that accounting is not black and white, that there are grey areas that involve judgment in applying accounting standards, which leads to earnings management.
Projected Completion Date: 07/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Siva Nathan
Additional Resources: Faculty time

Enhance focus in class by disallowing use of laptops in classroom.
Ensure greater focus on the lectures by banning the use of laptops that students were using to check email and other research other topics on the internet.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Collaboration Skills | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills
**Implementation Description:** Ensure greater focus on the lectures by banning the use of laptops that students were using to check email and other research topics on the internet.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** Tad Ransopher

**Include tax research written assignment as 1/4 of students’ grade**

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 under a compressed schedule (8 weeks). Project score should raise overall average.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Apply tax law
- **Outcome/Objective:** Technological Skills

**Implementation Description:** Include a new tax research written assignment.

**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** Lucia Smeal

**Use examples in class.**

Use several examples in class to provide guidance to students as to how to think about the effect of accounting results on stock prices and critically analyze current and proposed financial accounting standards to identify their strengths and weaknesses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

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

**Implementation Description:** Use several examples in class to provide guidance to students as to how to think about the effect of accounting results on stock prices and critically analyze current and proposed financial accounting standards to identify their strengths and weaknesses.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Siva Nathan

**Additional Resources:** Faculty time

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Psychology at Georgia State University has a long history of offering both undergraduate and graduate degree programs for both traditional and non-traditional students. Psychology is an extraordinarily broad field and the departmental curriculum reflects the diversity of our discipline. Psychology can be broadly defined as the study of behavior, and of those biological, psychological and socio-cultural factors that which create and influence behavior. It also encompasses the application of basic knowledge to improve the human condition. Psychology has links to numerous other disciplines (e.g., biology, sociology), and also a long tradition of interdisciplinary interaction and collaboration (e.g., education, medicine) based on shared goals in both basic and applied endeavors. The department offers a general undergraduate degree program that is integrated with the broader liberal arts education goals of the College of Arts and Sciences. It also contributes to the core curriculum for all undergraduates in the College.

---

**Goals**

**G 1: Area D: Natural and Computational Sciences**

Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the nature of science, and the scientific method, and/or understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

**G 2: Area E: Social Science**

Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and change.

---

**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)
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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

The course coordinator for PSYC1100 left the department this year. As a result, PSYC1100 instructors collected pre (but not post) data in both semesters. We are not able to report findings for this measure this year. The new course coordinator has asked all instructors to perform the pre/post tests.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

At least 70% of students received a score of 70% or better on our mastery test questions this year, N=438.

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

Implement PSYC1100 measure under new course coordinator

The previous course coordinator supervising the measures of learning outcomes is no longer with GSU. As a result, none of the instructors in the past year collected data for our PSYC1100 measurement of the natural sciences Core learning objective. The new course coordinator is making sure that all PSYC1100 instructors are recording these data.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: enforce measurement of core natural sciences objectives
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Goode (Course Coordinator for PSYC1100)
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 major change regarding the core curriculum was replacement of the outgoing course coordinator for PSYC1100, who is no longer with GSU. We hope to improve response from our PSYC1100 instructors with a new course coordinator.

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 no data for the natural sciences core curriculum measure; we plan to collect those data in the coming year. For the social sciences core measure, we met our target, but we haven't done this regularly in the past few reporting periods. The course coordinator for PSYC1101 will continue to strengthen and standardize the curriculum for this course, to work with incoming instructors (many for this course are visiting or GTA instructors), and to increase the use of technology in the classroom that benefits instructors (e.g. clickers).
Georgia State University
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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.

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)
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)
Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues.

SLO 5: Values in Psychology (G: 1)
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: 6)
Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.

SLO 8: Sociocultural and International Awareness (G: 2)
Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.

**SLO 9: Personal Development (G: 2) (M: 3)**

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)**

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The course coordinator for PSYC1100 left the department this year. Instructors for PSYC1100 collected pre, but not post data for this survey.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

At least 76.9% of students scored 70% or better on the mastery test questions this year, N=438.

**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 a randomly selected skill for an instructor. Behavior is rated by a trained observer (not the instructor). The students are evaluated on their ability to display each of five listening and six talking skills at least once during the role-play. The behavioral measure is administered during the last week of class.

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

**Target for O9: Personal Development**

Demonstrate at least 80% of both listening and talking skills.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All students demonstrated at least 80% of listening and talking skills, N=187.

**M 5: PSYC3530 - PORT 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Only 73.8% of students passed the PORT Quiz with a score of 75% or better. The average score was 80.75, N=261.

**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 copy of the rubric 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, 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 contributed 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

For the PSYC3530 assignments: The median score for Organization and Logic was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 97% 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 96% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. The median score for Position and Balance was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 99% 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 median score for Use of Evidence was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 79% 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 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 73% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. For the PSYC4800 assignments: The median score for Organization and Logic was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 77% 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 4.5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 73% 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 4.5, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 77% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Position and Balance was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 67% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

For PSYC3530: The median score for Grammar and Mechanics was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 94% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. The median score for Content and Development was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 96% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. The median score for Organization and Use of Sources was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 96% of the students were rated a score of 2 (the lower end of the ‘developing’ range) or higher. For PSYC4800: The median score for Grammar and Mechanics was 3, which is in the ‘developing’ range, and 46% 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 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 60% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher. The median score for Position and Balance was 4, which is in the ‘mastering’ range, and 73% of the students were rated a score of 4 (the lower end of the ‘mastering’ range) or higher.

M7: 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.
already exists in this new course. Occupational pursuits in a variety of settings. Emerge from the major with realistic ideas about how to implement their psychological knowledge, skills and values in PSYC3110 - we will not change our existing measure for this goal. Others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement. Course: PSYC3530 Quantitative Methods Questions (O: 2) We developed a series of questions to assess mastery of quantitative methods to be delivered in sections of PSYC3530 as part of exams, quizzes or other assignments. The full list of questions can be found in the document repository. Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge. Target for O2: Research Methods in Psychology Our target for this measure is that 75% of students answer 75% or more of these questions correctly. Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met Scores increased from pre (M=37.97, SD=7.27) to post (M=39.79, SD=7.41), however this difference was not significant, t(32)=-3.7, p=.32. Remap measures to outcomes. At the review of last year’s learning outcomes assessment, it was suggested we make some changes to our outcomes and the measures we use to assess them. Specifically, it was recommended that we have fewer objectives - at the time we were reporting on 11 learning objectives. It was also recommended we have fewer objectives being measured by a single outcome. To address these suggestions we have developed the following plan. The 11 objectives we were monitoring were based on ten learning objectives recommended for undergraduate programs in psychology by the American Psychological Association in a 2000 report, plus our university core objective (Contemporary Issues). As the ten learning goals outlined by the APA are so well-suited for our undergraduate program, we feel strongly that we should monitor each goal. Our subcommittee has identified courses with measures already in place that we can use to track progress toward these goals. We could not find sufficient justification for eliminating any of the ten. We do not, however, see the necessity of reporting on our core objective along with our undergraduate program objectives, as we report on it separately. While the goals themselves will remain very much the same, our mapping of measurements to goals will undergo a major revision. We anticipate it will take at least two years before we are measuring progress toward each goal with the new measures, but we have identified from which courses we will be collecting measurement data. For some of these courses we have already identified a specific measure, that is already being taken as part of the course, that we can use to track progress toward specific goals. Our planned map of courses to goals is as follows: 1. Knowledge Base of Psychology - Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and historical trends in psychology. Course: PSYC1100. Measure: We already have a mastery test in place that we can use to measure progress toward this goal. 2. Research Methods in Psychology - Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation. Course: PSYC3510 (2˚ measure PSYC3530) - we will need to find an existing measure in the course - this is the first semester it is being taught. 3. Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology - Students will respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes. Course: PSYC4800 - We have a two sample writing analysis in the course already - we will use an existing CTW rubric to compare pre/post writing samples. 4. Application of Psychology - Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues. Course: PSYC2040, PSYC2101 - We need to identify an existing measure in these courses to serve as 1˚ and 2˚ measurements for this goal. 5. Values in Psychology - Students will be able to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values that are the underpinnings of psychology as a discipline. PSYC3510 - We need to identify an existing measure in these courses to serve as a measurement toward this goal. 6. Information and Technological Literacy - Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes. We have a measure in place that is perfect for this goal - the library works with our department to offer a quiz on the Psychology Online Research Tutorial. 7. Communication Skills - Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats. PSYC3110 - we will not change our existing measure for this goal. 8. Sociocultural and International Awareness - Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity. Course: PSYC3570 - Multicultural Psychology - We need to identify and existing measure in this course to serve as a measurement for this goal. 9. Personal Development - Students will develop insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement. Course: PSYC3110 - we will not change our existing measure for this goal. 10. Career Planning and Development - Students will emerge from the major with realistic ideas about how to implement their psychological knowledge, skills and values in occupational pursuits in a variety of settings. Course: PSYC2030 - Careers in Psychology - We will identify a measurement that already exists in this new course.

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

**Schedule Tracking of APA Learning Outcomes**
In response to feedback from the UAC we have decided not to try to measure progress toward all 10 APA learning objectives every year. Rather, we will measure progress toward select objectives with rotation to try to cover the most relevant APA-mandated objectives regularly. Over the coming year, our UPC will work together to develop a schedule of which objectives we will measure progress toward, and what measures we will use for those objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
- **Implementation Status:** Planned  
- **Priority:** High  
- **Implementation Description:** schedule measures of APA learning objectives  
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Chris Goode/UPC  
- **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?

Most of the changes were to address ever-growing demand for courses required for the major. These changes were not made based on learning outcomes data, but on data from the Office of Institutional Research. We have, however, revised our learning outcomes tracking strategy to focus on fewer of the APA-recommended learning objectives for an undergraduate Psychology major, and these were based in part on feedback we received from the UAC.

**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 addition to the change in assessment strategy based on feedback from the UAC (see previous answer) we have aligned our CTW-related measures (which are also reported here for objective 3) to match the definitions specified by our accreditation body the American Psychological Association. Again, most of the other major changes to courses/curricula were based on the increasing number of psychology majors here at GSU.

---
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(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.

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

**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.

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

**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.
### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.
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 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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: MA Thesis Proposal GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**

During the oral presentation of the Master’s proposal, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations), or 3 (Exceeded expectations)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**

The average score should be between a 2 ("Met Expectations") and 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score was 2.19.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

The average score should be between a 2 ("Met Expectations") and 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score was 2.13.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

The average score should be between a 2 ("Met Expectations") and 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The average score was 2.34.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

**M 2: MA Thesis Defense GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**

During the oral presentation of the Master’s defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations), or 3 (Exceeded expectations)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target for **O1: Theory and Content**
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
93% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
88% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
95% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
86% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
98% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**

At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

### M 4: General Exam (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 4, 5, 8)

Doctoral examination scored by committee of faculty

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

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O4: Application**

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

A minimum of 90% of students should pass on first attempt

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

### M 5: General Exam GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)

During the oral defense of the General Exam, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations)

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

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**

At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
92% 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 6: PhD Dissertation Proposal GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**  
During the oral presentation of the PhD. proposal, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations)  
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Theory and Content**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O2: Research Methods**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness**  
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students received a score of 2 or 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 7: PhD Dissertation Defense GLOE (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9)**  
During the oral presentation of the PhD. defense, committee members are given a Graduate Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to complete. Each member assigns a rating of 1 (Did not meet expectations), 2 (Met expectations) or 3 (Exceeded expectations)  
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
### Target for O1: Theory and Content
At least 90% of students should receive a score of 2 ("Met Expectations") or 3 ("Exceeded Expectations").

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
96% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
92% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
96% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
98% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
98% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
98% of students received a score of 2 or 3.

### M 8: PhD Dissertation (Pass or Fail) (O: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)
Evaluates 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

#### Target for O2: Research Methods
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

#### Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

#### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

#### Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy
At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

**Target for O8: Values in Psychology**

At least 90% of students should pass on first attempt.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

More than 90% of students passed on first attempt.

<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>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O8: 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 2011-2012 - 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>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O9: 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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 11: Performance in methods courses (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psyc 8010: Psychological Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students earned a grade of A on a major methods assignment that reflects the performance in methods.</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>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Theory and Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students earned a grade of A on a major assignment that reflects the performance in historical trends in psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Target for O2: Research Methods** |
| At least 90% of the students should earn a grade of B or better on a major assignment that assesses expertise with historical trends in the field of Psychology. |
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met** |
| All students earned a grade of A on a major assignment that reflects the performance in history 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met** |
| All students earned a grade of A on a major assignment that reflects the performance in history 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

All students earned a grade of A on a major assignment that reflects the performance in history 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

All students earned a grade of A on a major assignment that reflects the performance in history 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

100% of 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

78% of GTAs received a rating of good to excellent on teaching evaluations (i.e., score on item 17 above 3.9).

### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
78% of GTAs received a rating of good to excellent on teaching evaluations (i.e., score on item 17 above 3.9).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

78% of GTAs received a rating of good to excellent on teaching evaluations (i.e., score on item 17 above 3.9).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

78% of GTAs received a rating of good to excellent on teaching evaluations (i.e., score on item 17 above 3.9).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

78% of GTAs received a rating of good to excellent on teaching evaluations (i.e., score on item 17 above 3.9).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

78% of GTAs received a rating of good to excellent on teaching evaluations (i.e., score on item 17 above 3.9).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.

**Target for O2: Research Methods**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.

**Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.

**Target for O4: Application**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.

**Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills**

Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Values in Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Career Planning and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty publish an average of one paper with one or more student co-authors and make at least three presentations with student co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% of our tenure-track faculty published at least 1 article with a student co-author and 53% presented at least 3 papers with a student co-author.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M 16: Annual evaluation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)**

Faculty members of each program review all students in their program annually to determine how many students are performing satisfactorily on each learning outcome.

**Source of Evidence: Evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Theory and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Reported This Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Reported This Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Communication and Collaboration Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target</strong>: Not Reported This Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Target for O4: Application

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## Target for O6: Personal Development

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## Target for O7: Information and Technology Literacy

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## Target for O8: Values in Psychology

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## Target for O9: Sociocultural and International Awareness

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## Target for O10: Career Planning and Development

At least 95% of student evaluations should indicate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target:** Not Reported This Cycle

The annual evaluations are not consistently written in a way to allow for extraction of this information.

## 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: Application

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: 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: 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: 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: 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: 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: 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 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 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

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Research Methods

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Theory and Content

Discuss measure
The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Committee will discuss whether student publications and presentation is a good measure of student learning or if it should be removed or modified.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Publications and presentations | Outcome/Objective: Communication and Collaboration Skills
**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?

This year we revised the learning outcomes, measures, and target. These were minor changes made. We are content with our 3 broad goals. However, in the coming academic year, we plan to discuss our 10 objectives, 16 measures, and 59 targets in order to select the most important objectives, measures, and targets. It was determined that our larger number of objectives, measures, and especially targets complicates the assessment process and makes it difficult to discern important training information. Thus, we aim to have approximately 4 key objectives, 5 measures, and 5 targets 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.

Psychology is a large department with 5 unique concentrations (i.e., Clinical, Developmental, NBN, Community, and Cognitive Sciences) and 2 dual-degree concentrations (i.e., Clinical - NBN, Clinical-Community). Each of the 5 concentrations has a Chair and a committee that conducts individualized training evaluations and changes to curriculum and courses. Thus, the data obtained at the department-level (i.e., this WEAVE report) has little impact. The findings are typically taken to the concentration level for consideration for changes to training. The Graduate Program Committee will meet to discuss how to best use the WEAVE reporting system to impact department-level training decisions.

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Public Administration MPA**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST

(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 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>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrate understanding of models of government and administrative reform (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Identify major ethical issues that arise in public or nonprofit sector (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must be able to identify the major ethical issues that arise in the public or nonprofit sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Analyze the nature and function of the public sector (G: 1) (M: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply basic concepts of measures and data sets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: 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 are able to demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and describe the results correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers (G: 2) (M: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables in both bivariate and multiple regression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10: Ability to demonstrate graduate-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (G: 3) (M: 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles (G: 4) (M: 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 12: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public and nonprofit policy issues (G: 4) (M: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to policy issues affecting the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 13: Demonstrate understanding of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors (G: 4) (M: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 14: Describe the technical nature and process of public and nonprofit budgeting (G: 5) (M: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 15: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or nonprofit organizations (G: 5) (M: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to assess, explain, and compare the political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in the U.S or explain how organizational characteristics and external sources of regulation and funding affect nonprofit organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (G: 6) (M: 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.</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 (PMAP 8111 or PMAP 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% at least partially met 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% at least partially met objective.

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
96% at least partially met objective.

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
88% at least partially 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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
88% at least partially met this objective.

M 6: Demonstrate ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (O: 6)
The students’ final examination and final paper provide evidence of their ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
M 7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers (O: 7)

The students' final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O7: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public and nonprofit managers

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8121 will at least partially meet this objective. The students' final paper and the midterm and final examinations measure their ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing public managers.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
92% at least partially met this objective.

M 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (O: 8)

Students use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public and nonprofit 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. Students use examinations and the final paper to demonstrate their understanding of basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
96% at least partially met this objective.

M 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (O: 9)

Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective. Students skills of being able to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables are measured by examinations and the final paper.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
90% at least partially met this objective.

M 10: Ability to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research (O: 10)

Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O10: Ability to demonstrate graduate-level writing skill in policy-relevant research

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. Students must produce a final research design paper to demonstrate master-level writing skill in policy-relevant research. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8131 will at least partially meet this objective.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
98% at least partially met this objective.

M 11: Demonstrated understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (O: 11)
Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O11: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

83% at least partially met this objective.

**M 12: Ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (O: 12)**

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm and final examinations and the final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O12: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public and nonprofit policy issues**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm and final examinations and the final paper.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

83% at least partially met this objective.

**M 13: Demonstrated understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (O: 13)**

On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O13: Demonstrate understanding of market failure and the potential role of the public and nonprofit sectors**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

83% at least partially met this objective.

**M 14: Demonstrated ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting (O: 14)**

Students demonstrate the ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting on assignments 1-4, the midterm and final examinations, and the final project.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O14: Describe the technical nature and process of public and nonprofit budgeting**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8161, Public Budgeting and Finance, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate the ability to describe the technical nature and process of public budgeting on assignments 1-4, the midterm and final examinations, and the final project.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

85% at least partially met this objective.

**M 15: Demonstrated ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation (O: 15)**

All of the course requirements consisting of four written assignments, a midterm exam, a final exam, and a final project will document the students' ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target for O15: Compare politics of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation in public or 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 in PMAP 8161 will at least partially meet this objective. All of the course requirements consisting of four written assignments, a midterm exam, a final exam, and a final project will document the students’ ability to compare political aspects of budgeting with rational methods of resource allocation.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
85% at least partially met this objective.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
85% at least partially met this objective.

M 16: Demonstrated ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks (O: 16)

On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O16: Demonstrate ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8171, Public Management Systems and Strategies, will at least partially meet this objective. On two examinations and a final paper students demonstrate their ability to identify key components of results oriented management frameworks.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
97% at least partially met this objective.

M 17: Demonstrated understanding of models of organizational structure and design (O: 17)

Students will demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O17: Demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of students in PMAP 8411 or PMAP 8203 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 demonstrate understanding of models of organizational structure and design on a midterm and final exam as well as a final paper.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
97% at least partially met this objective.

M 18: Demonstrated knowledge of contract and administrative law or nonprofit law (O: 18)

The research proposal and research paper will allow the student 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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O18: Demonstrate knowledge of contract and administrative law in public sector or nonprofit law

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 demonstrated knowledge of nonprofit law in the areas of charitable giving, advocacy, lobbying, commercial activity, fundraising and employee compensation.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% fully met this objective.

M 19: Evaluated the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees (O: 19)

The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.

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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% fully 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% fully met this 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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

69% at least partially met this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

97% at least partially met this 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 PMAP 8411 will at least partially meet the objectives. The three exercise assignments will measure the ability of students to evaluate the constitutional rights and responsibilities of public and nonprofit managers and employees.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% fully met this objective.
and nonprofit agencies
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 82% of the students in PMAP 8431 will at least partially meet this objective. On the midterm essay, the final essay, and the case study students demonstrate how to use organizational theories to solve management problems in public and nonprofit agencies.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
94% at least partially met this objective.

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 material to be covered.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
94% at least partially met this 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.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
PMAP is altering its data collection process on this objective. We are not ready to evaluate whether we are meeting this goal at this time.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Faculty review of curriculum in progress
In response to the WEAVE reporting process, the faculty who teach courses in the MPA program are engaged in an on-going process of curriculum review. During the past year several issues have been discussed and actions are pending. For example, the two-course sequence in research methods and statistics was a problem in the initial WEAVE report. Faculty met and examined the content of the two courses, variations in material covered by different instructors, and ways to make sections more consistent. This change was implemented during the past academic year, and progress made in better student learning outcomes. During the current academic year (2009-10), the issue has shifted to the discussion of two issues—the law course (PMAP 8411 Law for Public and Nonprofit Managers) and a potential capstone course. There is concern over the content and learning outcomes of the law course. It is under review, and new content related to contract law is under development for next year. There is also consideration of the issue of developing a capstone course for students in the MPA curriculum. A pilot version of the course was scheduled for the spring semester 2010, but not offered. The design and content of the course is under review for next year.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: MPA Committee and full faculty of the PMAP Department

Theories of Leadership and Organizational Behavior
This is a reasonably new problem. Students met the objective in Fall 2011, though barely, and only fell well below the mark in Spring 2012. The professor is assessing whether this is a continuing problem that will require a long-run response.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Professor will meet with department chair after end of fall semester to see whether problem persists and whether action is needed.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: John Thomas
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 department appointed a committee last year to study the learning objectives and WEAVE measures in the core courses in the MPA program. Faculty will incorporate these new learning objectives in their Spring 2013 syllabi, and the Spring 2013 WEAVE reports. Beginning Fall 2012, WEAVE spreadsheets are due on the same date that grades are due, so that information will be available for the first faculty meeting in the spring. Beginning Summer 2013, instructors teaching core courses in the summer will also submit WEAVE spreadsheets. The department’s academic specialist is going back through all available WEAVE Excel sheets to combine data into a single spreadsheet, so that it will be easier to track changes over time.

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

Mission / Purpose
The 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 from the five divisions of public health: biostatistics, epidemiology, social and behavioral sciences, health services administration, and environmental health.
Relevant Associations: Council on Education for Public Health [CEPH]

SLO 2: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation (M: 1)
Demonstrate the ability to plan, implement and evaluate programs and services designed to address public health conditions of a population(s).

SLO 3: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health (M: 1)
Understand and employ an ‘ecological approach’ to public health, with emphasis on linkages and relationships among the multiple determinants of health, to assure conditions that protect and promote the health of populations.

SLO 4: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills (M: 1)
Demonstrate Communication and Research skills consonant with the academic and professional field of Public Health.

SLO 5: Apply Critical Thinking Skills (M: 1)
Apply critical thinking skills within the context of public health practice and research.

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Final Thesis or Special Capstone Project (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
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. Evaluation of the thesis/capstone was conducted through a pilot evaluation program that included a 4 point, 5 item rubric that links to IPH SLOs. The rubric is attached as a connected document to this Measure.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Understand Core Public Health Concepts**

75% of student sample will score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the following Thesis/Capstone Assessment rubric item: "Writing shows understanding of Core Public Health Concepts relevant to chosen topic of thesis/capstone." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

8 out of 9 students (89%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.44.

**Target for O2: Demonstrate Planning, Implementation, Evaluation**

75% of student sample will score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the following Thesis/Capstone Assessment rubric item: "The thesis/capstone demonstrates planning, implementation, and evaluation of a program(s) designed to address public health conditions of a population(s)." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

8 out of 9 students (89%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.22.

**Target for O3: Understand an Ecological Approach to Public Health**

75% of student sample will score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the following Thesis/Capstone Assessment rubric item: "The thesis/capstone shows understanding of an Ecological Approach to Public Health, emphasizing linkages and relationships among multiple determinants of health." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

9 out of 9 students (100%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.56.

**Target for O4: Demonstrate Communication and Research Skills**

75% of student sample will score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the following Thesis/Capstone Assessment rubric item: "Writing demonstrates Communication and Research skills consonant with the academic and professional field of Public Health." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

7 out of 9 students (78%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.22.

**Target for O5: Apply Critical Thinking Skills**

75% of student sample will score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the following Thesis/Capstone Assessment rubric item: "Writing demonstrates application of critical thinking skills to problems relevant to Public Health." Student sample will consist of at least 50% of students who have completed either a Thesis or Capstone project at the end of the academic year (Spring Semester).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

9 out of 9 students (100%) received a 3 or higher on this rubric item. The average score for this item is 3.44.

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

**Complete Doctoral Program Application**

We are developing a proposal to initiate a PhD program within the IPH. We will continue to seek support and approval throughout the upcoming years.

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

**Enhancing Alumni Communications**

Due to the APR Self-Study, we were able to enhance our alumni response rate to the alumni survey this academic year. We want to maintain our exposure and contact with this very important stakeholder group as we move forward.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Ongoing
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Bachelor of Science in Public Policy degree is to prepare students for roles as effective citizens and people who work in the public service. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and values required to become responsible and visionary leaders in a wide range of settings. Students will understand development, implementation, and evaluation of policies in a variety of settings. While many students choose to enter a career in the public sector or in nonprofit agencies, others make contributions to the community, state, and nation as active citizens in the civic and public arenas.

Goals
G 1: Understand citizenship, community and public service
Citizenship is a basic component of a democratic society. Students learn the structure of the federal system as well and citizenship requirements for each level. The role of the individual as part of the larger community is also considered. Students become active participants in public service. This has been a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) course; however, this past year the faculty voted to change the CTW designation from this course to PMAP 3311, Critical Policy Issues. The change will take effect next year, removing the CTW designation from PMAP 3021.

G 2: Understanding leadership in a variety of policy settings
Students learn from leaders representing the range of policy settings—public, for-profit, and not-for-profit. Emphasis is upon leadership to produce change in organizations. Students also learn theoretical perspectives on leadership and organizational change. They compare practical views on leadership to theoretical perspectives.

G 3: Understand the policy process and critical public policy issues
Students describe the public policy process and understand critical policy issues.

G 4: Understanding policy data analysis using statistical methods
Students learn policy data analysis using quantitative research methods applicable to the study of public policy. Students use descriptive statistics as well as the development and testing of empirical hypotheses using basis inferential statistical methods.

G 5: Understanding the evaluation of public policy
Students learn to evaluate public policy using appropriate research methods for program evaluation. Inductive and deductive methods are used as well as the advantages of using evaluation as a mechanism for program improvement. This is a CTW course (Critical Thinking through Writing).

G 6: Understand principles of policy analysis
Students will understand principles of policy analysis including concepts such as market failure, public goods, and externalities, as well as other justifications for government involvement.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy (G: 1) (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate the variety of ways in which citizens can help to shape public policy.

SLO 2: Participate in public and community affairs (G: 1) (M: 2)
Through service learning students participate in public and community affairs. The students become active citizens of the community.

SLO 3: Develop writing skills appropriate to public policy (G: 1) (M: 3)
As a CTW course, students develop writing skills appropriate to the field of public policy.

SLO 4: Demonstrate how leaders make change in their organizations (G: 2) (M: 4)
Students learn from leaders from all three sectors of society and how these leaders make changes within their organizational settings.

SLO 5: Demonstrate understanding of key theoretical issues on leadership (G: 2) (M: 5)
Students must demonstrate their understanding of important issue in leadership theory.

SLO 6: Compare leadership theory and practice (G: 2) (M: 6)
Students must demonstrate their ability to compare theoretical aspects of leadership with practical applications.

SLO 7: Demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues under debate (G: 3) (M: 7)
Student must demonstrate the ability to describe the major contemporary public policy issues under debate in our society.

SLO 8: Apply knowledge of public policy process to current policy issues (G: 3) (M: 8)
Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by
the final class presentation and examinations.

**SLO 9: Demonstrate critical thinking about policy process and policy outcomes (G: 3) (M: 9)**
Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

**SLO 10: Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy (G: 4) (M: 10)**
Students demonstrate the application of introductory statistical techniques to analyze important questions in public policy.

**SLO 11: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 4) (M: 11)**
Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis.

**SLO 12: Apply scientific method to policy issues (G: 5) (M: 12)**
Students must demonstrate their ability to apply the scientific method to policy issues.

**SLO 13: Demonstrate use of appropriate techniques for evaluation research (G: 5) (M: 13)**
Students must demonstrate the ability to use appropriate techniques for evaluation research.

**SLO 14: Demonstrate ability to write an evaluation research design (CTW) (G: 5) (M: 14)**
Students must demonstrate the ability to write an evaluation research design paper as a CTW (Critical Thinking through Writing) assignment.

**SLO 15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (G: 6) (M: 15)**
Students demonstrate their understanding of the legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy.

**SLO 16: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention (G: 6) (M: 16)**
Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Students demonstrate how citizens shape public policy (O: 1)**
Students demonstrate how citizens can help to shape public policy. This is demonstrated on the writing assignments for the course (weekly memos), the ULearn discussion board sessions, and final report.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Demonstrate how citizens can shape public policy**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet the objective. This will be measured by weekly memos, ULearn discussion board sessions, and the final report.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
93% at least partially met the objective.

**M 2: Participate and report on public and community affairs through service learning (O: 2)**
Students participate in service learning and report on activities in their agencies that demonstrate how citizens work in public and community affairs. This is measured using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: Participate in public and community affairs**
Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet the objective. This will be measured by using weekly memos and hours logged using Volunteer Solutions. Also, class presentations at end of semester.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
91% at least partially met this 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 students enrolled in the Citizenship course will at least partially meet this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
82% at least partially met this objective.

M4: 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
Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
88% at least partially met this objective.

M5: 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
Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper.

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 meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of important theories of leadership on midterm and final examinations as well as a final paper.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
89% at least partially met this objective.

M6: 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
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
89% at least partially met this objective.

M7: 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
Students will demonstrate knowledge of main policy issues currently under debate using exams and classroom policy debates.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
93% at least partially met 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 will at least partially meet this objective. Students must demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of the public policy process to current policy issues. This is measured by the final class presentation and examinations.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

89% at least partially met 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 this objective. Students must demonstrate critical thinking about the public policy process and policy outcomes. This is measured by the final class presentation.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

80% at least partially met 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

67% at least partially met 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

65% at least partially met 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 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.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
97% at least partially met 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 the 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
97% at least partially met 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
97% at least partially met objective.

**M 15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy (O: 15)**

Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.

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

**Target for O15: Demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie market economy**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of the students enrolled in PMAP 4061, Introduction to Policy Analysis, will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of legal and political frameworks that underlie the market economy. This is measured by examinations and class assignments.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
67% at least partially met this objective.

**M 16: Demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy (O: 16)**

Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured through a final written assignment.

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

**Target for O16: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention**

Faculty teaching the course are asked to rate the performance of students on the learning objective at the end of the semester. There is a five point scale with 5 representing excellent, exceeding expectations by a substantial margin demonstrating mastery of the knowledge or skill; 4 representing fully demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 3 representing partially demonstrating the knowledge or skill; 2 representing barely demonstrating the knowledge or skill; and 1 representing a poor demonstration of the knowledge or skill. 80% of students will at least partially meet this objective. Students demonstrate understanding of the use of...
cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy. This is measured through a final written assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>Target:</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65% at least partially met objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

#### Basic Tools of Government Intervention

Public management and policy faculty approved the creation of a committee to review instructor assessment scores for PMAP 4061. The committee met several times and developed the following recommendations: The Department of Public Management and Policy should work with the Office of Academic Assistance in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies to assure that students complete the micro and macro economics prerequisites for the 4061 course. The Department of Public Management and Policy should do more to educate faculty about the WEAVE process and their role in helping us to meet our learning objectives. We have made some progress toward a culture change, but this is a long-term process. Faculty members do not always understand that the role extends beyond teaching the students as best they can; we must be improving learning and retention, and this is one of their responsibilities. In this case, we recommend revising the e-mail sent to faculty as a part of the ratings process. We caution against providing more information than faculty can absorb, but the e-mail should explain the purpose of the ratings and departmental goals and expectations. Instructors should be required to provide a brief explanation of WEAVE scoring when developing their assessment reports. It would be easy to provide a space for comments at the bottom of the spreadsheets that are used to collect the instructor ratings. Indeed, faculty could be required to comment when their average score is less than 85%. It is essential to understand the thinking of the instructors as they are giving the low scores. Of course, they might also be encouraged to comment on high scores.

#### 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.

#### Findings and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of students will at least partially meet this objective</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of the use of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention in the economy.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Implementation Status

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

#### Findings

- **2011-2012:** 65% at least partially met objective

#### Priority

- **High**
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 | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate understanding of cost-benefit analysis to evaluate government intervention

**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 well as 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

**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 lower division MATH courses 1101 or 1111 course during the fall semester 2010. The second step of the Action Plan is to establish in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Application of statistical techniques to analyze public issues | Outcome/Objective: Apply introductory statistical techniques to public policy

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 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Develop skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate skills using computer to perform basic statistical analysis

Implementation Description: Faculty will approve a change in lower division MATH requirements, so that students must have grades of C or higher in MATH 1101 or 1111. Students will also be required to make a grade of C or higher in MATH 1070, as a prerequisite for taking PMAP 4041.
Projected Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: PMAP faculty approval
Additional Resources: N/A

Core sequence: 4041-4061
WEAVE has identified weaknesses in the statistical methods, research design/evaluation, and policy analysis sequence in the core curriculum. These courses have traditionally been taught by doctoral students or part-time instructors rather than tenure-track faculty. We have probably not provided enough guidance or support for these mostly first-time teachers. This year, the School provided training for all new instructors in August and PMAP provided some classroom observations, feedback, and one-on-one counseling. The department will appoint a committee to study long-run improvements, which may involve assigning tenure-track faculty to teach the courses once a year, with prospective GTAs attending and assisting, and/or to provide more substantial support to GTAs through repeated observations and meetings.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Chair will appoint committee to discuss options.
Projected Completion Date: 03/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Greg Lewis

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?

Beginning Fall 2013, WEAVE spreadsheets are due on the same date that grades are due, so that information will be available for the first faculty meeting in the spring. The department’s academic specialist is going back through all available WEAVE Excel sheets to combine data into a single spreadsheet, so that it will be easier to track changes over time. During Spring 2013, the new director of the undergraduate program will convene a committee to update the learning objectives and WEAVE measures in the core courses. We expect the faculty to approve them by the end of the semester, and to begin incorporating them in Summer 2013.
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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 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 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>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Understand different ways of categorizing policies (G: 1) (M: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students understand different ways of categorizing public policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 2: Understand how different actors are likely to influence policies (G: 1) (M: 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students consider the influence of formal and informal actors on public policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 3: Understand different models of policy-making (G: 1) (M: 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 4: Apply basic concepts of measures and data sets (G: 2) (M: 4)</strong></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: Demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis (G: 2) (M: 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate skills using the computer to perform basic statistical analysis using SPSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 6: Demonstrate the ability to develop hypotheses, choose appropriate statistics to test them, and correctly describe the results (G: 2) (M: 6)</strong></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: Demonstrate ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze questions facing policy analysts (G: 3) (M: 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate the ability to apply introductory statistical techniques to analyze the kinds of questions facing policy analysts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 8: Demonstrate understanding of principles of research design methods appropriate to public administration and policy (G: 3) (M: 8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate the ability to understand basic principles of research design methods appropriate for research in public administration and policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 9: Ability to interpret regression coefficients on interval-level and dummy independent variables (G: 3) (M: 9)</strong></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: Demonstrate understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector (G: 4) (M: 10)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of microeconomic principles (such as supply and demand and market dynamics) and the public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 11: Apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues (G: 4) (M: 11)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 12: Demonstrate understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs (G: 4) (M: 12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate an understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs on the distribution of income and its role in public sector decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 13: Identify Causes of Bias in Regression Analysis (G: 5) (M: 13)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify the causes of bias in regression analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 14: Identify Major Threats to Validity in Evaluation Studies (G: 5) (M: 14)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to identify major threats to validity in evaluation studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 15: Select Appropriate Evaluation Design for a Particular Evaluation Domain (G: 5) (M: 15)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to select the research design appropriate for a particular evaluation domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SLO 16: To understand how to identify policy problems (G: 6) (M: 16)
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% at least partially met this objective.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% at least partially met this objective.

**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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% at least partially met this objective.

**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; 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

88% at least partially met objective.

---

**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; 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% at least partially met 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 public 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; 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

92% at least partially met 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; 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.
Students enrolled in PMAP 8141, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective.

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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141, Microeconomics for Public Policy, will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate their understanding of microeconomic principles and the public sector on a midterm examination and written assignments.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
83% at least partially met objective.

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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic theoretical and empirical tools of economic analysis to public policy issues on the midterm and final examinations and the final paper.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
83% at least partially met objective.

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. 82% of students enrolled in PMAP 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
83% at least partially met objective.

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 8141 will at least partially meet this objective. On the final examination and course paper students will demonstrate their understanding of the effects of public expenditures programs.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
72% at least partially met 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% at least partially demonstrate this skill.

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 are measured by examinations and the final project.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% fully 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% fully met this objective.

M 18: Understand how to construct a policy memo (O: 18)
Students in PMAP 8531 demonstrate how to construct a policy memo. This is done on several policy memo assignments and a final
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% fully met this objective.

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

Identifying Sources of Bias in Regression
This is a relatively new problem. The instructor and department chair will meet after the end of this semester to determine whether this is an ongoing problem and to discuss possible solutions.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Greg Lewis and Jesse Lecy

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?

The department appointed a committee last year to study the learning objectives and WEAVE measures in the core courses in the MPA program. Three of those courses are also core courses in the MPP program. Faculty will incorporate these new learning objectives in their Spring 2013 syllabi, and the Spring 2013 WEAVE reports. During Spring 2013, the MPP faculty will reconsider the learning objectives and WEAVE measures in the core courses to determine whether they need to be updated. Beginning Fall 2012, WEAVE spreadsheets are due on the same date that grades are due, so that information will be available for the first faculty meeting in the spring. Beginning Summer 2013, instructors teaching core courses in the summer will also submit WEAVE spreadsheets. The department's academic specialist is going back through all available WEAVE Excel sheets to combine data into a single spreadsheet, so that it will be easier to track changes over time.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Public Policy PhD
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
To combine the resources of two excellent schools of public policy to create a top doctoral program. To produce high-quality researchers capable of making contributions to the academic study of public policy and to the public policy process. To produce high-quality teachers, knowledgeable in the field and capable of conveying their knowledge to others.

Goals
G 1: Knowledge of Theoretical Frameworks
Students will have an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.

G 2: Analytical methods of public policy
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of the analytical methods used to study public policy.

G 3: Field of Specialization
Students will acquire an in-depth understanding of one major field of specialization in public policy.

G 4: Original Research in Public Policy
Students will apply their understanding of the theories and analytical methods of public policy to a particular sub-field specialization to produce original research.

Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the theoretical frameworks used to study public policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Comprehensive Examination (O: 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical framework section of the public policy section of the core comprehensive examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate understanding of public policy theory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The achievement target for the core portion of the comprehensive examination is 67% of students passing this portion of the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven students took core comprehensive exams in 2011-12. Five of them passed the public policy theory section, for a 71% passage rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 2011-2012 - Target: Met** |
| Seven students took core comprehensives; five of them passed the quantitative methods section, for a passage rate of 71%. |

| **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 2011-2012 - Target: Met** |
| Five students took field comprehensives in 2011-12; four passed. The student who failed went on to pass his field comp with flying colors this semester. |

| **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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met** |
| During the past year, four students received their doctorates in public policy. One had already taken a job abd at Sam Houston State University and one continued in her professional analyst position at the U.S. Government Accountability Office. In Fall 2012, the other two began tenure-track positions at George Washington University and Arizona State University. Records are incomplete, but among the students who did not graduate, at least 7 students presented conference papers and at least 5 were co-authors on journal submissions (resulting by the end of the year in two forthcoming articles and one revise-and-resubmit). Conference papers and journal submissions appear to be down, but this may be due more to poor record-keeping than to a real drop-off. |

**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  
**Implementation Description:** This has been implemented.  
**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

Revised dissertation colloquium
Beginning Fall 2012, the program requires all first- and second-year doctoral students to attend bi-weekly sessions on research. Sessions include lessons on the responsible conduct of research, as well as socialization into the academic enterprise -- submitting conference paper proposals and journal articles, responding to reviewers’ comments, developing a cv, etc. All second-year and later students are regularly encouraged to submit conference proposals. The department subsidizes the first $800 of travel to submit at an academic conference, and presenters must give practice presentations in the research series in advance of the conference.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Doctoral program director Christine Roch began the program this semester.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Doctoral program director Christine Roch  
**Additional Resources:** She is getting a partial course buy-out to run the program

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2011-2012 Reading Specialist (p-12) MEd**

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Master of Education Reading Specialist (RLL) is to prepare educators to become reading specialists who are informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice.

**Goals**

**G 1:** G-1 have a strong content knowledge of literacy theories and instruction  
Candidates are informed educators who have a strong content knowledge of literacy theories and instruction.

**G 2:** G-2 have pedagogical knowledge and dispositions needed to design culturally responsive literacy environments  
Candidates are professional educators with pedagogical knowledge and dispositions needed to design culturally responsive literacy environments and practices.

**G 3:** G-3 have knowledge of literacy practices and assessments that impact students' literacy growth and development  
Candidates have knowledge of literacy practices and assessments that impact student growth and development in literacy.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**
SLO 1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes (G: 1) (M: 1, 2)
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

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

SLO 2: Demonstrates knowledge of SBRR principles (G: 1, 2) (M: 2)
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.

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

SLO 3: Incorporates a wide range of curricular materials (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates incorporate 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.

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

SLO 4: View professional development as a career long responsibility (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

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

SLO 5: Incorporates a variety of assessment tools to plan effective instruction (G: 3) (M: 4)
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction which have impact on students' literacy growth and development.

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

SLO 6: Evaluates self and others' teaching practices (G: 2) (M: 3)
Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.

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

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History (O: 1)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards one and two.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Based on the literacy rubric submissions for 2011-2012, eight students scored in the advanced level (5), while 14 students scored in the proficient level (4). Therefore, students met the target goals and assessments in demonstrating content knowledge in reading and writing, and reading research and histories of reading.

M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations (O: 1, 2)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards one, two, and three.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes
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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Based on the literacy rubric submissions for 2011-2012, eight students scored in the advanced level (5), while 14 students scored in the proficient level (4). Therefore, students met the target goals and assessments in demonstrating content knowledge and foundations in reading and writing.
Target for O2: Demonstrates knowledge of SBRR principles

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Students demonstrated the following: four students scored in the advanced level (5) while seven students scored in the proficient level (4). Therefore, students met the target goals for 2011-2012.

M 3: Pedagogical Skills and Dispositions (O: 3, 4, 6)

Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards four, five, six, and eight.

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

Target for O3: Incorporates a wide range of curricular materials

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

According to students' understanding and knowledge in pedagogical skills and dispositions in incorporating a wide range of curricular materials, three students scored in the advanced level (5), while eight students scored in the proficient levels (4). Therefore, students met the requirements as measured on the rubric.

Target for O4: View professional development as a career long responsibility

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

According to students' understanding and knowledge in pedagogical skills and dispositions in incorporating a wide range of curricular materials, three students scored in the advanced level (5), while eight students scored in the proficient levels (4). Therefore, students met the requirements as measured on the rubric.

Target for O6: Evaluates self and others' teaching practices

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Based on the outcome of how students evaluated themselves and other's teaching practices, two students scored in the advanced level (5), while nine students scored in the proficient levels (4). Therefore, students met the requirements as measured on the rubric.

M 4: Impact on students (O: 5)

Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy portfolio rubric. A rating will be determined using standards four and seven.

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

Target for O5: Incorporates a variety of assessment tools to plan effective instruction

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

In examining the impacts on students and how they incorporate assessment tools to plan effective instruction, six students scored in the advanced level (5), while 27 students scored in the proficient levels (4). Therefore, students met the requirements as measured on the rubric.

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

Redesigned Portfolio

Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lori Elliott
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Redesigned Portfolio

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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: 08/2010

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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes
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?
For our program, we have made minimum changes to our assessment report to demonstrate effective and rigorous learning outcomes and target goals for our students. We will assess our student progress and determine what kinds of changes and improvements need to be added 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.
Our program has demonstrated great improvement and impact on our assessment finding of over 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured for each assessment component. The students in our program have met the proficient requirements in our degree program. We will assess our student progress and determine what kinds of changes and improvements need to be added for the upcoming academic year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your
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### Mission / Purpose

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). 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))

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level and 70% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) of knowledge in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level in the area of clinical practice as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 4: Clinical Practice at Endpoint (O: 4)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level in the area of clinical practice as shown on their scores of the final Teaching Evaluation Instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M 5: Dispositions (O: 3)
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level in the area of clinical practice as shown on their scores of the final Teaching Evaluation Instrument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level and 75% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (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).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
GACE Scores for 2011-2012 are still pending as of 10/16/2012. I am still waiting on Berlinda's response about it. However, our passing rate for GACE tests has been 100% over the past two years (2009-2011), which indicates that our students are able to take and pass the content tests.

**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)
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Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Portfolio Support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Strengthening Professional Standard**
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, “students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility” has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

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

**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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective): Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective): Measure (Key Assessment): 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.
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

**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
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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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?
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 not made any major change in the assessment process; however, we have emphasized phasing portfolio assessment into the course throughout the program so that we have been able to see the progress of our candidates learning throughout the program. In doing so, our students have received feedback on their portfolio narratives each semester from their 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 findings indicate that we are doing well in general, but we would like to improve our program. Our scores in assessment reflected some weaknesses with some of our candidates (e.g., we found that only 70% of the students scored at the effective level for Professional and Pedagogical Skills). So, this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. I, the program coordinator, have discussed all ESOL faculty members who teach for GOML in order to reinforce this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? 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 Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. with ESOL Concentration - Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line) is to prepare educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service in the fields of literacy and ESOL education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL (G: 1) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading (G: 1) (M: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills (G: 2) (M: 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions (G: 2) (M: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students (G: 3) (M: 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Content Knowledge in ESOL (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge in ESOL through coursework is assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an effectively proficient level (Score 4) level of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their ESOL Content Knowledge section of Final portfolio rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Content knowledge in Reading (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content knowledge in Reading in coursework is assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 59% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their EDRD course work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Planning Performance (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' ability to plan effectively is assessed in the course work and clinical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) of knowledge in the area of planning as shown in their course work in EDRD 7630 in Fall Semester 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an effectively proficient (Score 4) level in the area of clinical practice, ESOL, as shown on their scores of the course, TSLE 7440 spring 2012 rubric. 100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an effectively proficient (Score 4) level in the area of clinical practice, Reading, as shown on their scores of the course, EDRD 7630 fall 2011 rubric.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) in the area of dispositions, ESOL, as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric (which was administered in TSLE 7440 in spring 2012). 88% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 53% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of dispositions, reading, as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric (which was administered in Summer Semester 2011 - EDRD 7600 & Spring Semester 2012 - EDRD 7600).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

82% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level and 70% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning in regards to ESOL as shown on their scores of the advocacy rubric administered in the course, TSLE 7260 in summer 2011. 100% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an effective proficient (Score 4) level in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning in regards to reading as shown on their scores of the impact rubric administered in the course, EDRD 7650 fall 2011.

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

**Embed**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Time for complementation
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** 0
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**Embed standard**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 09/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
- **Additional Resources:** Additional faculty
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Embed 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: 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)
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.

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: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Additional Resources: 0

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
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: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)
Embed standards for portfolio

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Additional Resources: 0
- Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Embed standards for portfolio

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

- Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
- Projected Completion Date: 09/2010
- Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
- Additional Resources: none
- 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
- Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Clinical Practice
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
- Implementation Description: Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work.
- Projected Completion Date: 06/2012
- Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

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 improving their content knowledge in ESOL. 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Content Knowledge in ESOL
  - Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL
- 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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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

closely monitoring students' progress in the EDRD 7600 course in terms of dispositions

In the course work, EDRD 7600, 88% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 53% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their EDRD 7600 course work. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 53% received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their dispositions as teachers and leaders. This means that expectations for them to develop positive dispositions are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work as well as in the program level.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

Implementation Description: Expectations for them to develop positive dispositions as teachers and leaders are high in the courses and throughout the program and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course and program work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator & EDRD reading faculty for GOML

closely monitoring students' progress in the ERD 7600 course

In the course work, ERD 7600, 88% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 59% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their ERD 7600 course work. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 59% received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Also, 100% students in the final exit portfolio on the reading content received a score of 3. Nevertheless, 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: 2011-2012
closely monitoring students' progress in the TSLE 7260 course in terms of effects on K-12 student learning.

In the course work, TSLE 7260, 82% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 70% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning in regards to ESOL. It is close to 90% and given that as high as 70% students received a high score as a 4, the results are positive. Nevertheless, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their effects on K-12 students and advocacy work for ELLs. This means that expectations for them to develop the knowledge and skills are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work as well as at the program level.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Content knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

Implementation Description: Expectations for them to develop the knowledge and skills are high in the courses and throughout the program and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course and program work.
Projected Completion Date: 06/2013

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 not made any major change in the assessment process; however, we have emphasized phasing portfolio assessment into the course throughout the program so that we have been able to see the progress of our candidates learning throughout the program. In doing so, our students have received feedback on their portfolio narratives each semester from their 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 findings indicate that we are doing well in general, but we would like to improve our program. Our scores in assessment reflected some weaknesses with some of our candidates in the following areas: 1. Only 88% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 59% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their EDRD course work. 2. Only 88% of candidates in 2011-12 scored at an adequately proficient level (Score 3) and 53% of candidates in 2011-2012 scored at an effectively proficient level (score 4) in the area of dispositions, reading, as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric (which was administered in Summer Semester 2011 - EDRD 7600 & Spring Semester 2012 - EDRD 7600) 3. Only 82% of candidates in 2011-12 scored an adequately proficient (Score 3) level and 70% of candidates in 2011-12 scored a proficient level (4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning in regards to ESOL as shown on their scores of the advocacy rubric administered in the course, TSLE 7260 in summer 2011. Thus, these are the areas which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. I, the program coordinator, have discussed all ESOL and REading faculty members who teach for GOML in order to reinforce these areas in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
**What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?**

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
How will you use your findings from this year? 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**

**2011-2012 Reading, Language, & Literacy (ESOL) TEEMS MAT**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mission / Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G 1: Content knowledge</strong> Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge (M: 1, 2)</strong> 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 &amp; Curriculum).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


**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 (Key Assessments), 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.

**Target for O1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge**
GACE Scores are still pending as of 5/10/2011.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
GACE Scores for 2011-2012 are still pending as of 6/01/2012. However, our passing rate for GACE tests has been 100% over the past four years (2007-2011), 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)

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2011-12 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 62% and a maximum of 75% 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).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The following results are for each area: (1) Contextual Factors: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 88.4% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher), (2) Learning Goals: 89.5% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher), (3) Assessment Plan: 97% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 91% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher), (4) Design for Instruction: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 92.5% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Midpoint (O: 2)**
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)

**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 Rubric.
Increase Collaboration and Communication

The PSC/NCATE review of our program indicated a need for increased involvement by public school partners. In addition, faculty have noted a need to increase communication between faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In 2005-2006, efforts will be made to have at least 2 meetings with all faculty and all supervisors to discuss, evaluate, and redesign when necessary program design, syllabi, and supervision practices. In addition, all supervisors will visit practicum/supervision sites prior to the arrival of student teachers to meet with cooperating teachers and provide an overview of the program and expectations. We expect this initiative to strengthen the overall success of our interns when in the field.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: 2006-2007 school year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL Faculty and Supervisors: Amy Flint, Gertrude Tinker Sachs, Yan Wang and Eudes Aoulou
Increased Focus on Assessment
Candidates in the TEEMS RLL-ESOL Program performed moderately well on "Understanding and using assessment for learning." Evidence for demonstrating this standard was revealed in their electronic student teaching notebooks, supervisor observations and portfolio standards. To that end the TEEMS faculty will more systematically address issues of authentic assessment, rubric creation, and how assessment drives instruction. The faculty will do this in courses and in student teaching seminars.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: 2008-2009 School year
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS RLL-ESOL faculty and supervisors: Gertrude Tinker-Sachs, Amy Flint, Teresa Fisher,

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)

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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description:

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

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 not made any major change in the assessment process; however, we have emphasized phasing portfolio assessment into the course throughout the program so that we have been able to see the progress of our candidates learning throughout the program. In doing so, our students have received feedback on their portfolio narratives each semester from their 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 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 (e.g., we found that only 64% of the students scored at the effective level for understanding a “learning environment”. So, this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty members have reinforced this area in their respective courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** How will you use your findings from this year? 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**

**2011-2012 Real Estate BBA**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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: 1, 2, 3)

To develop creative decision-making skills associated with the real estate industry. 1) The student should be able to apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations. 2) The student should be able to evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances. 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: 4)

The student should be able to formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations (O: 1)**

Measure 1: Apply knowledge of real estate analytical tools to produce sound equity investment recommendations

Criteria 1: Understand investment principles. (RE4160) Criteria 2: Apply knowledge of investment analysis techniques to real property. (RE4160)

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

**Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills**

2.0

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Student average of 2.0 over the two criteria.
M 2: Evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances (O: 1)

Measure 2: Evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances Criteria 1: Understand the methods of financing real estate. (RE4150) Criteria 2: Effectively compare the types of financing instruments (RE4150)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Student average on C1 and C2: 2.52

M 3: Use knowledge of real estate development to layout efficient project development plans (O: 1)

Measure 3: Use knowledge of real estate development to layout efficient project development plans Criteria 1: Understand design, construction, and analysis procedures (RE4050) Criteria 2: Appreciate the impact of changing technical and economic activities on space needs and the form and design of physical structures (RE4050)

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target for O1: To develop creative decision-making skills

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Student average C1: 2.38 C2: 2.31

M 4: Formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions (O: 2)

Measure 1: Formulate and communicate soundly-constructed analyses and recommendations relating to real estate decisions Criteria 1: Identify, evaluate and assemble arguments based around real estate problems (RE4700) Criteria 2: Persuasively communicate interpretations and solutions to real estate problems (RE4700)

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

Target for O2: To develop business communication skills

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Student average C1: 2.57 C2: 2.77

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: Finished
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: Finished
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
Projected Completion Date: 05/2011

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. M2 Evaluate appropriate real estate financing methods in varying circumstances Understand the methods of financing real estate. Effectively compare the types of financing instruments, M3 Use knowledge of real estate development to layout efficient project development plans. 1. Understand design,
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. Identify, evaluate and assemble arguments based around real estate problems. Persuasively communicate interpretations and solutions to real estate problems. RE4700

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
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**

**2011-2012 Real Estate MS**

*As of 12/13/2016 04:42 PM EST*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1: Understand the real estate framework (M: 1, 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Understand the framework within which real estate markets operate and the interaction of the components of that framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2: Apply theoretical principles and skills (M: 4, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2: Apply theoretical principles and skills to the analysis and solution of a range of real estate problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3: Organize and communicate effectively (M: 7, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3: Organize and communicate effectively in all stages of the real estate problem solving process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures, Targets, and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1: Real estate as a financial and operational asset (O: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 Understand real estate as a financial and operational asset and its market Criteria (and course location of assessment): Appreciate the nature and working of real estate markets and the motivations of various participants (investor, developer, finance-provider, occupant etc). (RE8020) Understand the role of finance in real estate markets (RE8030) Recognize impact of regulatory and institutional frameworks upon markets and assets within markets and the role of real property law as a risk management process in the acquisition, management and disposition of built space (RE8040) Understand the processes and techniques used to analyze supply and demand for real estate (RE8060).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages on this Measure C1 8020 2.45 C2 8030 2.75 C3 RE8040 2.70 C4 8060 2.00.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: The markets for capital (O: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M2 Understand the markets for capital and related financial assets Criteria (and course location of assessment): Understand the nature and working of markets for financial capital (RE 8030) Understand the dynamic inter-relationships between capital markets and real estate markets (RE8030) (years prior to AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Understand the real estate framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages on this measure: C1: 3.00 RE8030. C2: 2.50 RE8030.</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 (RE8060)
- Understand the economic forces that affect demand, supply, equilibrium and disequilibrium in real estate markets (RE8060)
- 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Averages on this measure: C1: 2.10 RE8060 C2: 2.30 RE8060 C3: 2.27 RE8050.

### M 4: Application to real estate investment problems (O: 2)

M1 Select and apply appropriate techniques to the analysis and solution of real estate investment problems

**Criteria (and course location of assessment):**
- Identify, evaluate and assemble key data for use in real estate asset investment analysis (RE8090). (years prior to AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8020).
- Select and apply appropriate techniques/tools to investigate real estate investment decisions and issues (RE8090). (years prior to AY2012 course location of assessment was RE8020)
- Select and apply appropriate techniques/tools to support real estate market-studies. (RE8060)

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

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

2.0

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**


### M 5: Application to real estate financing problems (O: 2)

M2 Select and apply appropriate techniques to the analysis and solution of real estate financing problems

**Criteria (and course location of assessment):**
- Identify, evaluate and assemble key data for use in analysis of real estate finance decisions (RE8030)
- Select and apply appropriate instruments and techniques to support real estate finance decision-making (RE8030)
- Critically review techniques and data issues in real estate finance (RE8030)

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

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

2.0

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Average on this measure: C1 2.75 RE8030 C2 2.50 RE8030 C3 2.75 RE8030.

### M 6: Application to real estate development problems (O: 2)

M3 Select and apply appropriate techniques to the analysis and solution of real estate development problems

**Criteria (and course location of assessment):**
- Identify, evaluate and assemble key data for use in analysis of real estate development decisions (RE8050)
- Select and apply appropriate techniques to support real estate development decision-making at project planning and project implementation stages (RE8050)
- Critically review techniques and data issues in real estate project planning and real estate development (RE8050)

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

**Target for O2: Apply theoretical principles and skills**

2.0

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Averages on this Measure C1 2.75 C2 2.50 C3 2.75 C4 2.75 C5 2.75.

### M 7: Skills in investigation design and organization (O: 3)

M1 Demonstrate effective skills in the design and organization of investigations to support the solution of real estate problems

**Criteria (and course location of assessment):**
- Identify appropriate investigations in response to real estate decision problems (RE8070)
- Produce coherent and articulated analyses targeted at a range of quantitative and qualitative real estate problems (RE8070)

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

**Target for O3: Organize and communicate effectively**

2.0

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

C1 8050 2.53 C2 8050 2.40 C3 8050 2.27

### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Averages on this measure. C1: 2.50 RE8090. C2: 2.50 RE8090.

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
2011-2012 Rehabilitation Counseling MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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

O/O 2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)
Practice ethical codes consistent with Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) requirements and state of Georgia licensing.
O/O 3: Work with clients with disabilities (G: 3) (M: 2, 3, 4)
Demonstrate competence in rehabilitation counseling with individuals and with groups of clients with physical, cognitive and/or emotional disabilities.
Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

O/O 4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations (G: 1, 3) (M: 2, 3, 4)
Students will demonstrate effective counseling and consulting with diverse population including disability, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, and other relevant special issues.
Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

O/O 5: Successfully secure employment (or continue educ) (G: 1)
80 per cent of students will successfully located relevant employment within six month of graduation. Others may choose to continue their education or delay entry to the work force in order to parent children.
Relevant Associations: Council on Rehabilitation Education

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Certification tests and major exams (O: 1, 2)
a) Passing the national certification exam (CRC) by students/graduates, and b) passing master's comprehensive exams
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence
90 % pass rate on first attempt is expected

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

M 2: Reviews and assessments of ethical conduct (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Reviews during classes CPS 6050, 6450, 7430, 7660, 7680 as assessed by taped samples, site supervisor evaluation, forms 1005, 1006, comprehensives and CRC.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: Demonstration of rehab counseling competence
Successfully complete the internship sequence as judged by faculty and site supervisor.

Target for O2: Certification and licensing ethical code practice
Students will demonstrate knowledge about psychological diagnosis.

Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities
All students will select an internship site that provides services to people with disabilities

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Ethical conduct foundation will be accomplished through coursework associated with the introductory class (6050). All student will pass this class.

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

Target for O3: Work with clients with disabilities
Successful completion by all students of helping skills, group and internship classes

Target for O4: Counsel and consult with diverse populations
Evaluation will occur through site practicum/internship classe supervisors and faculty. All students will successfully accomplish this goal.
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.

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.

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.
  - 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

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Religious Studies BA
As of: 12/13/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
In the aftermath of September 11th, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline has become strikingly evident. Educated students need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate setting, and they need to gain this knowledge not from those who already are committed to a particular set of beliefs but from scholars who are trained in the
Measures, Targets, and Findings

Other Outcomes/Objectives

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

Goals

G 1: Knowledge of the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate knowledge in the following areas: 1) Religious Traditions of the World (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, African Religion, Judaism, Christianity, Islam) 2) Foundational Thinkers in the World Religions (Laozi, Confucius, Buddha, Abraham, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed) 3) Major Religious Thinkers (Gandhi, Suzuki, Maimonides, Buber, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Malcolm X, King, Nagarjuna, Shankara, etc.) 4) Major Theorists in the Study of Religion (Eliaide, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ Smith, etc.) 5) Representative Critical Theories and Methods (historical, anthropological, philosophical, sociological, psychological, ethical, feminist, etc.) 6) Fundamental Technical Categories (sacred space and time, cosmology, mythology, ritual, sacrifice, scripture, hermeneutics, ethics, deities, etc.) 7) Common Comparative Themes (ethics, mysticism, gender issues, death, politics, festivals, war and violence, etc.) 8) Historical Role in Religion in Culture (non-textual expression, popular religion/culture, pluralism and exclusivism, syncretism, art and music, etc.)

G 2: Technical Skills in the Academic Study of Religion
It is expected that students majoring in Religious Studies will acquire appropriate technical skills in the following areas: 1) Reading Critically (outlining arguments, identifying conclusions, contextualizing author and text, detecting vagueness/ambiguity, etc.) 2) Thinking and Writing Critically (establishing premises and reaching conclusion, avoiding fallacies, utilizing proper grammar/diction/usage, etc.) 3) Conducting Effective Research in Religious Studies (using libraries and on-line resources, evaluating scholarship, synthesizing, etc.)

SLO 1: Knowledge of General Religious History (M: 2, 4)
Ability to extrapolate a general working knowledge of the great historical religious traditions, e.g., Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Shinto.

SLO 2: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers (M: 1, 2, 4)
Ability to understand, contextualize, and explain the thought of major religious thinkers.

O/O 3: Skills in Critical Thinking and Expression (M: 3, 4)
Ability to think critically and write persuasively within the academic study of religion.

O/O 4: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion (M: 3, 4)
Ability to conduct effective research in religious studies.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Evaluating Capstone Papers (Theoretical) (O: 2)
Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final semester in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee (consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to theoretical content, i.e., knowledge of critical theory in the study of religion, scholarly categories, comparative method, etc.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for Q2: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers
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, 2)
Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final semester in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee (consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to historical content, i.e., knowledge of religious history, religion in its social and cultural contexts, comparative data, etc.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Knowledge of General Religious History**
75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 3.3 or higher.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers**
75% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for historical content ranking 3.3 or higher.

**M 3: Evaluation of Capstone Papers (Technical Skills) (O: 3, 4)**
Each graduating major is solicited to submit a capstone paper from an upper-level Departmental course from his or her final semester in residence. Each paper is subsequently evaluated blindly by each member of the Assessment Committee (consisting of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members) with regard to technical skills.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O3: 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.

**Target for O4: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion**
75% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranking 2.7 or higher on a 4.0 scale. 33% of faculty evaluations for technical skills ranking 3.3 or higher.

**M 4: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (Numerical) (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
Each graduating major is solicited to fill out and submit an exit survey, where the respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Religious Studies major with regard to specific learning outcomes, i.e., understanding the nature and varieties of religion, familiarity with critical theory and major theorists, ability to conduct research and write critically, etc. Students ranked goals on a five-point scale, with 1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest ranking.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target for O1: Knowledge of General Religious History**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

**Target for O2: Knowledge of Major Religious Thinkers**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

**Target for O3: 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.

**Target for O4: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion**
90% of student rankings on relevant survey questions scoring 4.00 or higher. Mean student rankings on relevant questions scoring 4.25 or higher.

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

**Long-Range Curricular Planning**
With the addition of several new faculty over the last two years, and more likely forthcoming, the Department will develop a comprehensive, but flexible plan for curricular offerings over the next several years.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Kathryn McClymond, Jonathan Herman, Curriculum Committee

**Modifying Assessment Criteria**
The Assessment Committee will modify the existing Assessment procedure so that individual measures match more precisely with specific learning objectives.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Projected Completion Date:** 02/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Jonathan Herman, Assessment Committee

**Research and CTW Courses**
The Department will take deliberate steps to provide a significant research component in at least one of the required CTW courses.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 07/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Tim Renick

**Comparative Religion**

Reviewing curriculum to determine if sufficient comparative courses are offered within each cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Projected Completion Date: 04/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

**Research in Religious Studies**

Continued monitoring that majors have sufficient exposure to research methods in department’s signature courses; continued integration of research component into CTW courses.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Evaluating Student Exit-Surveys (Numerical)
- Outcome/Objective: Ability to Conduct Research in Religion

Projected Completion Date: 09/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Kathryn McClymond

**More Targeted Submissions**

The Assessment Committee will explore ways to enable closer to 100% compliance with submission requests, and the Curriculum Committee will examine ways in which students may be encouraged to situate every thinker and/or theoretical approach in its historical context.

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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Religious Studies, MA**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

In the aftermath of September 11th, the importance of Religious Studies as a discipline has become strikingly evident. Educated students need to learn about religious beliefs, practices, and motivations in a scholarly and dispassionate setting, and they need to gain this knowledge not from those who already are committed to a particular set of beliefs but from scholars who are trained in the histories, languages, and practices of religions. Universities are one of the few venues in which such education about religion (rather than “religious education”) currently takes place. Given this fact, it is perhaps not surprising that Religious Studies has enjoyed incredible national growth since September 11th. Time Magazine (9/11/2002), the Atlanta Journal Constitution (8/6/2002) the Associated Press (9/11/2002), and the London Times (9/6/2002) each recently reported on this phenomenon. But it is important to note that the field has been growing for decades, with new degrees (either graduate or undergraduate) in Religious Studies being established during the last twenty years at such schools (to use the Southeast as an example) as the University of Georgia, Florida State University, Florida International, Duke, and UNC-Greensboro. Georgia State’s diverse student body and emphasis on international and multi-cultural education makes its Religious Studies Program absolutely essential to its larger projects. When the College of Arts and Sciences organized a lecture series in the aftermath of September 11th, Religious Studies provided as many speakers as any other program in the University. When CNN broadcast one of its first reports on the brand of Islam that may have inspired the September 11th attacks, it was a Georgia State Religious Studies faculty member who appeared live on prime time to explain the issues. Although it might be an overstatement to say that University projects like the new programs in Middle East Studies, Jewish Studies, and Asian Studies would not exist without Religious Studies participation, it is safe to say that these programs would be far weaker. Religious Studies is an integral part of the intellectual life of this University.

**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, Ngeruji, Shankara, etc.), major theorists in the study of religion (Eliahu, W.C. Smith, Freud, James, Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Daly, Douglas, JZ Smith, etc.) representational 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, sectarianism, 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
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 conceptually 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
2011-2012 Research Measurement and Statistics MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to 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 recognised 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 1: Doctoral students or employees as researchers in the field
Graduates of the RMS master's program will be doctoral students in the unit's RMS program or at other universities.

G 2: Employed in research related jobs
Graduates of the RMS master's program will be employed in research related jobs.

G 3: knowledgeable educational researcher
The students who graduate from the RMS master's program will be knowledgeable educational researchers.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

- 2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
- 2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be able to write a review literature related to their field of study and the various methodological approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3: Design a research study (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to: (1) select an appropriate design for addressing a research query; (2) to choose an appropriate population from which to sample; (3) choose an appropriate sampling technique for the intended level of generalizability; (4) operationalize all variables of interest, including, as applicable, the selection of measurement instruments intended to gather data on said variable(s); (5) craft an appropriate procedure for data collection; (6) write a professional-level Method section of a research report, describing the above aspects of a design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Analyze data and report the results (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to: (1) recognize an appropriate technique for analyzing data, given the research query and the design used to collect the data; (2) conduct the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data; (3) interpret and to report on the results of the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Master's project/thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**

- 85% of the students will meet the expectations
- 15% will exceed

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**

- 85% of the students will meet the expectations
- 15% will exceed

**Target for O3: Design a research study**

- 85% of the students will meet the expectations
- 15% will exceed

### 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
- **Projected Completion Date:** 07/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** RMS Faculty

**Redesigning measures**

There has been a change in leadership and subsequent changes in reporting officers in the unit. The unit has begun creating
measures - rubrics and analytic guidelines to evaluate the learning outcomes and objectives of the program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Data will be collected at the end of the academic year 2012-2013 using the new measures designed.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Research, Measurement, Statistics (GOML) MS

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Research, Measurement, and Statistics program is to 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 recognised 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 1: Doctoral students
Graduates of the RMS online master's program will be doctoral students in Georgia State University or other programs in the field.

G 2: Employed in research related fields
Graduates of the RMS master's program will be employed in research related jobs in their field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 2)
Students will be able to 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.

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.
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

SLO 2: Review and critique the research literature (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Students will able to write a review and critique the literature related to a study and the various methodological approaches.

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
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).
5.4 Enhance the global competency of students, faculty and staff.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

SLO 3: Design a research study (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Students will be able to: (1) select an appropriate design for addressing a research query; (2) to choose an appropriate population from which to sample; (3) choose an appropriate sampling technique for the intended level of generalizability; (4) operationalize all variables of interest, including, as applicable, the selection of measurement instruments intended to gather data on said variable(s); (5) craft an appropriate procedure for data collection; (6) write a professional-level Method section of a research report, describing the above aspects of a design.

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
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 4: Analyze data and report the results (G: 1, 2) (M: 1)
Students will be able to: (1) recognize an appropriate technique for analyzing data, given the research query and the design used to collect the data; (2) conduct the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data; (3) interpret and report on the results of the analysis(es) appropriate for the research query and the design used to collect the data.

Strategic Plan Associations

2.1 Expand support for doctoral programs.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.
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.
5.5 Other efforts in support of Goal 5 (Globalizing the University).

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Committee/Advisor evaluation of master’s thesis/project/product (O: 1, 2, 3, 4)**
All faculty will use a 3 point scaled rubric and analytic guide as the tool to measure students’ performance on the final master’s research thesis/project/product.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Form a clear, useful, and practical research query**
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**Target for O2: Review and critique the research literature**
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**Target for O3: Design a research study**
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**Target for O4: Analyze data and report the results**
85% of the students will meet the expectations 15% will exceed

**M 2: Thesis/Project (O: 1)**
This outcome will be evaluated using a rubric and analytic guide.

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

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

**Plans for data collection**
This program will officially begin its implementation process in Spring 2013. Plans for its evaluation are being put in place for this the first cohort of students who have enrolled in the program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The members of the department are coming together to create and design rubric and analytical frameworks that can be used to evaluate the outcomes of the program.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/2015
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chris O'Shima

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Respiratory Therapy BS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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.

2.0 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)
2. Outcomes of educational support services (3.3.1.3)

#### 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).
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

### 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).
2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
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.

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.

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 similar to 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

80% of students will achieve a minimum grade of 90% on their assigned oral case presentation based on a standard rubric used by the faculty.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

During fall semester 2011, 15 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 71% to 98%. 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 91% with 10 out of 15 (66%) meeting the target score. For spring semester 2012, 16 students out of 21 (76%) achieved 90% or higher. Scores ranged from 75% to 98% with the average score = 92%. During summer 2012, 20 students were evaluated during clinical seminar. Grades ranged from 70% to 100%. 17 students out of 20 (85%) scored 90% or higher with the average score =94%.

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 critical 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 4085 based on approved rubric by CTW.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Student initial scores on a professional issue paper ranged from 60 to 100. After three revisions allowed lowest grades improved from 60 to 90.

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% or higher on this competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 of 29 students (100%) passed the CRT on first attempt. From review of the score report, national first-time passing rate is 79% and % of national average for this program is 129%. RT students average score on this competency was 4.07 while the national average was 3.59. The highest possible scores was 5.0. 27 of 29 (93%) students scores were 80% or higher. GSU average score for this exam is 86%, national mean score is 80%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. as determined by the National Board of Respiratory Care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 of 29 or 97% passed the WRRT on the first attempt. From review of the score report, the average score on this competency was 3.17 with the national average at 2.75. For this competency, 4.0 was the highest possible score. Two students scored 1, 5 students score 2. All other students scored 3 or above. 22 of 29 (76%) students scored 80% or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

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 are 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 questions appropriately. Demonstrates good 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 excellent pronunciation. Everyone can hear the 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.

References
Score_________
7 total; 5 from refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; <4 approved website
6-7 total; 4 from refereed journals/books; none older than 5 years; 2 approved website
5 total; 2 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Case Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

Projected Completion Date: 12/2010

Responsible Person/Group: All faculty participate. Program Director responsible.

Additional Resources: No

NBRC WRRT Exam
Will continue to refine analysis of competency. Since this is the first time we have been this specific with an item on the exam matrix, will follow for another year to determine any trends.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

Projected Completion Date: 05/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Additional Resources: No

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: NBRC Entry Level CRT | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

Implementation Description: Planned
Projected Completion Date: 04/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Program Director

Additional Resources: not at this time

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Capstone Course 2011-2012
Continue to allow revisions to the paper and use of CTW rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Course | Outcome/Objective: Communication Skills

NBRC WRRT Exam
Review this section of the exam in RT 4075/7075 which is a review course for the WRRT. New written computer tests purchased. Also have students take computer tests and identify areas of weakness. Tests allow students to test over specific areas of weakness. Students take computer WRRT exam and review these questions with the students in class.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: NBRC Written Registry Exam | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking in Respiratory Therapy

Projected Completion Date: 04/2013

Student case presentation activity
Prior to students presenting oral case study they will meet with assigned faculty to review the case study and faculty will identify any needs by the student. Power point slides will be reviewed for errors that would reduce the overall score of the case study presentation as well as any errors in data reporting and formatting. The faculty will also offer guidance by showing the student an example of a case study with a high grade and one with a lower grade and point out the inconsistencies to cause the lower grade. Further assistance can be obtained from senior students and provide examples of case studies that were previously presented.

Director of Clinical Education and Medical Director will continue to present lecture on how to present a case study at the beginning of the semester for new students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
**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?

For Measures and Findings-Case Presentation, Target Change: 90% of students will achieve a minimum grade of 90% on their assigned oral case presentation based on a standard rubric used by the faculty to: Current: 80% of students will achieve a minimum grade of 90% on their assigned oral case presentation based on a standard rubric used by the faculty. This target was changed because after reviewing the outcome of this target since 2009 the target was seldom achieved although close in some cases. It is difficult to see first year students presenting a complex medical case study and have 90% of the students achieve 90% or better. Student's presenting for the first time are nervous and are unsure of themselves in front of a large class with faculty and physicians in attendance. Some students achieved between 85 and 89% on the first case study which is very good. We will monitor for this next year. The faculty will review the grading rubric for the clinical case study and make changes as necessary.

**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 indicate there is no need for curriculum revision, course changes or sequencing. The program has one of the highest passing rates on national exams in the country.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

A rubric was developed and revised for case study presentation over the past 3 years. Each faculty member had input into this process. Also each faculty member is given a student that will be presenting a case study in order to help the student in his/her presentation. This has improved the scores of the case study and made the student feel more comfortable in the presentation. Reviewing the complex nature of the clinical case study and letting the student know what is most important during the presentation has given the student a more confident presentation and presence. No other changes were made.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

We keep close observation on many of the assessments found in this report and the faculty will make changes from semester to semester as needed. Changes that were made have a positive effect on the student (case study presentations). Change were made to help students feel more confident taking national exams with purchase of more sample exams and reviewing the exams especially areas that the student failed. This resulted in a higher passing rate for the class. The departments changes when needed were effective in either achieving or partially achieving targets.

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

We will monitor the passing scores for student case study evaluations. Our goal is to meet our target for this measure and finding for this year and to continue to refine the case study presentation process. We anticipate we will meet the set target for case studies and for the NBRC national exams.
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.

**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 and interdisciplinary approach to 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 7030).

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target for O1: Communication in respiratory care**
All graduate students must complete oral presentation and written presentation assignments in core master's curriculum (RT 7030).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All current entry-level integrated master’s students have completed oral presentations and written presentations as required in RT 7030.

**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 members or directed study project to directed study project committee members.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Seven students completed thesis research successfully.

**Target for O2: Critical thinking in the application of research**
Graduate students will complete either a thesis or project.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Of total of 10 MS students in 2011-2012 academic year, 5 completed thesis and 5 complete a project.

**M 3: Understanding Health Policy in the US (O: 3)**
Students will show mastery of contemporary concepts by participation is 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 80% or higher.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Six students successfully completed HHS 8000 with scores higher than 80%.

**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 advisement 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

Implementation Description: Will continue to monitor
Responsible Person/Group: Robert Harwood
Additional Resources: none

Development of thesis and project rubic
Develop a rubric thesis and project so as to be consistent in grading and importance of project.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Demonstrate appreciation for the research process | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

Projected Completion Date: 12/2012

Evaluate rubic for oral and written assignment in RT 7030
Continue to have students complete an oral presentation and a written assignment in RT 7030 and be graded with developed rubics. We will evaluate the rubics to assure consistency in the oral and written assignments and assure the student is achieving the stated goal.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Understanding advanced topics in respiratory care | Outcome/Objective: Communication in respiratory care

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

SNHP 8000
Plan this year is to meet with faculty to discuss another course to meet this finding.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Understanding Health Policy in the US | Outcome/Objective: Understanding Health Policy in the United States

Projected Completion Date: 05/2012

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Risk Management & Insurance (Mathematical Risk Management) MS

Mission / Purpose
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.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

2.0 Students understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning using verbal, numeric, graphical and/or symbolic forms.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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.

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

**SLO 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.

**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.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

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.

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

**SLO 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.

**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 1: Exams in MRM 8320 (O: 1)

Each student will demonstrate expertise in the quantification and analysis of operational stochastic risk exposures through responses to selected questions from course exams in MRM 8320 Introduction to Stochastic Risk Management Models.

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

**Target for O1: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure One Rubric to a random sample of student exams submitted during each evaluation period.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

To measure this objective, we used the results of exams and projects evaluated in MRM 8320. The Midterm exam and Project grades are used to measure Criteria No. 1 (Demonstrate Mathematical Expertise to Quantify Operational Stochastic Risk Measures), and the Final exam grades are used to measure Criteria No. 2 (Demonstrate Mathematical Expertise to Analyze Operational Stochastic Risk Exposures). It must be noted that the data for MRM8320 and MRM8610 is based on an entire class sample, which aside from MRM majors includes AS majors. The results, based on criteria related to the Measure One Rubric are as follows: Fall 2011: Criterion No. 1: 3.03% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 12.12% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 84.85% exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Criterion No. 2: 3.03% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 9.09% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 87.88% exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Fall 2010 Criterion No. 1: 3.03% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 21.12% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 75.76% exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Criterion No. 2: 0% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 3.03% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 96.97% exceeded the standard (score = 3.0)

**SUMMARY:** The majority of students met the criteria, and the tendency is increasing. Insofar as MRM8320 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think further action is required.

### M 2: Selected student projects in ECON 8780 (O: 1)

Through performance on selected projects in ECON 8780 Financial Econometrics, each student will demonstrate technical expertise in mathematical and statistical theory to quantify and analyze various financial stochastic risk exposures.

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

**Target for O1: Mathematical and statistical theory expertise**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure Two Rubric to a random sample of student projects submitted during each evaluation period.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Findings, as follow, are based on criteria related to the Measure Two Rubric: Criterion No. 1: Demonstrate mathematical expertise to quantify financial stochastic risk exposures 2010: 10% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 70% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 20% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) 2011: 10% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 75% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 15% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) 2012: 5% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 80% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 15% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Outcomes are measured by the students' performance on the homework assignments and the in-class, closed-book exam. The exam verifies the students' understanding of econometric theory and methods used to model financial risks. In particular, the exam covers the modeling of univariate and multivariate distributions, copulas, basic time-series models, and time-varying conditional and correlation modeling. Criterion No. 2: Demonstrate mathematical expertise to analyze financial stochastic risk exposure 2010: 0% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 90% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 10% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) 2011: 5% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 85% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 10% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) 2012: 0% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 85% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 15% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Outcomes are measured according to the final project, which consists of developing, estimating, and backtesting practical models for financial risk forecasting. Specifically, the students are asked to develop a methodology that describes the time-varying conditional dependence structure among financial asset returns. The resulting models are used to forecast tail-risk measures associated with portfolios of those assets. The empirical performance of these forecasts is analyzed and backtested using formal statistical procedures. **SUMMARY:** The majority of the students meet the criteria, and the tendency not decreasing. Insofar as ECON8780 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think further action is required.

### M 3: Projects and exams in MRM 8610 (O: 2)

Through performance on selected projects and exam questions in MRM 8610 Financial Engineering, each student will demonstrate the technical expertise in economic and financial theory to determine the value of traded and non-traded assets and liabilities and to document the risks associated with the securities.

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

**Target for O2: Economic and financial theory expertise**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure Three Rubric to a random sample of projected
and selected exam responses submitted during each evaluation period.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Findings are based on criteria from the Measure Three Rubric as follows: The assessment of Criterion 1 (“Value Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is based on Question 2a/b of the Spring 2012 final project. The assignment is to evaluate a long term asset-linked insurance contract with option feature. Residual risks are studied in Question 2c/d of the Spring 2012 final project. Thus, these results are used for evaluating Criterion 2 (“Document Risks Associated with Non-Traded Assets and Liabilities”). Criterion No. 1: 11% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 32% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 57% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Criterion No. 2: 35% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 46% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 19% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Criterion 3 (“Value Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is evaluated based on Question 1a/c of the Spring 2012 final project. The focus here is on valuing derivatives in complete securities markets managing exposures via Delta and Delta/Vega-Hedging. Criterion No. 3: 24% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 54% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 22% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) Criterion 4 (“Document Risks Associated with Traded Assets and Liabilities”) is based on Question 1b of the Spring 2012 final project. Here, students analyze the impact of volatility risk on the profit/loss distribution. Criterion No. 4: 11% of students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 51% of students met the standard (score = 2.0); 38% of students exceeded the standard (score = 3.0) SUMMARY: While the number of students failing Criterion 3 appears high, this is primarily a result of the complexity of problem 1c (Vega-hedging). If the assessment were based solely on question 1a, all students would meet the standard. Therefore, we believe the concept was well understood and no action is required. For Criterion 2, 36% of students failing to meet the standard is excessive. The instructor will emphasize the role of other risk factors in non-traded beyond market risk the next time he teaches the class in the Spring of 2013.

**Target for O3:** Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models

**M 4: Selected student case work in RMI 8370 (O: 3)**

Through performance on selected case work in RMI 8370 Financial Risk Management, each student will demonstrate the ability to recommend appropriately the risks that should be managed and the tools available that will most efficiently achieve the firm's objectives.

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

**Target for O3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure Four Rubric to a random sample of student case work submitted during each evaluation period.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

This assessment is based on a review of exams and cases relating to the two criteria: (1) Identify appropriate risks to be managed and (2) recommend appropriate tools of the Measure Four Rubric. The second criteria is tested in exams, in which students are asked to assess the hedging suitability of different derivative instruments in different situations. The first is tested more extensively in cases. In particular, groups of students are given extensive risk identification exercises in the United Grain Growers case and the Enron case, and all of the other cases feature risk identification at some level. The assessment is based on a review of student performance on exams and cases in 2011 and 2012. For the two criteria, approximately 16% of RMI 8370 students failed to meet the standard (score = 1.0); 21% met the standard (score = 2.0); and 53% exceeded the standard (score = 3.0). The majority of the students meets or exceeds the standards. Insofar as ECON8780 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think action is required.

**Target for O3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models**

**M 5: Selected projects in MRM 8620 (O: 3)**

Through performance on selected projects in MRM 8620 Quantitative Financial Models, each student will demonstrate the ability to identify the limitations of the risk management models and therefore the associated risks of those limitations along with strategies to manage these exposures.

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

**Target for O3: Development of firm-wide integrated risk management models**

A 2.0 average on all criteria. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure Five Rubric to a random sample of projects submitted during each evaluation period.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Findings are based on criteria related to the Measure Five Rubric as follows: Criterion 1 (“Identify the Limitations of Risk Management Models”) is evaluated based on Projects 1, 2, and 3. Project 1 deals with portfolio selection in the presence of parameter uncertainty, Project 2 discusses the estimation of asset pricing models (CAPM and extensions) based on different econometric approaches, and Project 3 asks students to estimate risk-neutral densities based on different Vanilla option prices. All three projects demonstrate the level of parameter and model risk. All students met the standard and the vast majority exceeded the standard. Average percentage scores are listed below: Spring 2010: 93% of students met the standard (score of 2.0 or greater); Spring 2011: 91% of students met the standard (score of 2.0 or greater) Spring 2012: 98% of students met the standard (score of 2.0 or greater) Project 2 (“Recommend Appropriate Strategies to Manage Identified Limitations of Risk Management Models”) is evaluated based on Project 4. Here, a complex (Asian) option is hedged using the underlying as well as a simple vanilla option in a model with stochastic volatility. It demonstrates that alternative instruments can be used to safeguard against risks in more general frameworks. All students met the standard and the vast majority exceeded the standard. Average percentage scores are listed below: Spring 2010: 88% of students met the standard (score of 2.0 or greater) Spring 2011: 91% of students met the standard (score of 2.0 or greater) Spring 2012: 94% of students met the standard (score of 2.0 or greater) SUMMARY: All students met the criteria, and the tendency is not decreasing. Insofar as MRM8620 contributes to the overall objectives of the program, we do not think action is required.

**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.
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 we have not completed an assessment report last year and the format changed since the previous assessment, the first part of the question is not applicable. In view of changes to the assessment process in the following year, after going through this assessment round, the program directors will ask the course instructors to better monitor the criteria while teaching their classes (rather than assessing them ex-post).

**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 an annual internal assessment of our program where we discuss of whether our courses are up to date. From this assessment, we identified two potential aspects of the curriculum where action may be required: Programming Boot Camp: Programming skills have become increasingly important for placing our graduates. While some students enter the program with basic (or even advanced) programming knowledge, others have little experience in this direction. To ascertain that all students are familiar with programming basics, we intend to offer a programming boot camp and make it mandatory for all students entering the program. We believe this will add tremendously to their education and will also allow us to teach our classes more effectively (since we can focus on algorithms rather than implementation details). We are already in the process of implementing this change, and we hope the first boot camp will take place in the summer of 2013. Should we replace MRM8620? MRM8620 ("Quantitative Financial Risk Modeling") was intended as a hands-on class that is taught in lockstep with MRM8610 ("Financial Engineering") and focuses on the implementation of the theoretical models there. However, since MRM8610 is also mandatory for our MAS students (who in fact present the majority of students in MRM8320, MRM8600, and MRM8610), a proper coordination proved difficult in the past since (1) implementation basics also need to be covered in MRM8610 and (2) partly as a consequence, important theoretical concepts for implementation from MRM8610 (e.g. changes of measure/risk-neutral pricing) are not introduced till relatively late in the semester. Furthermore, the programming boot camp will acquaint students with programming. Therefore, we question whether MRM8620 contributes to the program in an effective fashion. Instead, we propose to adjust the suggested course sequence by moving RMI8370 ("Financial Risk Management") to the Spring semester instead of MRM8620, but in turn offering MRM8620 in the (second) Fall in a restructured fashion. One possibility is to have MRM8620 and MRM8630 as separate classes on interest rate and credit risk, respectively. Currently, both aspects should be covered in MRM8630 although the limited time does not allow for a detailed treatment of credit risk. A separate class will allow to not only discuss conventional material such as such as the pricing of credit derivatives but to also discuss issues related to counterparty credit risk that are gaining increasing significance in the marketplace. Alternatively, we could leave MRM8630 as is but offer MRM8620 as a capstone seminar class with varying topics (akin to AS8810 in the MAS program). Possible topics include counterparty credit risk, calculation of capital requirements, or banking Economic capital models.
### Mission / Purpose
A substantially revised version of this program is in the midst of the approval process. An appropriate assessment plan will be prepared and implemented once the program revisions have been approved and implemented.

### Goals
G 1: See Mission/Purpose

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: See Mission/Purpose (M: 1)

### Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: See Mission/Purpose (O: 1)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: See Mission/Purpose**
Complete approval of revisions to program. Revise assessment plan in light of revised program. Implement revised assessment plan.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
**Program Revision Approval**
Achieve approval of program revisions. Revise assessment plan to match revised program. Begin implementation of revised plan.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - **Measure:** See Mission/Purpose
  - **Outcome/Objective:** See Mission/Purpose
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Phillips and Marty Grace
- **Additional Resources:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

### Georgia State University
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2011-2012 Risk Management & Insurance BBA**

(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
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1: Identification and structuring of risky situations (G: 2, 3) (M: 1)
Students will be able to recognize risk and uncertainty and their impact on individual, business, and societal decision making. Pertinent risks include those related to the person and property, leverage, longevity, securing future consumption, and asset transfer. Students will be able to take an uncertain situation and determine the nature of the problem(s) to be solved.

SLO 2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1)
Students will be able to take an uncertain situation, and: (1) recognize mathematical, financial and/or statistical tools to be used in solving; and (2) use quantitative tools to model risks and craft alternatives to address them.

SLO 3: Comprehension of the business risk management process (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 2)
Students will have technical comprehension of the business risk management process, including the identification and evaluation of loss exposures, the analysis of the various risk control and financing techniques available to manage the exposures, decision making under conditions of uncertainty, control mechanisms to monitor the results of the risk management program.

SLO 4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process (G: 1, 5) (M: 3)
Students will have theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process. Students will be able to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.

Measures, Targets, and Findings

M 1: Performance on selected Projects in RMI 3750 (O: 1, 2)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected projects in RMI 3750 Probability Theory and Simulation Analysis in Risk Management an understanding of the sources of uncertainty in a business application.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O1: Identification and structuring of risky situations
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

Target for O2: Modeling risk using quantitative tools
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE ONE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 2: Selected Projects and identified exam questions in RMI 4300 (O: 3)
Students will be given the task of identifying and prioritizing the hazard risks of a given business organization through the use of a Risk Mapping approach to risk assessment.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O3: Comprehension of the business risk management process
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE TWO RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

M 3: Selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 (O: 4)
Each student will demonstrate through performance on selected case studies and exam questions in RMI 4350 Enterprise Risk Management theoretical and technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process and the ability to identify and critically analyze the strategies that firms use to enhance corporate value through their risk management function.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: Technical knowledge of the Enterprise Risk Management process
A 2.0 average on all criteria, with no more than 20% of any criteria falling in category 1. Measurement will be done by applying the MEASURE THREE RUBRIC to a random selection of students during each 4-year evaluation period.

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
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.

It is now expected that this process will be completed in the 2012-2013 Assessment cycle.

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.

Relevant Associations:

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.

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

SLO 2: Effective Communication Skills (G: 2) (M: 4, 5, 7)
Students will demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.

Relevant Associations:

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

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.

Relevant Associations:

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

O/O 6: Ethics and Social Responsibility (G: 1, 4) (M: 8)
Students will incorporate dimensions of ethics and social responsibility in their decision making. Ethics and social responsibility captures a values concept that may be defined differently by different people. However, it is always part of an overall system of values that is grounded in an understanding of the beneficial role of business organizations in a society and the complementarities of ethical and social responsible action and the achievement of that role.

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.

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.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
The seniors graduating in the Summer of 2011, Fall of 2011 and Spring of 2012 we all asked about their desire to continue their education. 791 out of the 1248 students graduating indicated a specific formal education goal beyond their BS degree. At 63.4% we have hit this goal for the first time based only on students who had made decisions about their future education. (This percentage does include in the denominator those students who did not respond to this question on the exit exam.) Another 7.8% of the students graduating indicated that they were undecided.

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. Gives task support to other members. Occasionally gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.
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. Gives no task support to other members. Sometimes gives task support to other members. Occasionally provides task support to other group members. Consistently provides task support to other group members. Consistently gives more task support than expected. Measure 3 Interaction: Consider how the student team member relates and communicates to other team members. Behavior is detrimental to group. Behavior is inconsistent and occasionally distracts group meetings. Regularly projects appropriate team behavior including: listening to others, and allowing his/her ideas to be criticized. Consistently demonstrates appropriate team behavior. Consistently demonstrates exemplary team behavior. Attendance: Consider the student team member's attendance at the group meetings. (This includes in class meetings.) Failed to attend the group meetings. Attended 1%-32% of the group meetings. Attended 33%-65% of the group meetings. Attended 66%-99% of the group meetings. Attended 100% of the group meetings. Responsibility: Consider the ability of the student team member to carry out a chosen or assigned task, the degree to which the student can be relied upon to complete a task. Is unwilling to carry out assigned tasks. Sometimes carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Carries out assigned tasks but never volunteers to do a task. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and occasionally volunteers for other tasks. Consistently carries out assigned tasks and always volunteers for other tasks. Measure 2 Involvement: Consider the extent to which the student team member participates in the exchange of information (does outside research, brings outside knowledge to group). Fails to participate in group discussions and fails to share relevant material. Sometimes participates in group discussions and rarely contributes relevant material for the project. Takes part in group discussions and shares relevant information. Regularly participates in group discussion and sometimes exceeds expectations. Consistently exceeds group expectations for participation and consistently contributes relevant material to project. Leadership: Consider how the team member engages in leadership activities. Does not display leadership skills. Displays minimal leadership skills in team. Occasionally assumes leadership role. Regularly displays good leadership skills. Consistently demonstrates exemplary leadership skills. Overall Performance Rating: Consider the overall performance of the student team member while in the group. Performance significantly fails to meet group requirements. Performance fails to meet some group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements. Performance meets all group requirements consistently and sometimes exceeds requirements. Performance consistently exceeds all group requirements.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O4: Effective Team Membership
We will have at least 80% of students achieving a 4.0.

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.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills
On all three subs-parallel 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
Assessment was done on 127 graduating seniors presenting in their capstone BUSA 4980 class. A grid showing the raw number and percentage in each cell is linked here. The students were significantly below the target of 80% scoring at or above the 3.0 level on all three measures. Totals were 52.8%, 54.0% and 37.8% respectively. Please see grid for details on all cells.

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 in 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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
A total of 50 assignments were used in this assessment. 10 papers each were randomly drawn from 5 different senior-level CTW classes in 5 different departments of the RCB. 3 of the papers were deemed not usable for this purpose leaving 47 to be evaluated with the rubric. 9 papers, or 19.1% of the sample, were rated a 4, 25 papers, or 53.2% of the sample were rated 3. Thus, 72.3% of the papers were rated a 3 or higher. This is below the target of 80% for this measure. Another 11 papers or 23.4% were rated a 2 and 2 papers or 4.3% were rated a 1.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

A total of 50 assignments were used in this assessment. 10 papers each were randomly drawn from 5 different senior-level CTW classes in 5 different departments of the RCB. Two dimensions are used in this rubric. The first looks at the student's ability to systematically and logically interpret data. On that dimension 6 students, or 12% were rated a 4 and 28 students or 56% were rated a 3. Thus, 68% of the students were rated a 3.0 or higher. This is below the 80% target for this measure. 14 of the remaining students, or 28% were rated a 2, and 2 students, or 4% were rated a 1. The second dimension of the rubric looks at the student's ability to reach conclusions that lead to recommendations. On this second dimension 3 students or 6% were rated a 4 and 23 students or 46% were rated a 3. Thus we had 52% of the students scoring at 3.0 or higher. This is below the target of 80%. Of the remaining students 18, or 36% of the total scored a 2 and 6 students, or 12% of the total scored a 1.

**M 7: Ability to Use Technology (O: 2, 3)**

To what extent did the BBA program enhance students’ ability to use technology? This will be measured by the students’ self-reported ability on the two questions of the Use and Manage Technology Factor on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey. Q 68 To what extent did the Business program enhance your Ability to use technology Q 68 To what extent did the Business program enhance your Ability to manage technology

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

**Target for O2: Effective Communication Skills**

To earn a higher than average performance rating on the Educational Benchmarking exit survey when measured against ratings by students of all three groups of peer schools and improvement in absolute rating over prior year.

**Target for 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.

**M 8: Ethics and Social Responsibility (O: 6)**

The students’ use of ethical and social responsibility considerations in the analysis and recommendations associated with a business problem will be assessed on the dimensions of the Ethics and Social Responsibility rubric.

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

**Target for O6: Ethics and Social Responsibility**

80% of students will be at or above the "B" level on the rubric scoring of the case analysis. Grading Rubric for Ethics and Social Responsibility Dimension of Citic Pacific case. A = 5 = Integrated, comprehensive, and dynamic analysis; one that is rationally supported and effective. B = 4 = Working toward "A," but incomplete, some inconsistencies or misunderstandings; analysis has gaps, could be more effective. C = 3 = Working toward "B," but with weaknesses in many areas, major inconsistencies, or failure to properly address items needed for assignment completion. D = 2 = Case Analysis turned in, little else; poor or no analysis of merit, lacking rationale or analysis; poor understanding of corporate governance mechanisms and little or no effective effort to remedy. F = 1 = Failure to do assignment at threshold level. This is the old rubric as of 2012. Please see the new rubric loaded in the Document Repository.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Twenty-five papers were selected for this review in the Spring Semester of 2012. Five each were randomly taken from five different BUSA 4980 classes. All of these sections assign a common case for analysis, Citi Pacific. The assignment is on corporate governance. For this evaluation the evaluation was done along four measures in the new rubric.

**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 management 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-committed 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)

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Robinson College of Business MBA
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The goal of the Robinson College MBA program is to enhance the student's general management abilities and provide an opportunity to place emphasis on a functional area of expertise.

The RCB was asked to replace the prior mission statement, which was little more than a marketing tag line. The current entry is a statement of the RCB's goal, which was adapted from its introductory web page. It is only intended to be a temporary Mission statement. 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.

**SLO 3: Effective Team Membership (G: 3, 4)**
Students will be able to perform as effective members of multi-functional teams in executive problem solving and solution implementation situations.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Critical Success Factor Analysis (O: 1)**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE This measure contains three sub-parts that respectively look at the level of sophistication in a student's ability to identify, prioritize, and focus on critical success factors in decision making. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 1 Rubric to common mid-term and final exam questions in the MBA program's final strategy courses, MBA 8820, PMBA 8820 and EMBA 8710. For analysis, answers will be randomly selected from across sections and courses. In the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 cycles a more detailed analysis was conducted as part of the College and University level monitoring of this program, which is being conducted at the request of SACS. The program was assessed as a whole as in years past. In addition the program was assessed based on location and on format. In this cycle all programs offered a capstone strategic management course. In all locations where a version of this class was offered the assessment was done with the exception of the Alpharetta location, which will be included in the 2012-2013 assessments. A grid showing the sections included in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 assessment of student learning outcomes is linked here. All sections were given the same material, used very similar Harvard cases as exams and asked the same questions on the exam. The same instructor taught all the sections. One person in all cases did assessment. Exams analyzed were selected from each section. A total of twelve exams from each section were selected as follows: The section enrollment was divided by twelve. The resulting number was rounded down to find the ratio of students that need to be included in the sample from that section. A die was then thrown to determine where in the alphabetical roster selection should begin. From that starting point students were selected based on the ratio of exams needed.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Students again did not meet this goal. The first item scores at about 70% for the top two categories, which is close to where it has been historically. The second item showed marked improvement and actually reached 73% in the top two categories. While this was still below the goal of 80%, it showed dramatic improvement. The third item, however, did not show such improvement with only 62% of the students reaching the top two categories. A detailed breakdown of raw scores and percentages is in the Rubric Analysis document attached for the academic year 2011-2012.

**M 2: Environmental Opportunity Analysis (O: 1)**

This measure contains two sub-parts that respectively look at the level of sophistication in a student's ability to understand and analyze a firm's resources and capabilities in the context of a competitive environment. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 2 Rubric to common mid-term and final exam questions in the MBA program's final strategy courses, MBA 8820, PMBA 8820 and EMBA 8710. For analysis, answers will be randomly selected from across sections and courses. In this cycle a more detailed analysis was conducted as part of the College and University level monitoring of this program, which is being conducted at the request of SACS. The program was assed as a whole as in years past. In addition the program was assessed based on location and
on format. In this cycle all programs offered a capstone strategic management course. In all locations where a version of this class was offered the assessment was done with the exception of the Alpharetta location, which will be included in the 2012-2013 assessments. A grid showing the sections included in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 assessment of student learning outcomes is linked here. All sections were given the same material, used very similar Harvard cases as exams and asked the same questions on the exam. The same instructor taught all the sections. One person in all cases did assessment. Exams analyzed were selected from each section. A total of twelve exams from each section were selected as follows: The section enrollment was divided by twelve. The resulting number was rounded down to find the ratio of students that need to be included in the sample from that section. A die was then thrown to determine where in the alphabetical roster selection should begin. From that starting point students were selected based on the ratio of exams needed.

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

**Target for O1: Students can Analyze Relevant Questions**

On both sub-parts' criteria we will have at least 80% of students achieving a 3.0.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

Students showed mixed results this year relative to the past on these measures. On the first item students continued their improvement with 70% of the sample showing performance in the top two classifications. This upward trend was not reflected, however, in the second measure where the scores dipped a bit to show only 59% of students in the same top two classifications.

**M 3: Student Ability to Develop Corporate Strategies (O: 2)**

This measure contains four sub-parts that respectively look at the level of sophistication in a student's ability to develop viable corporate strategies that integrate functional, global, legal and ethical dimensions. Measurement will be done by applying the Measure 3 Rubric to common mid-term and final exam questions in the MBA program's final strategy courses, MBA 8820, PMBA 8820 and EMBA 8710. For analysis, answers will be randomly selected from across sections and courses. In this cycle a more detailed analysis was conducted as part of the College and University level monitoring of this program, which is being conducted at the request of SACS. The program was given as a whole as in years past. In addition the program was assessed based on location and format. In this cycle all programs offered a capstone strategic management course. In all locations where a version of this class was offered the assessment was done with the exception of the Alpharetta location, which will be included in the 2012-2013 assessments. A grid showing the sections included in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 assessment of student learning outcomes is linked here. All sections were given the same material, used very similar Harvard cases as exams and asked the same questions on the exam. The same instructor taught all the sections. One person in all cases did assessment. Exams analyzed were selected from each section. A total of twelve exams from each section were selected as follows: The section enrollment was divided by twelve. The resulting number was rounded down to find the ratio of students that need to be included in the sample from that section. A die was then thrown to determine where in the alphabetical roster selection should begin. From that starting point students were selected based on the ratio of exams needed.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**

This year showed similar outcomes to past years and many of the reasons are likely the same. The first item again was rather well mastered. Students were in the top two categories in 66% of the papers reviewed. While below the target, this is well above the other scores in this section. The second item incorporating globalization was at 29% This was not something prompted in the question asked, but should have been incorporated by the students. The same could be said for the legal and ethical considerations. Once again the question did not prompt these areas specifically. The goal was to see the extent to which students would explicitly mention that these items were considered in their answers. Only about 5% of students did so. These remain highly disappointing results.

**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)

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 College has begun to capture more detailed data on the performance of students in the three different formats of the MBA program and across the different locations at which the program is offered. This will continue on through the next cycle at least. With this data the College will be able to see if there are patterns of performance that indicate more or less effectiveness along any of those dimensions. These data will primarily be used for the detailed monitoring reports requested by SACS with respect to these different formats and locations. It will, however, allow for valuable insights on within program variations that can inform the feedback loops and action plans of the College with respect 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.

The College is going to re-think how it measures the social, ethical and global dimensions. Our approach has been to not have these issues specifically prompted in the case that is being analyzed by the students and measured for these learning outcomes. The idea is that students should, without prompting, incorporate these dimensions into an analysis. Clearly this is not happening on any significant level. This may be due to the nature of business writing which puts a premium on succinctness. Because these issues are not brought to the fore they are crowded out by the issues that are given the premium on space and time in much of business communication. In that scenario the issues will emerge in a fuller vetting of the problem. That is what happens subsequent to an initial analysis in the business world. An alternative may be to change the content of the case being analyzed so that the issues are relevant. With that a measure of how well the students handle it when presented may be meaningfully measured.
The candidate will be actively engaged with the community of scholars in the discipline.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 2: Competency in research (G: 1) (M: 1, 7)**

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

**O/O 5: Placement in research-oriented 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 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: Rubric - Research Paradigm (O: 2)**

Criteria #1 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O2: Competency in research**

80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

86.6% of 15 students were rated as performing at a 4 or 5 level on the rubric.

**M 2: Rubric - Contexts (O: 1)**

Criteria #2 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**

80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

80% of students were rated as a 4 or 5 on the rubric.

**M 3: Rubric - Creates knowledge (O: 3)**

Criteria #3 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O3: Creates new knowledge**

80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

86.7% of 15 students were rated at a 4 or 5 on this dimension of rubric.

**M 4: Rubric - Knowledge of literature (O: 1)**

Criteria #4 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**

80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

86.7% of 15 students were rated as a 4 or 5 on this dimension of rubric.

**M 5: Rubric - Cognate knowledge (O: 1)**

Criteria #5 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Comprehensive understanding of subject**

80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
71.4% of 15 students were rated as a 4 or 5 on this dimension of rubric.

M 6: Rubric - Involvement in community (O: 4)
Criteria #6 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O4: Professional Engagement
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met
69.3% of 14 students were rated as a 4 or 5 on this dimension of the rubric.

M 7: Rubric - Use of technology (O: 2)
Criteria #7 on the rubric will be applied to the students work at the time of the dissertation defense. Rubric can be found in the document repository.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O2: Competency in research
80% of students will achieve a 4 or 5 on the five dimension rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
84.6% of 13 students were rated as a 4 or 5 on this dimension of rubric.

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
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Mission / Purpose
The Ed. S. School Counseling Program is designed to produce educationally oriented professional school counselors with broadly based, multi-disciplinary backgrounds whose over arching goal is to help all P-12 students be successful in school. Graduates are equipped to counsel students in P-12 settings as well as parents and teachers; to consult with parents, teachers and other school and community personnel; to advocate for students and parents; to evaluate school counseling programs, and to coordinate the
resources of the school and the community in order to meet the developmental needs of the students. The role calls for facilitating, nurturing persons knowledgeable of educational objectives and accustomed to working with others in providing leadership and expertise in child growth and development, assessment, group process facilitation, interviewing and consultation skills, classroom intervention techniques, interpersonal dynamics, program evaluation, advocacy and the curriculum of the school.

**Goals**

**G 1: P-12 Student Learning and Development**

School counselors are committed to their students and to their learning, growth and development. To this end, school counselors use their skills to assist students in individual, small group, and classroom guidance settings. School counselors also monitor and evaluate student learning and development to provide the most effective school counseling programs.

**G 2: Professional Practice/Experience**

School counselors reflect on their practice and learn from that experience.

**G 3: Learning Communities**

School counselors are participating members of learning communities. This participation allows them to share their expertise and to gain valuable ideas from other practicing school counselors.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Counseling Knowledge and Skills (G: 1) (M: 1)**

School counselors understand and practice effective counseling skills that contribute to P-12 student learning and development.

Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

**SLO 2: Monitors and Evaluates P-12 Student Learning & Dev (G: 1) (M: 2)**

In order to assist all P-12 students in school success, school counselors must monitor, manage, and evaluate student learning and development. Student learning and development as assisted by school counselors takes place through school counselors' leadership in individual and small group counseling, classroom guidance activities, parent and teacher consultation, using community resources, and advocating for students.

Relevant Associations: American School Counselor Association

**SLO 3: Professional Reflection and Learning (G: 2) (M: 3)**

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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a Satisfactory grade on the action research project

Findings 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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: 09/2013
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: Finished
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: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: School Counseling 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?
All students met all standards during the past academic 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?

No changes have been made in the assessment process. 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.

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. 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

No operational changes have been made. The students met the standards set by the program; therefore, changes were not needed.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

All standards were met by the students this year; thus, we view our curriculum and teaching effectiveness as high. No operational improvements are called for at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

All the standards set for the program were met. There are some changes that can be made to help students complete graduation requirements in a timely manner. We have an orientation (attendance optional) for the Ed. S. program. We will begin using a form that states that the student attended/did not attend the orientation. If they did not attend, we will ask them to state that they read and understood the handbook. In this way, we can underscore the importance of being familiar with administrative graduation requirements. We believe this will aid in the improvement of students graduating in a timely manner.
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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 coordinating community resources to improve student success, and working with teachers and other education professionals to create an environment that promotes academic, career, and person/social development of all students.

**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: 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, establishing 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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

**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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a score above the cut-off score of 25.
Site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate the students on the following classroom guidance skills: uses needs assessment to promote academic success, career development and personal/social development; implements strategies and activities to lesson according to student needs; effectively processes activities; uses appropriate summary/closure techniques; utilizes classroom materials; uses a variety of activities to achieve lesson goals; keeps group on task; uses effective classroom management skills; paces data to develop lessons/units; clearly defines session goals; effectively structures the group; uses age appropriate activities and addresses and evaluates further 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: 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 2011-2012 - 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

**Target for O5: Demonstrates MC Awareness, Advocacy, Ldrship**

At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for multicultural awareness, advocacy and leadership.

**M 6: Appraisal Case Study (O: 6)**

In CPS 7450 students demonstrate their understanding of appraisal concepts by writing a case study that includes a definition of appraisal, how appraisal relates to the counseling process, intake questions and anticipated responses, issues that need to be addressed and evaluated further, development instruments and the rational for their selection, legal, ethical and moral issues, resolutions, and multicultural considerations. Case studies are evaluated based on the previously stated issues as well as on organization, written expression, appropriate use of citations and references and on integration of course material.

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

**Target for O6: Knowledge of Indiv & Group Approaches to Appraisal**

At least 90% of the students will earn a B or better on the case study.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned a B or better on the case study.

**M 7: Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) (O: 7)**

Work on the Targeted Intervention Project (TIP) is begun during CPS 8260 and completed during CPS 7661/7681. Tudents analyze the demographic data from their schools and determine where gaps exist between demographic groups in achievement or in access to classes and other activities and services, formulate a plan that is academically and developmentally appropriate to close the gap, and implement that plan. A research method is selected to evaluate the results of the plan. A paper is written describing their efforts.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O7: Demonstrates Advocacy, Ldshp, Action Research**

At least 90% of the students will earn 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of the students earned 80% or better on the Targeted Intervention Project.

**M 8: Site Supr. Eval. of Classroom Guidance Skills (O: 8)**

The site supervisors for CPS 7661/7681 evaluate the students on the following classroom guidance skills: 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.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target for O8: Demonstrates Classroom Guidance Skills
At least 80% of the students will be rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for classroom guidance skills.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of the students were rated at the novice/independent level or higher on the overall area rating for classroom guidance skills.

M 9: Consultation Quizzes (O: 9)
Two quizzes in CPS 7550 allow students to demonstrate their knowledge of consultation, including theories of consultation, methods of working with parents, families and communities to empower them and conducting programs to enhance students’ development needs.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for O9: Knowledge of Consultation & Collaboration
At least 80% of the students will earn a B or better (80% or higher) on Quiz 1 and 2 combined.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
95% 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 2011-2012 - 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

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: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013

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 are met all program requirements and standards.
**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 M.Ed. 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 Master in Education 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.

The assessments indicate that our students are performing effectively. We will continue to provide the instructions and experiences that we now provide.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

Although the students continue to meet the standards set by the program regarding the practicum/internship, several operational improvements have been made that the School Counseling faculty think will improve the practicum/internship experience. The practicum/internship orientation will be held earlier in the academic year so that placements can occur earlier. This is important so that the students can meet with the on-site supervisor before the previous school year ends to make plans for the beginning of the next school year when the student will be placed at that school. Current on-site supervisors have stated that it is extremely important for the internship student to be at the school during pre-planning. The application deadline was moved from November 15 to November 30.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

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.

---
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**Mission / Purpose**

The goal of the Masters/Ed.S. program in School Psychology is to train school psychologists to become certified for work in the schools. By successfully completing the courses, practica and internships in this program, the graduating school psychologists are prepared to continue to provide and evaluate effective school psychological services that include consultation, preventive intervention, counseling as well as data-based decision making and psycho-educational diagnosis targeted to students, teachers, parents, administrators and community members affiliated with public schools. In addition, graduates develop advanced knowledge and skills in using research methodology and statistics, in planning, implementing, and evaluating school-based evaluation research, in understanding current trends in the field of school psychology, in ethical issues relevant to the practice of psychology in educational settings and in using technology to facilitate practice in school settings.

**Goals**

**G2: Understands School Psychology Practice**
Students will understand the foundations and practice of school psychology.

**G1: 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.

**G3: 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.

**G4: 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 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 3:</th>
<th>Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate competence in home/school/community collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategic Plan Associations

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4:</th>
<th>Implements Data Based Decision Making (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to implement effective Data-Based Decision Making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5:</th>
<th>Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will understand responsibilities related to professional, legal, and ethical duties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6:</th>
<th>Effectively utilizes technological applications (G: 1) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and utilize technology effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 7:</th>
<th>Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning (G: 1, 2, 3, 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will understand student diversity in development and learning in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 8:</th>
<th>Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will practice effective consultation and collaboration in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 9:</th>
<th>Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand school system organization, policy development, and school climate for school-age children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 10:</th>
<th>Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention (G: 4) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and learn how to implement effective methods of prevention and crisis intervention involving children's mental health.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 11:</th>
<th>Understands Research and Program Evaluation (G: 3) (M: 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student will conduct and understand research and program evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Associations:</td>
<td>NASP &amp; NCATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategic Plan Associations

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

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Internship Portfolio (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Internship Portfolio is a compilation of psychological reports consultation reports, assigned activities, the site-based supervisors' rating and university-based supervisors' rating of the student that demonstrates the graduate student's performance and mastery of required skills and competency in program objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for O1: Understand Development of Wellness, Socialization and Life Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of interns received a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency in the 2011-2012 internship year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Develops Cognitive and Academic Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Promotes System-Based Service Delivery Through Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100 % of interns earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency for the 2011-2012 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Implements Data Based Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100 % of interns earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency for the 2011-2012 academic cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Understand Professional, Legal, Ethical Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: Effectively utilizes technological applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Understand diversity, development, &amp; learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Effective at Consultation &amp; Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All students in the 2011-2012 year earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Understands School Organizations, Policy, &amp; Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Understands Prevention &amp; Crisis Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Understands Research and Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of Ed.S. interns will receive a rubric rating of &quot;3&quot; or higher for this area of competency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns (100%) earned a 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 MEd practicum students will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 Practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
During the 2011-2012 academic year all practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

Target for O1: Understand 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 practicum students (100%) earned a 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All 2011-2012 interns and practicum students (100%) earned a rating of "3" or higher on this 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
Student survey responses will demonstrate an understanding of their professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities as school psychologists.

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

Measure | Outcome/Objective:
---|---
PEF Disposition Survey | 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

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.
Graduated 6 students! Placed 6/7 students on APA/APPIC internships, which are highly competitive. Maintained about 50% student diversity. Got funding to replace one faculty member. Placed 2 students in academic/research positions. Many publications and presentations. Reduced course load. Applied for 4 grants, 2 successful, 1 no, 1 yet to be determined.

University-wide Committee Participation—Use this space to document any staff participation on University-wide committees (e.g., University Senate).
Cadenhead and Varjas on University Senate

Academic Teaching Activities—If the staff participated in teaching (or assisted in the teaching of) academic courses as part of their responsibilities to the department, please note that here.
all faculty teach classes.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
Mission / Purpose
The GSU school psychology PhD is an innovative program that seeks to develop and amplify the role of the school psychologist beyond their traditional roles and functions. Training is oriented toward developing students who are proficient practitioners and researchers. Students refine their knowledge and skills in assessment, prevention/intervention, and consultation. Students develop a cognate that reflects their particular interests and intended area of specialization. PhD school psychology students are also trained to be producers of research.

Goals
G 1: Goal 1: Professionalism
To prepare our graduates to ground his/her practice in basic science and to conduct legal and ethical practices in a pluralistic, diverse society.

G 2: Goal 2: Scientific and Research Foundations for Professional Practice
To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly research regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.

G 3: Goal 3: Professional Strategies Targeted to the Needs of Learners, Their Parents, and Their Schools
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at intervention, consultation, and assessment.

G 4: Goal 4: Area of Sub-Specialization
To ensure that our graduates, in addition of professional preparation as a school psychologist, has a subspecialty.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 2: Follow the tenets of legal, ethical, and social responsibility in practice (G: 1) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are informed about and committed to legal and ethical practices
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

SLO 3: Understand the practice of psychology (G: 1) (M: 5)
To ensure that our graduates practices are sufficiently grounded in the basic science of psychology.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 4: Understand the principles of psychology and school psychology (G: 2) (M: 3, 5)
Graduates demonstrate knowledge of advanced principles of psychology and school psychology.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

Strategic Plan Associations
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 5: Use and conduct research (G: 2) (M: 1, 2, 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates can use research findings and properly conduct research, particularly regarding the practice of psychology in educational settings.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

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).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 6: Intervention (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing preventative and remedial intervention.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

Strategic Plan Associations
4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

SLO 7: Consultation (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)
To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing consultation.
Relevant Associations: APA & NASP
**Strategic Plan Associations**

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

**SLO 8: Psychoeducational Assessment (G: 3) (M: 3, 5)**

To ensure that our graduates are proficient at providing psychological assessment.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

**SLO 9: Develops skills in one or more subspecialization (G: 4)**

Graduates acquire and demonstrate adequate mastery of a subspeciality that strengthens their skills as psychologists.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**Other Outcomes/Objectives**

**O/O 1: Diversity Awareness & Sensitive Service Delivery (G: 1) (M: 5)**

To ensure that our graduates are prepared to work as professional school psychologists in a pluralistic, diverse society.

Relevant Associations: APA & NASP

**Strategic Plan Associations**

2.2 Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.

4.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 4 (Complex Challenges of Cities).

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Successful completion of pre-dissertation research (O: 5)**

PhD students must completed 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

6 students completed predissertation during 2011-2012 academic year.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

6 students defended dissertation in 2011-2012 academic year. None attempted and was unsuccessful.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

6 students defended dissertation in 2011-2012 academic year. None attempted and was unsuccessful.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

1/1 person took and passed comprehensive exam in 2011-2012

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1/1 person took and passed the comprehensive exam in 2011-2012

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1/1 person took and passed the comprehensive exam in 2011-2012

#### Target for O6: Intervention
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective intervention practices.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1/1 person took and passed the comprehensive exam in 2011-2012

#### Target for O7: Consultation
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of effective consultation practices.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1/1 person took and passed the comprehensive exam in 2011-2012

#### Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment
As part of their comprehensive examination, at least 90% of students will demonstrate an understanding of psychoeducational assessment.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1/1 person took and passed the comprehensive exam in 2011-2012

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for diversity and cultural awareness.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for ethics and professional behavior

#### 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.

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for readiness to enter practice

#### 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for use of research
### Target for O6: Intervention
100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for intervention skills

### Target for O7: Consultation
100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for consultation

### Target for O8: Psychoeducational Assessment
100% of doctoral interns will receive a rubric rating of "3" or higher for this area of competency.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of 2011-12 interns received a score of "3" or higher on supervisors rating for assessment

### 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 upcoming 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

#### continue emphasizing research completion
Faculty should continue emphasizing research completion and examining opportunities to decrease coursework requirements

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure: Successful completion of dissertation research | Outcome/Objective: Use and conduct research
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Truscott & Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** none

#### modify program materials to reflect changes in course requirements
all materials need to be modified to reflect increased research and elimination of the core.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** handbook and web-based materials
- **Projected Completion Date:** 01/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Truscott
- **Additional Resources:** GA time

### 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 continue to graduate large numbers of PhD students. This should continue for 2 more years until we are at a more reasonable number of 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?
Publications and presentations continue to occur at high levels, which indicates we are making good progress on research emphasis.

#### 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 reduced courses overall by eliminating the requirement for a cognate and some other COE core courses, while increasing research requirements.
Mission / Purpose
The mission of the MEd. Online Program in Science Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity in science teaching by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices. Candidates develop knowledge, teaching expertise, and dispositions that will enable them to become 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: Goal/Purpose Statement
Candidates who are admitted to this program have basic science knowledge; therefore the goals of the program divided into three areas: Planning, effects on P-12 learners and content. 1. Planning: Candidates will expand their content and pedagogical knowledge of the natural sciences by excelling in science courses that will enable them to plan and implement lessons that demonstrate their understanding of science concepts and principles. Effects on P-12 Learners Candidates will enlarge their content base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in the natural sciences and pedagogical practices that include teaching science as inquiry with emphasis on the nature of science, working with diverse student populations, developing assessment strategies that will target the academic development of the learner in the area of science. Candidates will engage in reflective practice to improve their instructional practices. Content Candidates will expand their content knowledge of the natural sciences by excelling in science courses that they will enable them to plan and implement lessons that are interdisciplinary in which they teach learners how to show respect for science, each other, the school and the community.

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 their content and pedagogical knowledge of science to develop a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement in their instructional plans.

SLO 2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning (M: 2)
Aligned with Goal 2; Key Assessment – Effects on P-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 academic, 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: Develop lessons that utilize concepts and processes in science in order to teach science as an interdisciplinary unit; as inquiry with the inclusion of the nature of science, and in relationship to the personal, historical, and social perspectives of life. Candidates will also incorporate the use of technology in their teaching.

Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings
M 1: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) (O: 1)
Candidates will develop lesson plans using a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement in their instructional plans. Candidates must achieve a rating of at least "3" out of "5" for this measure.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target for O1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
1. Candidates will develop lesson plans using a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement in their instructional plans. Candidates must achieve a rating of at least "3" out of "5" for this measure.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All of the candidates scored at the "4" out of "5"on this target indicating that they have knowledge of when to engage students in inquiry projects and how to link these instructional practices to things that are taking place in the lives of their students. In addition, data indicate that students have a good understanding of how to assess their students and use this data to improve instruction.
**M 2: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning (O: 2)**

Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Candidates will use a variety of contemporary and traditional assessment strategies to evaluate the academic, 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. Students must achieve a rating of at least “2” out of a possible “3” for this measure.

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All of the candidates (100%) received a good rating for this measure. Fifty percent of the students scored a rating of “3” out of “3” and 50 percent scored a rating of “2” out of “3”. This indicates that the candidates have a good understanding of how to develop assessment instruments that are aligned with their teaching goals and objectives in order to determine the impact that their teaching had on students’ performance.

**M 3: Measure for Content Knowledge (O: 3)**

Candidates will develop lessons that utilize concepts and processes in science in order to teach science as an interdisciplinary unit; as inquiry with the inclusion of the nature of science, and in relationship to the personal, historical, and social perspectives of life. Candidates will also incorporate the use of technology in their teaching. Students must achieve a rating of at least “2” out of a possible “3” for this measure.

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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All of the candidates (100%) met by scoring a rating of “2” out of “3”. This implies that the candidates have a good understanding of how teach science content and make it meaningful to real life situations.

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

**Clinical Practice**

Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 33% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 33% scored at the exceeds level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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.

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

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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)

**Planning - Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

**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:** None  
**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 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 part of 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): 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 in order to minimize the number of revisions to obtain an acceptable document.

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

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure (Key Assessment): 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)
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 were asked to complete an exit portfolio which was not completely aligned with the Key Assessments. Faculty worked with the Associate Department Chair to aligned the National Science Teacher Standards with the Key Assessments. This alignment allows the evaluator of the portfolio to identify areas of improvement for both the students and 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.

Inquiry is presently taught in the EDSC 8400 Strategies of Science Instruction, however, in the upcoming year, the course will be modified to engage candidates in mini inquiry projects that can be used in their science classroom. Also in EDSC 8400, the focus has been on one aspect of the learning environment which is safety, but in the future a more holistic approach will be used which focus on the total learning environment inclusive of psychological, social, emotional, and instructional settings.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
NA

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
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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 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 than 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 (Key Assessments), 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 sections of the Broad Field Science Exam (024 and 025). 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 3.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Beginner level or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
1. We had a 100% pass rate on the GACE broadfield exam by our candidates during the reporting period. Thus, it is clear that our candidates have successfully met this proficiency area associated with the program. 2. More than 80% of the candidates were rated at the "Effectively Demonstrated" level and 15% at the "Acceptable" level on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation. No candidates scored at the "Basic" level which means that the candidates exceeded the expectation for this assessment. 3. INTASC Standards 1 (Content Knowledge) and 7 (Curriculum Decisions) were used to document the content knowledge of candidates in the portfolio. Candidates did extremely well on this segment of the key assessment. For Standard 1, 51% of them were rated at the Advanced level, 42% at the Proficient level, and 7% of the candidates did not complete this standard. Standard 7 revealed that 35% of the candidates were rated at the Advanced level, 57% at the proficient level, and 7% of the candidates did not complete this segment of the portfolio. The measure for this target indicate that the candidates far exceeded the expected performance.

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 4.25 rating, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Overall the ratings attained by the candidates on the different assignments that comprised this larger assessment area indicate that our candidates have developed effective capacities in the areas addressed by the assignment elements. This assertion is supported by the fact that the mean average for the candidates was above a 4 (out of 5) on all 25 elements. However, one can identify a couple of elements for which there is room for improvement. For instance, in the category 'Multiple Modes and Approaches', more candidates were rated 'Proficient' (the 2nd highest rating) than were rated 'Exemplary' (the highest rating) prior to 2012; however, the data for 2012 show that more students scored exemplary than proficient. This improvement may be accounted for by the increased efforts to help students develop and apply these skills. It was also true of the categories 'Activities, Assignments and Resources', 'Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment', and 'Use of Contextual Information'. Mid-term and Final Evaluation Rubrics show that more than 80% of the students scored at the "Effectively Demonstrated" level and 15% at the "Acceptable" level. All of the candidates scored above the "Needs Improving" level. 3. INTASC Standards 2 (Student Learning and Development) was used to document Professional and Pedagogical Skills in the portfolio. Candidates did extremely well on this segment of the key assessment. Data revealed that 40% of the candidates were rated at the Advanced level, 24% at the Proficient level, 29% at the Basic level and 7% did not complete this section of the portfolio. The measure for this target indicates that it was met since only 7% of the candidates did not complete the portfolio.

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 reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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 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 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target 1: All of the candidates did extremely well on this target. The data for the Design for Instruction showed that 86% of them scoring at the Exemplary level, 12% at the Proficient level, and 2% at the Acceptable level. The ratings for Instructional Decision Making revealed that 87% of the students received a rating Exemplary and 13% Proficient. This data confirms that the candidates exceeded the expectation of the target in that none of the candidates scored at an unacceptable level. Target 2: Candidates were rated very high on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics. Seventy percent of the candidates scored at the Exemplary level, 29% at the Proficient level and 1% at the Partially Demonstrated level. Candidate performance exceeded the expectation for this target. Target 3: INTASC Standards 3 (Student Diversity) and 4 (Instructional Variety) were used to document Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences in the portfolio. Candidates did extremely well on this segment of the key assessment. For Standard 4, 40% of them were rated at the Advanced level, 35% at the Proficient level, 18% at the Basic level and 7% of the candidates did not complete this standard. Standard 3 revealed that 40% of the candidates were rated at the Advanced level, 31% at the proficient level, 22% at the Basic level and 7% of the candidates did not complete this segment of the portfolio. The measures for this target indicate that the candidates met the expected performance since 7% of them scored at the Beginner level or below.

M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments (O: 4)

There will be two 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. 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 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 4.25 rating, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of Beginner or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target 1: Candidates demonstrated their knowledge of Contextual Factors by scoring a rating of 81% at the Exemplary level and 19% at the Proficient level. None of the students scored at the unacceptable level. Disaggregation of the data indicated that the candidates need more support in the use of a variety of approaches to support their instructional practices. Target 2: Candidates were rated very high on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics. More than seventy percent of the candidates scored at the Effectively Demonstrated level and 29% at the Adequately Demonstrated level. Candidate performance exceeded the expectation for this target. Target 3: INTASC Standard 5 (Learning Environment) was used to document Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environment in the portfolio. Candidates did extremely well on this segment of the key assessment based on the following ratings: 22% of them were rated at the Advanced level, 60% at the Proficient level, 18% at...
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 & 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 reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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. 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. 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 being rated at the Beginner level or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target 1: The data related to this Assessment Plan instrument indicate that the candidates have a good understanding of how to assess students as well as how to use assessment data to guide instruction. The average rating for the instrument showed that 87% of the students were rated Exemplary and 13% proficient. None of the students received a rating less than 3. Target 2: There are three areas of this Assessment Plan instrument which will be focused upon because they are unique to this instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Learning Environments, and Planning and Instruction. An overall analysis of the ten elements related to these areas suggests that our candidates are leaving the program being able to use their knowledge of their students and their learning styles to both create a learning environment conducive to productive interactions and to plan and implement instruction that takes these factors into account. This assertion is supported by the fact that the mean average for each of these ten elements was above a 3 (out of a possible 4). As with other assessment instruments, a more fine-grained analysis of the data points to a couple of areas for improvement. For instance, 42% of them were rated at the Advanced level, 46% at the Proficient level, and 11% at the Basic level. The measures for this target indicate that the candidates exceeded the expected performance of this standard.

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 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 being rated at the Beginner level or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target 1: 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 reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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. 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 being rated at the Beginner level or below.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target 1: 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 reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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 an overall rating of 18, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by reviewers of this section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

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

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Target 1: The number of features of the candidates' dispositions which were examined by this instrument. In general, the data suggests that students are leaving the program with the proper dispositions to be an effective secondary school teacher as indicated by the fact that the averages on each of the elements was above a 3 (out of 4). This assertion is supported by the fact that by spring 2012 92% of the candidates scored at the Exceptional level and none of the candidates received a rating less than 3. This target was met.
the needs of diverse populations of students. In these areas, more candidates scored "Adequately Demonstrated" (2nd highest rating) or "Partially Demonstrated" (3rd highest rating) as scored "Effectively Demonstrated" (highest rating). Target 3: INTASC Standards 9 (Reflective Practitioner) was used to document impact on Student Learning - Reflection in the portfolio. Candidates did extremely well on this segment of the key assessment. For this standard, 35% of them were rated at the Advanced level, 53% at the Proficient level, and 11% at the Basic level. The measure for this target indicates that the candidates exceeded the expected performance for this standard.

**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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments
- **Outcome/Objective:** Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments

- **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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Objective 1 - Content Knowledge
- **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

- **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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure (Key Assessment):** 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:** MAT Science Ed Unit

**Additional Resources:** None
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
Responsible Person/Group: All science education faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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)

Improvement of Assessment Strategies

The content of the courses and the nature of the assignments throughout the program are helping prepare our candidates to use a variety of assessment tools and to effectively develop these with instructional goals in mind, observational data and data obtained by supervisors through interactions with candidates hint that there is still room for improvement in this area. For instance, our candidates seem unwilling or unable to integrate non-traditional summative assessments (e.g. performance-based problems) with more traditional strategies. Our plan to continue to evolve the program in this area is to use assessment more as a thread throughout the methods courses so that whenever candidates engage in an activity designed to develop understanding of a particular pedagogical practice (e.g. using model-building to support conceptual understanding), there is an appropriate assessment tool tied to it. In addition, candidates will be asked to reflect on their assessment strategies and submit an assessment plan as a part of the Teacher Work Sample assignment. This process will be monitored and if necessary, a course in assessment may be offered in the future.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection

Implementation Description: Faculty will help students develop assessment tools for performance based objectives which will also include authentic assessment.
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching methods courses.
Additional Resources: None

Improving Classroom Management

Related to the standard of Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments, the element on which candidates scored the lowest was related to learning environment. Faculty will place more emphasis on classroom management, particularly as it lays the foundation for other aspects of the classroom experience. Some format of classroom management will be included in the three methods classes.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments | Outcome/Objective: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments

Implementation Description: Faculty will identify areas of classroom management that should be addressed in all methods classes.
Methods classes will be modified to include some format of classroom management.

**Responsible Person/Group:** All professors teaching the science methods courses.

**Additional Resources:** None at this time.

### 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 assessment process for the M.A.T. Program in Science Education is reviewed every year in order to meet the needs of the candidates in the program. Efforts have been made during this academic year to streamline some of the more intense assignments such as the Teacher Work Sample Unit. Students are still required to do the unit, but more support is given to the candidates in the three Methods Classes, and the process of developing the unit is extended over two semesters with the candidate finishing the unit during the last semester of Practicum III. In addition, it was found that there was some repetition in the practicum assignments, so these assignments have been overhauled such that they remain challenging without any overlapping. The Key Assessments have not changed, but the assignments have been modified in order to improve the performance of candidates in every domain of each standard.

### 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.

While there were no major areas of concern brought to light by an analysis of the data obtained from assessment instruments, there were some elements of the candidates' proficiencies which indicated areas where there is room for improvement. The assessment instruments associated with the Planning standard suggested that some candidates still need to work on being able to vary their instructional strategies and being able to tune those strategies to appeal to multiple modalities. There are two possible reasons for this: Either the candidates 'apprenticeship of observation' in science classrooms has made it difficult for them to break free from the classic transmissive mode of teaching or that an over-emphasis on inquiry has not allowed candidates to think about whether practices related to this kind of teaching are varied enough to meet the needs of all learners. This is something that must be explored further by those teaching and supervising in this program. Related to the standard of Clinical Practice, the element on which candidates scored the lowest was related to classroom environment. It is not surprising that, with all of the things a science teacher has to attend to, they might not give as much attention to the overall classroom environment as those evaluating them would like. Recently we have begun to place more emphasis in this area, particularly as it lays the foundation for other aspects of the classroom experience, so we will see if this makes a difference in future iterations of this program.

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:

Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

NA

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:

What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

NA

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:

How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

NA
**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, 2)**
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Two students completed a thesis or project during the review period.

**M 2: Thesis or Project Completed (O: 1)**
Graduate committee completed assessment according to grading rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: The student will complete a thesis or project**
The program graduated 2 students with thesis/project that met the requirements.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The unit found the rubric satisfactory for assessment purposes in this cycle.

**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

**New assessment summary**
The unit will implement a new student assessment summary for the next cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Thesis or Project Completed | Outcome/Objective: The student will complete a thesis or project
Responsible Person/Group: Unit coordinators
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 evaluated our assessment of learning outcomes through the APRC process. As a result we will create a new data collection instrument and analysis techniques as to achievement of performance milestones.

**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 create and implement an annual student report that will be used for assessment purposes.

Annual Report Section Responses

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year—**Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

We completed an APR review in Fall of 2012.

---
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**2011-2012 Social Studies Education MEd**
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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 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 posses deep knowledge of students and adaptations to their individual situations to provide for optimal learning (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)
SLO 6: Disposition (G: 1, 2, 3) (M: 2)

6) Disposition: 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 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

Measures (Key Assessments), 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 UniversityWritingCenterfor assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwwcr/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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Social Studies Content Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Cultural Studies/Diversity - Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge 4 (100%) 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 0.00 Overall Assessment of Learning 3 (75%) 1 0 0 0 3.75 4.03 Overall Assessment of Effects on Student Learning 3 (75%) 1 0 0 0 3.75 4.03 Overall Assessment of Clinical Practice 2 (50%) 0 0 0 3.50 3.00 Overall Assessment of Professionalism 4 (100%) 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 2 (50%) 1 (25%) 0 1 (25%) 0 3.00 4 1.22 Historical Inquiry - Option 1 2 (66%) 1 0 0 0 3.67 4.07 Civic Action - Option 2 2 (66%) 1 0 0 0 3.67 4.07 Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1(50%) 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 (50%) 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50

Target for O2: Curriculum Standards

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Curriculum Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2(50%) 2 (50%) 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Curriculum Resources 3 (75%) 1 (25%) 0 0 0 3.75 4.03

Target for O3: Learning Environment

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Rubric: TEACHING PERFORMANCE: Learning Environment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Responsive Culturally Responsive Practice 1 (25%) 3 (75%) 0 0 0 3.25 3.43 Communication & Technology 4 (100%) 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Classroom Resources 4 (100%) 0 0 0 4.00 4.00

Target for O4: Knowledge of Students

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Knowledge of Students Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev High Expectations and Differentiation 4 (100%) 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Learning Theory 2 (50%) 2 (50%) 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Family Communication 3 (75%) 1 (25%) 0 0 0 3.75 4.03
### Target for O5: Assessment

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

#### Findings 2011-2012 - 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 Stdev Data-driven Assessment 3 (75%) 1 (25%) 0 0 0 3.75 4 0.43 Student Self-Assessment 2 (50%) 2 (50%) 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Grading Procedure 2 (50%) 2 (50%) 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50

### 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 2011-2012 - 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 (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
  - Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Content Knowledge
- **Responsible Person/Group:** COE Program Faculty / SS Program Faculty
- **Additional Resources:** n/a

#### Create New MED Degree Program

1. **Content knowledge:** As a result of data analysis, faculty determined that students require more support in demonstrating their knowledge and ability to work with diverse cultures. The program faculty have determined that this is a function of the program portfolio, and not necessarily an indicator of a lack of knowledge or inability to accomplish this standard. 2. **Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions:** Program faculty have determined that Social Studies M.Ed. students need more opportunity to engage in connecting theory and practice in the classroom. The new M.Ed. currently in the final approval process
accomplishes this task by adding a field work component that is especially important for graduate students who are not currently working in the school system. 3. Impact on student learning: Program faculty have determined that Social Studies M.Ed. students need more opportunity to engage in connecting theory and practice in the classroom to see firsthand their impact on student learning. The new M.Ed., which is currently in the final stages of the approval process, accomplishes this task by adding a field work (“practicum”) component that is especially important for graduate students who are not currently working in the school system.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 10/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Caroline Sullivan

### 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 students maintained strong results and accomplishments. In addition, faculty worked to create the new M.Ed., which is currently in the final stages of the approval process.

**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 graduate level M.Ed. students already exhibit high levels of critical thinking and frequently enroll in doctoral level classes. One faculty member commended the critical thinking of the M.Ed. 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?

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 the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** How will you use your findings from this year? 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 Masters of Education in Teaching (MAT) 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 MAT Social Studies 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 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 follow 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 (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

M 1: Content and Curriculum (O: 1)
Data for the objective of Content Knowledge are taken from the Final StudentTeaching Evaluation Instrument. The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum II/III (student teaching). 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the 2011-2012 target, 100% of the students scored at the level of adequately demonstrated and 95% of the students scored at the highest level of effectively demonstrated.
**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the 2011-2012 target, 100% of students scored at the level of proficient and 95% of students scored at the level of exemplary.

**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 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: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the 2011-2012 target, 100% of students scored at the level of adequately demonstrated and 71% of students scored at the level of effectively demonstrated.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the 2011-2012 target, 100% of students scored at the level of acceptable and 86% of students scored at the level of exceptional.

**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 Adequately Demonstrated and 60% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the 2011-2012 target, 100% of students scored at the level of proficient and 95% of students scored at the level of exemplary.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
For the 2011-2012 target, 100% of students scored at the level of proficient and 89% of students scored at the level of exemplary.

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

Maintain Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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)

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
Measure (Key Assessment): 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.
Maintain Student Performance
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial preparation program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

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. We also have incorporated portions of the Teacher Work Sample in our Social Studies Methods courses as well. This has allowed for more consistency between the assessment process within the practicum experiences and also overall program coursework.

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. Also, in our EDSS 7560 course, a focus on the use of primary source documents, historical landmarks, and artifacts in the teaching and learning of social studies has been added. This new emphasis addresses the GA Common Core Standards for Literacy in the Social Studies and allows our students to have specific instruction and experiences in this area of teaching.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle's (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average grade on this log was 28 out of 30 points. Students met this target.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average score for this paper was 8.85.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average score for this measure was 83%.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
The average score for this measure was 83%.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
The average score on this assignment was 7.9. This goal was not quite 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met
Students earned an average score of 80.5% on this assignment so the goal was met.

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

TheoryEarlyLife
This course is the first CTW offering for students within the major. Additional opportunities to submit paper drafts and rewrite the assignment will be included. In addition, writing consultants will be used in all sections to provide additional one-on-one consultation for student support with their papers.

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

Orientation
Orientation to major

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: The orientation process for majors is being refined. This will help students make decisions about sequencing courses and expectations about progression of programs of study. At this point, we have developed a new model that is a hybrid of individual and group formats. This seems to be working well
Responsible Person/Group: BSW Program Committee

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: Planned
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
2011-2012 Social Work MSW
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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 01: Evaluate & Integrate Multiple Sources of Knowledge**
  - The class average for the proposal will be 90% or higher on SW 8200, Evaluation & Technology course.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Class average was 92 for the proposal on the activity.

**M 2: Common Ground (O: 2)**

Students 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 02: Theory and Practice with Communities**
  - The class average for the integrative paper on Common Ground will be 90% or higher

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

95% of student received a B or higher on the paper on this required reading and analysis.

**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 03: Power and Privilege**
  - The class average for the power and privilege paper will be 90% or higher in the Leadership & Management course.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

92% of students received 90% or higher on this assignment.

**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 04: Leadership in Community Change**
  - The class average for the paper and oral presentation on the community projects will be 90% or higher

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% students received a B or higher on the presentation and paper of the 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Community Collaboratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

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

### 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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

---

**Georgia State University**
**Assessment Data by Section**
**2011-2012 Sociology Assessment of Core**
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

### Goals

**G 3: Critical Analysis**
Students will learn to critically analyze the complexity of social behavior, and how historical, economic, political, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: critical understanding (G: 3) (M: 1)**
Common embedded questions on objective exams are designed to allow students to demonstrate their critical understanding 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: 3) (M: 1)**

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.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

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

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: SOCI 1101 and SOCI 1160 embedded exam questions (O: 1, 2)**

SOCI 1101 and soci 1160 exam questions The goal assessment categories here are "Sociological Perspective," "Multicultural Issues," and "Global/International Issues." Five multiple-choice questions were designed to assess competence in each goal area. Instructors in all sections of Soci 1101 and Soci 1160 were requested to select at least one multiple choice in each of the three section and to embed the questions in their final exams. Instructors were free to select more than one question as long there was at least one question to assess each of the three goals. The total number of students who were assessed in this area was 963 students from 9 sections of 1101 (418 students), and 11 sections of 1160 (545 students). In the area of "Sociological Perspective," 92% of students in 1101 and 93% of students in 1160 answered questions correctly; in the area of "Multicultural Issues," 78% of students in 1101 and 93% of those in 1160 answered questions correctly; and in the area of "Global/International Issues correctly," 91% of students in 1101 and 94% 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: critical understanding**

At least 80% of students should answer questions correctly.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

The target was met, over all.

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

**maintain current level of success**

Most of our targets were more than surpassed, with the majority of students in most cases considered answering embedded questions correctly. Our plan is to maintain the current level of success.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Implementation Description: Continue as we have been doing.

Responsible Person/Group: Adia Harvey Wingfield, new Assessments Coordinator

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Sociology BA**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST

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

**Mission / Purpose**

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University is committed to excellence in the advancement of knowledge about social forces, social behavior, and social change. Through dedicated research, teaching, and service, the Department's work benefits students, colleagues, policy makers, and the public. Established in Cycle: 2007-2008 Active Through: 2007-2008 Entry Status: Final Established By: Migration Tool on 10/13/2008 Help

**Goals**

**G 8: critical analysis**

Students will learn to critically analyze the complexity of social behavior, and how historical, economic, political, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change.
### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

#### SLO 2: Data Collection and Data Analysis (G: 8) (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: 8) (M: 2, 4)
Faculty assessment of students' ability to:
- A. To identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems
- B. Analyze contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

#### SLO 4: Communication Skills (G: 8) (M: 2)
Students develop effective written communication and editing skills
- B. Students show appropriate writing conventions and formats

**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.

### Other Outcomes/Objectives

#### O/O 1: Acquisition of Knowledge (G: 8) (M: 1, 2, 3, 4)
Faculty assessments of students' abilities to:
- A. Articulate key sociological concepts and theories
- B. Apply the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems
- C. Utilize key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

#### O/O 5: Critical Thinking Skills (G: 8) (M: 2, 3)
- A. Students formulate research questions and formulate testable hypotheses
- B. Students are able to analyze and interpret data (hypothesis testing, drawing inferences, formulating conclusions)
- C. Students demonstrate how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

### 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 students articulated key sociological concepts or theories in their final exams or course papers. 200 students in five sections were evaluated (on a four-point scale). Professors judged that 29% of their students were doing work they considered excellent (a score of 4); that 27% were doing work they evaluated as very good (a score of 3); that 18% were doing work they saw as good (a score of 2), and that 19% were doing work they considered to be poor (a score of 1).

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge**
- 70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in the paper.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met**
- 55% were assessed as "excellent" or "very good."

#### M 2: SOCI 3020 (Sociological Methods) Paper and/or Exam (O: 1, 3, 4, 5)
Assessment is based on professors' evaluations of: students' course papers (in which they develop research proposals) and/or final exams. Students' work is assessed on each outcome/objective measure. 99 students (in four sections) were assessed based on their course papers or final exams. In terms of demonstrating "analytic skills," professors assessed 24% of students' papers as excellent; 39% as very good; 22% as good; and 15% as poor. In terms of demonstration of "critical thinking," the professor assessed 31% of students' papers as excellent; 36% as very good; 19% as good, and 14% as poor. In terms of "communication skills," the professor assessed 23% of students' papers/exams as excellent; 36% as very good; 27% as good, and 14% as poor. Three of the professors (the fourth omitted this measure) evaluated 74 students' papers in terms of their demonstration of "acquisition of knowledge": 26% of these papers/exams as excellent (a score of 4); 36% were judged to be "very good" (a score of 3) in this area; 23% were judged to be "good" (a score of 2) and 15% were judged to be poor (a score of 1).

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

**Target for O1: Acquisition of Knowledge**
- 70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of knowledge acquisition in their papers/exams.
### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

62% were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" at demonstrating their knowledge acquisition.

### Target for O3: Analysis of Social Problems

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

63% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in their analysis of social problems.

### Target for O4: Communication Skills

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their communication skills.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

59% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in their communication skills.

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

67% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of critical thinking skills.

### M 3: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance (O: 1, 2, 5)

This measure is based on professors' evaluations of students' analytic skills and critical thinking skills in Statistics courses. Professors evaluate students on a 4-point scale. 234 students (in six sections) were evaluated. The professors assessed 30% of students to be excellent (a score of four) in their demonstration of analytic skills (appropriate computer skills); 34% were assessed as very good, 29% as good, and 7% as poor in this area. The professors judged 29% to be excellent in their demonstration of critical thinking skills (able to analyze and interpret data). They assessed 35% of students as very good; 30% as good; and 6% as poor in this area.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

### Target for O2: Data Collection and Data Analysis

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of analytic skills (appropriate computer skills) on their final exams.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

64% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in their demonstration of analytic skills.

### Target for O5: Critical Thinking Skills

70% of the students will score "excellent" or "very good" in their critical thinking.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

64 of students were assessed as demonstrating "excellent" or "very good" critical thinking skills.

### M 4: SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper (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 or papers. The work of 293 students (in five sections) was assessed. In the area of "acquisition of knowledge," professors judged 18% of students' work to be excellent; 43% to be very good; 42% to be good, and 7% to be poor. In terms of demonstrating an ability to analyze (and suggest solutions to) contemporary problems, professors judged 18% of students' work to be excellent; 43% to be very good; 43% to be good; and 6% to be poor. In the second (global) measure, professors judged 18% of students' work to be excellent; 44% to be very good; 42% to be good, and 6% 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

62% of students were assessed as "excellent" or "very good" in 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

61% of students were assessed as demonstrating "excellent" or "very good" analytic skills.
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 or Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge
- Analysis of Social Problems
- Measure: Sociological Theory (SOCI 3030) Final Exam or Paper | Outcome/Objective: Acquisition of Knowledge

monitor student performance

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased (but is only slightly less than our target in this category -- 67% instead of 70% achieving assessment as "excellent" or "very good" in critical thinking). The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

monitor student performance

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased (from last year, which showed an increase from the year before). The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

monitor student performance

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

monitor student performance

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

monitor student performance

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance | Outcome/Objective: Critical Thinking Skills

monitor student performance

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the
Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there are ways to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not. And then, if there are ways to discern this (which is really not clear to me), they may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved.

**established in cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Sociological Theory (SOCl 3030) Final Exam or Paper  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of Knowledge

**monitor student performance**

Faculty assessment of students' work as "excellent" or "very good" has decreased. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider whether there is any way to discern whether student performance is truly declining or not.

**established in cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**monitor student performance**

Here, assessment data shows continual improvement over the course of the past three years. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved. Or perhaps our targets are too high!

**established in cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analysis of Social Problems

**monitor student performance**

Here, we have a slight increase from last year. The Undergraduate Director, in concert with the Undergraduate Committee, may wish to consider ways that student performance may be improved. Or perhaps our targets are too high!

**established in cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** SOCI 3010 (Social Statistics) student performance  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Data Collection and Data Analysis

**monitor student performance**

In the past, we have stated that our goal is to have 70% of students assessed as demonstrating that they are doing an "excellent" or "very good" job in meeting learning goals, as demonstrated through professors' assessment of performance on papers and/or exams (in the four upper-level required courses we assess). This year, we met this goal.

**established in cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**monitor student performance**

Student performance in this area has improved, based on collected data, over the past two years. The Assessments Coordinator should continue to monitor student performance, and may wish to take up with the Undergraduate Committee whether our target is too high.

**established in cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** SOCI 3201 (Inequalities) Final Exam or Paper  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Acquisition of Knowledge

---

**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 continue to offer a wide diversity of courses as CTW courses, as per our original 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?**

I do not think that our data are a clear indication of changes from one year to the next; the data seem to increase each year -- that is, more students are assessed -- but the criteria by which they are assessed can be interpreted in a wide way by different faculty members. There has not been a great deal of consistency among the group assessing each year. This may be why results vary a great deal from one year 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 have trouble offering all the CTW courses we need, because of the bottleneck of majors who now need them.

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your program?**
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 haven't been many changes; we were lucky from the outset that we already stressed critical thinking through writing in our courses. Our initiative has not changed 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?

We haven't made changes from last year. Next year, there will be a new Undergraduate Director (& Assessment Coordinator) collecting our data.

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 data collection has always been capturing a moving target of sorts. Different faculty members participate in assessment; results can vary a great deal depending on who the assessors are. I suspect their collective judgment varies more than the general quality of student work being assessed. In any case, we have not changed our curriculum, courses, or sequence of courses as a result of assessment data collected last year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

No changes were made in the past year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

The data vary. We set an arbitrary goal of having at least 70% of students assessed (by professors) as excellent or very good. This year we fell short of this goal, but I do not think this in an indication that we need to make curricular or pedagogical changes. I am not sure what it means. It may be that faculty are evaluating students more harshly as they become comfortable with doing these evaluations; it may be that the quality of student work is declining. (Or it may be a combination of these factors.) The changes in data are similar to other variations from year to year, and cannot yet, in my view, be called meaningful. Nor do they demand any substantive action.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

My goal will be to communicate to the incoming director of undergraduate studies (and assessment) the vagaries of the assessment process. I am not sure if there is a way to make these data more meaningful. In general, I feel that they demonstrate that we are doing a pretty effective job of stressing the Social Sciences area learning outcome that "students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, and/or spatial relationships develop, persist, and/or change. We also promote the BOR learning outcomes related to "understanding . . . the U.S and its related political, social, and/or institutional developments," and "understanding . . . of political, social, economic, and/or institutional developments across the globe."

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.

We continue to offer courses that contribute to students' analytic skills in sociology. More assessment data were collected this year than in past years (rather than reporting on data collected during one semester, I report on data collected during two semesters.)

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.

Next year, a new Undergraduate Director (and Assessment Coordinator) will be in charge; my goal is conveying to her the changes both in the assessment monitoring systems that have been in effect these past several years, and an understanding of the general issues she will need to take into account.

Modifications in Intended Outcomes—If you modified any of your intended outcomes since the previous reporting cycle, please note those here.

I changed the "Goals" to reflect the newly articulated General Education Goals distributed by the people who run the assessment program. All our outcomes and measures apply to this general goal, so no changes were made to these.
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### Mission / Purpose

The Department of Sociology at Georgia State University provides graduate students with a broad exposure to the discipline of Sociology as well as in-depth study in special areas of expertise. The broad knowledge of Sociology comes through coursework in a variety of substantive areas, as well as through training in research methodologies, statistics, and theory. The goals of the Department are to provide a general intellectual foundation that supports the student's analytical understanding of social life, a sound methodological background that prepares the student for social research and policy evaluation, and a rich and specialized body of knowledge that equips the student for the practice of Sociology in both the public and private sectors.

### Goals

**G 1: Analytical Skills**  
Students are expected to master appropriate analytical skills.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills**  
Students are expected to possess appropriate critical thinking skills.

**G 3: Communication Skills**  
Students are expected to evidence appropriate written communication skills.

**G 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**  
Students are expected to appropriately use sociological concepts, theories, information, and data sources.

**G 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**  
Students are required to possess the ability to appropriately analyze pressing social problems.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 4)</th>
<th>The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Measures, Targets, and Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 1: Masters Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student's original Masters Thesis and Thesis Defense are used for assessment by the Thesis Chair. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Research Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: New Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Writing Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Concepts and Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
67% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as "Good."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Facts and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students were rated as "very good" or "excellent" on this item by the Thesis committee chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O11: Use of Data Sources</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “very good” or “excellent” on this item by the Thesis committee chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O12: Social Problems</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% of students were rated as “excellent” on this item by the Thesis committee chair. One student was rated as “Good.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O13: Global Questions</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “very good” or “excellent” on this item by the Thesis committee chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Techniques</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “excellent” on this item by the course instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O3: Research Reports</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “excellent” on this item by the course instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “very good” or “excellent” on this item by the course instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Data Analysis</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “very good” or “excellent” on this item by the course instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O6: New Research Questions</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “very good” or “excellent” on this item by the course instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O7: Written Communication</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as “very good” or “excellent” on this item by the course instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O8: Writing Conventions</th>
<th>75% of students should be rated as “very good” or “excellent.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target:</strong></td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of students were rated as “very” on this item by the course instructor. 40% of students were rated as “good.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for <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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O1: Data Collection</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O3: Research Reports</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O4: Formulating Hypotheses</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O6: New Research Questions</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O7: Written Communication</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O8: Writing Conventions</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for <strong>O11: Use of Data Sources</strong></th>
<th>75% of students rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012</strong> - <strong>Target:</strong> Met</td>
<td>77% of students were rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the course instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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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
The Department is to provide a general intellectual foundation that supports the student's analytical understanding of social life, a sound methodological background that prepares the student for social research and policy evaluation, and a rich and specialized body of knowledge that equips the student for the practice of Sociology in both the public and private sectors.

### Goals

**G 1: Analytical Skills**
Students are expected to master appropriate analytical skills.

**G 2: Critical Thinking Skills**
Students are expected to possess appropriate critical thinking skills.

**G 3: Communication Skills**
Students are expected to evidence appropriate written communication skills.

**G 4: Acquisition of Knowledge Skills**
Students are expected to appropriately use sociological concepts, theories, information, and data sources.

**G 5: Analysis of Contemporary Questions Skills**
Students are required to possess the ability to appropriately analyze pressing social problems.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

- **SLO 1: Data Collection (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
  The student should demonstrate that he/she has acquired the skills to collect data.

- **SLO 2: Analytical Techniques (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
  The student has demonstrated appropriate analytical skills.

- **SLO 3: Research Reports (G: 1) (M: 1)**
  The student is able to explain how to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

- **SLO 4: Formulating Hypotheses (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**
  The student can formulate research questions and/or formulate testable hypotheses.

- **SLO 5: Data Analysis (G: 2) (M: 1, 3)**
  The student is able to analyze and interpret data.

- **SLO 6: New Research Questions (G: 2) (M: 1)**
  The student demonstrates how to use results of analysis to formulate new research questions.

- **SLO 7: Written Communication (G: 3) (M: 1)**
  The student has developed effective written communication and editing skills.

- **SLO 8: Writing Conventions (G: 3) (M: 1)**
  The student shows appropriate writing conventions and formats.

- **SLO 9: Concepts and Theories (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)**
  The student articulates key sociological concepts and theories.

- **SLO 10: Facts and Information (G: 4) (M: 1, 2)**
  The student applies the most up-to-date facts and information about social conditions and problems.

- **SLO 11: Use of Data Sources (G: 4) (M: 1)**
  The student utilizes key data sources that provide sociological information and research findings.

- **SLO 12: Social Problems (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)**
  The student has developed the ability to identify, analyze, and suggest solutions to pressing social problems.

- **SLO 13: Global Questions (G: 5) (M: 1, 2)**
  The student analyzes contemporary multicultural, global, or international questions.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

**M 1: Doctoral Dissertation (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13)**
The student's original Doctoral Dissertation and Dissertation Defense are used for assessment by the Dissertation Chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Data Collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of students should be rated as &quot;very good&quot; or &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Target for O2: Analytical Techniques**                     |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O3: Research Reports**                          |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses**                    |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O5: Data Analysis**                             |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O6: New Research Questions**                    |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O7: Written Communication**                     |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O8: Writing Conventions**                       |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O9: Concepts and Theories**                     |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O10: Facts and Information**                    |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |

| **Target for O11: Use of Data Sources**                      |
| 75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."|
| **Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**                         |
| 100% of students were rated as "excellent" on this item, by the Dissertation Chair. |
### Target for O12: Social Problems

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target for O13: Global Questions

75% of students should be rated as "very good" or "excellent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of students were rated as &quot;excellent&quot; on this item, by the Dissertation Chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 2: Theory Component of Doctoral Exam (O: 9, 10, 12, 13)

The student’s performance on the theoretical question of the Doctoral Exam is used for assessment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O9: Concepts and Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O10: Facts and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O12: Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O13: Global Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the theoretical question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M 3: Methods Component of Doctoral Exam (O: 1, 2, 4, 5)

The student’s performance on the methodological question on the Doctoral Exam is used for assessment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O1: Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O2: Analytical Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O4: Formulating Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings 2011-2012</th>
<th>Target: Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target for O5: Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
50% of students will pass the methods question on the Doctoral Examination.

### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

56% of students passed the qualifying examination in this area, as rated by a committee of faculty.

#### 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 Component of Doctoral Exam  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Analytical Techniques  
- **Label:** Data Analysis  
- **Label:** Data Collection  
- **Label:** 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 Component of Doctoral Exam  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Concepts and Theories  
- **Label:** Facts and Information  
- **Label:** Global Questions  
- **Label:** 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

---

**Georgia State University**  
**Assessment Data by Section**  
**2011-2012 Spanish BA**  
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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
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.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met
The BA programs in MCL have a new reporter/director of undergraduate studies. During this reporting cycle the new reporter is using the resources, methods, and results given to him by his predecessor. 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 7.8, 8.7, 8.2, and 8.1. All courses but one met their targeted score in their assessment for literature.
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

**Target for O1: Research and Data Collecting Skills**

Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 1=Fails to meet standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard Target= 90% of students receiving a rating of a 2 or higher

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as follows: 4=8 3=27 2=16 1=2 96% of students met or exceeded the standard

**Target for O2: Critical Thinking Skills**

Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 1=Fails to meet standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard Target= 90% of students receiving a rating of a 2 or higher

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as follows: 4=1 3=30 2=18 1=4 92% of students met or exceeded the standard

**Target for O3: Acquisition of Knowledge**

Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 1=Fails to meet standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard Target= 90% of students receiving a rating of a 2 or higher

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as follows: 4=8 3=56 2=35 1=7 93% of students met or exceeded the standard

**Target for O4: Effective writing, communication and editing**

Students were rated on a scale of 1-4 1=Fails to meet standard 2 = Meets standard 3 = Exceeds Standard 4 = Far Exceeds Standard Target= 90% of students receiving a rating of a 2 or higher

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Students were rated as follows: 4=12 3=97 2=47 1=14 92% of students met or exceeded the standard

**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

---
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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)
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: 1)
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: 2)**

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.

**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 6: Scholarly Publication Summarization (G: 2) (M: 3)**

Students can effectively summarize scholarly publications of various kinds.

**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 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 Presentation Skills (G: 3) (M: 4)**

Students demonstrate effective verbal and nonverbal delivery skills.

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

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

**SLO 9: Writing Skills (G: 3) (M: 5)**

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: 6)**

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,
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: 7)**

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.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Intercultural Paper (O: 2)**

Students studied intercultural concepts throughout the semester. During the last half of the semester, we read an article on glocalization—the mixing of the local culture with Western influences to create a hybrid culture. Students were asked to view a foreign film and analyze it for evidence of glocalization. In order to do this, student needed to be able to exhibit an awareness of Western culture as well recognizing variations from this culture. The rubric assesses students’ ability to understand the variations between cultures as evidenced in the mass media. The rubric assess students on two things: 1) the ability to identify intercultural concepts discussed in the course in the mass media examples and 2) the ability to then apply those concepts in a meaningful way to analyze the cultural episode. Each of these categories is rated from 1 to 5 with 1 being Poor, 2 being Fair, 3 being Good, 4 being Excellent, and 5 being Superior. Please see attached rubric for additional information. The students were given a score in each of the categories and then the scores were averaged to get a score out of 5.

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

**Target for O2: Communication Variations**

Average of 4 (out of 5) for majority of the students.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Thirty student papers were assessed using the Situational/Demographic Communication Variations Rubric. Of the 30 papers assessed, 16 scored a 4 or above. Fourteen students scored below a 4.

**M 2: Intercultural Communication Competence Training Module (O: 4)**

Students in SPCH 3750 were asked to create a training module targeted toward a specific audience about a specific cultural group. The module included training sessions, a cartoon, case studies, quizzes, and handouts. Each of the student modules was assessed using the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric from the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The rubric measures 6 categories: Cultural Self-Awareness, Cultural Worldview Frameworks, Empathy, Verbal and Nonverbal Communication, Curiosity, and Openness. However, because the “Openness” category refers to actual interaction, it was excluded from this assessment because the data did not measure this category. The rubric assesses each category from 1 to 4 with 1 being the Benchmarch, 4 being the Capstone, and 2 and 3 being the Milestones. For more information, please see attached rubric. The students were given a score in each of the five categories and then the scores were averaged to get a score out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O4: Communication Competence Requirements**

Average of 3 (out of 4) by majority of students.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Using the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, 28 student projects were assessed. Seventeen students scored a 3 or higher. Eleven students scored below a 3.

**M 3: 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

2012 Results

**M 4: Persuasion Oral Presentation (O: 8)**
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

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
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
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: Medium
- Implementation Description: Meet with faculty teaching SPCH 3050 and potentially larger SPCH faculty to brainstorm measures/assignments that could give us data for this objective. Develop a plan for data retrieval.
- Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty

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

Develop Rotation for Measuring Objectives

This year, we completely revised our mission, goals, and learning objectives. So, this was our first effort at measuring our new goals and learning objectives. In this cycle, we measured 8 of the 11 objectives set forth in our new Assessment Plan. For the upcoming cycle, we need to measure the 3 objectives not measured in the cycle. Also, we need to develop a rotation for when objectives will be measured so that the 11 objectives are measured consistently over time.

- Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: The Assessment Coordinator will develop a rotation for objective measurement.
- Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator

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
- 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
- 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

Broader Data

The data for verbal and nonverbal presentation skills was collected for one class. Because our major is Speech Communication, several classes require formal presentations. Additional data should be collected from a variety of classes to determine whether the current data is reflective of a small sample size or a skill gap in our majors.

- Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
- Implementation Status: Planned
- Priority: High
- Implementation Description: Meet with SPCH 3050 and potentially larger SPCH faculty to discuss classes and assignments that will give us the necessary measures.
- Responsible Person/Group: Assessment Coordinator and Speech Faculty
**Responsible Person/Group:** Speech Area Faculty

**Rubric Adjustment**
The AACU's Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric was used to analyze student papers for message critique. The rubric should be examined to see if the general critical thinking rubric is an appropriate assessment tool for this measure or if another tool should be used. Another option is to use this tool with some minor adjustments.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Persuasion Final Paper
- **Outcome/Objective:** Message Critique

**Responsible Person/Group:** Speech Assessment Contact Person

---

**Georgia State University**
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**2011-2012 Sports Administration MS**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The Master of Science in Sports Administration degree seeks to prepare graduates with professional skills and knowledge for careers in the $800-plus billion dollar sports business industry through an exceptional program inspired by excellence, vision, scholarship, leadership, and entrepreneurship.

**Goals**

**G 2:** Students will be knowledgeable of the discipline of sport business management.

Students will gain a focused knowledge of the discipline of sports business management

**G 1:** Students will be successful professionals working in the sport business industry.

Students will be successful professionals in the sports business industry.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization. (G: 2) (M: 1, 5)

Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization, specifically the organizational processes of planning, staffing, leading, and controlling by developing an organizational manual as team project.

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 3:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing. (M: 2, 5)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing and the ability to apply this information by creating a marketing plan.

**SLO 4:** Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance (G: 1, 2) (M: 1, 5)

Students will be able to demonstrate their understanding of the core principles of budget and finance in sport by creating an investment portfolio and performing a financial analysis of a sport organization.

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 6:** Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process (M: 1, 4, 5)

Students will be able to demonstrate their understanding of the legal process and be able to identify potential legal issues related to sport business by drafting case briefs, presenting case summaries, and participating in a student-run mock trial.

**SLO 7:** Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and apply sport business concepts (M: 5)

Students will be able to demonstrate their ability to analyze and apply sport industry concepts by completing an internship with a sport organization and a comprehensive exam or by writing a thesis.
### Other Outcomes/Objectives

**O/O 2:** Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze a sport organization’s problems (M: 1, 5)

Students will demonstrate the ability to identify, research, and critically analyze a current sport organization’s problems by developing a case study with solutions.

Relevant Associations: Sport Management Program Review Council (SMPRC); North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM); Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA)

**O/O 5:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport (M: 3, 5)

Students will be able to identify the role and significance of sport in a contemporary society and the cultural issues (race, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability) by writing a research paper.

### Measures, Targets, and Findings

#### M 1: Major Projects (O: 1, 2, 4, 6)

The student will demonstrate conceptual understanding of unique aspects of sport business in major projects in courses. Projects will be evaluated with an emphasis on the accuracy of the application of course content to the project; organization of the project; discussion of the materials and information presented; use of appropriate grammar and spelling; and accuracy of research material used for the project.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization.**

Students will develop an organization manual and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

55 students met the target goal

**Target for O2: Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze a sport organization’s problems**

Students will develop a case study and provide solutions to the problems identified for the organization; students will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

56 out of 58 met the target goal

**Target for O4: Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance**

Students will create an investment portfolio and perform a financial analysis of a sport organization; students will score a 7 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

51 out of 58 students met the target

**Target for O6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process**

Students will develop legal briefs and perform at an acceptable level or higher as stated on the rubric associated with this project.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

54 out of 58 students met the stated criteria

#### M 2: Students will create a marketing plan (O: 3)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing and the ability to apply this information by creating a marketing plan.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing.**

Students will score at least 70 points on the project using a rubric established for evaluation

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

54 out of 54 met the specified target level of performance

#### M 3: Papers (O: 5)

Students will write a research paper on a contemporary issue in society related to sport. Students will discuss at least one cultural issue (race, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability) in the paper.

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

**Target for O5: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport**

Students will write a research paper on a cultural issue related to sport and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation in the program.
### Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met

68 out of 68 students met the specified target.

#### M 4: Presentations (O: 6)

Students will participate in a mock trial and will score a 70 or higher on the rubric developed for the project.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group.

**Target for O6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process**

Students will score 19 or higher on the rubric developed for evaluation of the mock trial.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

53 out of 58 students met the identified target level of performance.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

53 out of 58 students met the identified target level of performance.

#### M 5: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
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Students will complete a culminating essay comprehensive exam that covers all required course content.

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

**Target for O1: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the managerial aspects of sport organization.**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on each question completed. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 15 students scored 7 12 students scored 8 5 students scored 9 3 students scored 10.

**Target for O2: Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze a sport organization's problems**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

35 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 15 students scored 7 12 students scored 8 5 students scored 9 3 students scored 10.

**Target for O3: Students will demonstrate an understanding of sport marketing.**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

55 students completed the exam and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 13 students scored 7 10 students scored 8 19 students scored 9 13 students scored 10.

**Target for O4: Students will demonstrate their understanding of core principles of budget and finance**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

36 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 4 students scored 7 17 students scored 8 11 students scored 9 4 students scored 10.

**Target for O5: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the cultural issues associated with sport**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

51 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 11 students scored 7 4 students scored 8 15 students scored 9 21 students scored 10.

**Target for O6: Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the legal process**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

19 students completed the exam question and met the criterion of scoring 7 or higher. Results are as follows: 1 student scored 7 5 students scored 8 10 students scored 9 3 students scored 10.

**Target for O7: Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and apply sport business concepts**

The student must score 7.0 or higher on the exam to pass. A rubric is used to evaluate the exam question.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Program goals: to improve writing skills, personal accountability when working with others, application of legal knowledge

The program will address three major concerns over the next year. 1. Place more emphasis on research-supported writing. To address this concern, the program has revised the comprehensive exam rubric to specifically state the number of references required to complete each comprehensive exam question. The rubric should inform students about the level of quality needed to pass the question and thus improve the overall quality of the student responses. 2. Incorporate more accountability on individuals when doing group projects. Currently some of the projects do not have this accountability built into the assessment. The accountability for individual performance will be added to the assessment. 3. Increase emphasis on the application of legal issues rather than a focus on the conceptual knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Revision of comprehensive exams and addition of a rubric. Addition of accountability measures on group projects. A description of these will be added to the syllabi Change of content for KH 7610. Textbook will not be used. Instructor will identify appropriate legal cases to be used in delivering the class.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Comprehensive exam revisions: All Sport Administration faculty members Revision of grading for group projects: All Sport Administration faculty members who use group projects Changes to KH 7610: Dr. Brison

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?
Sport Administration is a graduate program and this question is not applicable.

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?
Sport Administration is a graduate program and this question is not applicable.

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?
Sport Administration is a graduate program and this question is not applicable.

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?
Sport Administration is a graduate program and this question is not applicable.

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 rubric has been developed for scoring the responses to comprehensive exam questions. Students now receive a copy of the rubric when the questions are distributed and faculty members use the rubric for scoring the exams. The changes were made to improve reliability when scoring the exams. We will add a specific requirement of number of resources to use when completing the exam because students are not supporting their statements with sufficient references.

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 showed that students were not using research to document their statements on comprehensive exams. There will be more emphasis on writing in classes and deliberate instruction in including references to papers submitted during program completion. An issue of group accountability was raised. To address this, instructors will add a requirement to group projects that will require students to not rely on the work of others when completing group projects. KH 7610 has discontinued the use of a textbook for the class and substituted case studies for course reading materials. This change puts more emphasis on application of knowledge rather than acquisition of knowledge.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

The major changes in the assessments used for program evaluation involved the comprehensive exam. After looking at the data, several students were barely passing the exam even though they had done well on writing assignments in their classes. The change was the development of a rubric that all faculty members used for grading the exam.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

Students seem to do well on projects and presentations used during the program. Based on assessment results, the program is delivering the content knowledge that students will need once they enter the workforce.
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The comprehensive exam and mock trial assignment will be monitored to see if there is a change in performance in next year's results. By focusing on including research to support papers submitted by students, they should be better prepared to write their comprehensive exam questions. The mock trial rubric will change to focus more on application of knowledge and to see if students are able to generalize knowledge from class as they fulfill the various roles for the mock trial.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Sports Medicine MS
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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. 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.
3. 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.
4. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**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. Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3. Enhance a research culture.
4. 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. 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.
3. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**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. Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3. Enhance a research culture.
4. Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

### O/O 4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities (G: 1, 2, 4, 5) (M: 4, 6, 7, 8)

Students will demonstrate both practical and cognitive knowledge of therapeutic modalities

**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.
3. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student promotion and progression
2. Timely graduation
3. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Standard Associations**

2. Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3. Enhance a research culture.
4. Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.

### O/O 5: Understands importance of professional development and service to the profession (G: 1, 3) (M: 1, 6)

Students will demonstrate an understanding of professional development, responsibilities, and its importance to their continued growth in their chosen field

**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.
3. Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Institutional Priority Associations**

1. Student promotion and progression
2. Timely graduation
3. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**Standard Associations**

2. Leverage our national reputation in professional degree programs for the development of societal leaders.
3. Enhance a research culture.
4. Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
5. Enhance Georgia State’s contributions to the sciences, and health and medical research and education.
### 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

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

### O/O 6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation (G: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (M: 4, 6, 7, 8)

Students demonstrate knowledge in orthopedic assessment and injury rehabilitation

### 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 27 students successfully presented 2-3 times each semester providing relevant research.

**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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All 27 students completed 4 "shadows" of various sports medicine professionals. Also, all 27 students completed 2 volunteer sports coverages in the state.

#### 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

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All 27 students are currently certified by the American Red Cross in Emergency Response, CPR, and First Aid. All 27 students are currently certified by the NATA BOC.

### M 3: Thesis or Research Project (O: 1)

Students must complete a thesis or research project prior to graduation

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O1: Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice**

Completion of satisfactory research project

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% (11) of graduating students completed acceptable research projects including IRB approval, data collection, data analysis, and a presentation of their findings.

### 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a 3.75/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Target for O3: Demonstrates effective Sports Medicine Administration**

Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a 3.75/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**

Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a 3.75/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Target for O6: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation**

Students must receive a 3/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

100% of students received a 3.75/5 or better on end of semester evaluation by clinical supervisor.

### 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

**Target for O1: Understanding and utilizing Evidenced Based Practice as related to athletic training practice**

All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

90% of students received an 80% or better on case study assignment on the first try. The last 10% of students received an 80% or better on case study assignment on the second try, for a total completion rate of 100%.

**Target for O4: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities**

All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

90% of students received an 80% or better on case study assignment on the first try. The last 10% of students received an 80% or better on case study assignment on the second try, for a total completion rate of 100%.

**Target for O5: Understands importance of professional development and service to the profession**

All students must complete a case study every semester and present it to peers.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of students completed a case study and presented it to their peers. Three students presented their research at a Regional Athletic Training Conference. Two students presented their research at a National Athletic Training Conference.

Target for **O6**: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation
All students must complete a case study every semester and re-work it until a 80% or higher is achieved.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
90% of students received an 80% or better on case study assignment on the first try. The last 10% of students received an 80% or better on case study assignment on the second try, for a total completion rate of 100%.

**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

Target for **O2**: Is proficient in acute Injury and Illness Care
Students must receive a B for their final grade.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
80% (12 out of 15) of students received a B or better on their final grade. 20% (3 out of 15) students received a B- as their final grade.

Target for **O4**: Understands and applies therapeutic Modalities
Students must receive a B or better for their final grade.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This course was not offered.

Target for **O6**: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation
Students must receive a B or better for their final grade.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
82% (9 out of 11) of students received a B or better for their final grade. 18% (2 out of 11) students received a B- for their final grade.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students passed the sports medicine portion of the comprehensive exam with a 3.5 or better on two injury based case studies.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students passed the sports medicine portion of the comprehensive exam with a 3.5 or better on two injury based case studies.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students passed the sports medicine portion of the comprehensive exam with a 3.5 or better on two injury based case studies.

**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
More hands on-experience
Students will have a greater opportunity than previously to practice with and demonstrate proficiency with a wider variety of rehabilitation tools.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Proficiency Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation

Implementation Description: Designated time during class for hands-on experience.
Projected Completion Date: 12/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Cheryl Appleberry
Additional Resources: None, due to receiving research funds from the dean.

Updated material and added clinical experience
Due to the advances in evaluation techniques a new textbook will be introduced. Furthermore, more information was gleaned from two practicing experts at a national convention and will be included into the material presented.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Proficiency Exam | Outcome/Objective: Knows orthopedic Assessment and injury rehabilitation

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Cheryl Appleberry
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 changes we made include changing 2 of our outcome measures of a final exam grade of B or better to a final course grade of B better. This change was made in order to better track learning over time rather than on just one day. In the upcoming year, the final proficiency exam will be removed. This will occur because of the large demands required for completion of the research project.

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.

Due to 80-82% of students receiving a B or better in our Evaluation and Rehabilitation classes improvements to each class have been proposed. The Evaluation class will have new techniques and new textbook introduced. The Rehabilitation class will have a wider variety of hands-on experiences with the addition of new rehabilitation tools available for practice.

Annual Report Section Responses

Most Important Accomplishments for Year—Briefly describe the major things you accomplished over the past year. Be sure to note previous Action Plans that were executed this year, plus any accomplishments that are not otherwise mentioned in your outcomes reporting.
We have maintained our 100% placement rate following graduation. Three students have earned professional sports team positions. A course change was proposed and accepted to offer KH 7820 instead of EPRS 7900 in order to better align the students' research goals with applicable research methods. A course change was proposed and accepted to offer only one biomechanics class in order to better align the students' clinical and research needs.

Challenges for Next Year—Briefly describe any special challenges (related to budget, personnel, increased standards, new projects, new expectations, etc.) that you will be facing during the next reporting cycle that might affect your department's outcomes.
Removal of clinical faculty with 15 years of experience and hiring a new tenure track faculty member for the 2013-2014 academic year.

Additional Resources:
Responsible Person/Group:
Projected Completion Date:
Implementation Description:
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Priority:
Established in Cycle:

Cost Reductions:

Program Improvement:

Outcome Improvement:

Other:

Summary:

Milestones:

Outcomes:

Outcomes Reporting:

Enrollments:

Injuries:

Injuries Reporting:

Practicums:

Practicums Reporting:

Student Acquisitions:

Student Acquisitions Reporting:

Student Funding:

Student Funding Reporting:

Student Recruitment:

Student Recruitment Reporting:

Student Retention:

Student Retention Reporting:

Student Satisfaction:

Student Satisfaction Reporting:

Transfers:

Transfers Reporting:

Transfer Rates:

Transfer Rates Reporting:

Tuition:

Tuition Reporting:

Wages:

Wages Reporting:

Workforce Development:

Workforce Development Reporting:

Workforce Retention:

Workforce Retention Reporting:

Workforce Satisfaction:

Workforce Satisfaction Reporting:

Workforce Transfers:

Workforce Transfers Reporting:

Workforce Turnover:

Workforce Turnover Reporting:

Employment:

Employment Reporting:

Employment Rates:

Employment Rates Reporting:

Employee Compensation:

Employee Compensation Reporting:

Employee Health:

Employee Health Reporting:

Employee Retention:

Employee Retention Reporting:

Employee Satisfaction:

Employee Satisfaction Reporting:

Employee Transfers:

Employee Transfers Reporting:

Employee Turnover:

Employee Turnover Reporting:

Employee Absence:

Employee Absence Reporting:

Workforce:

Workforce Reporting:

Workforce Absence:

Workforce Absence Reporting:

Workforce Health:

Workforce Health Reporting:

Workforce Retention:

Workforce Retention Reporting:

Workforce Satisfaction:

Workforce Satisfaction Reporting:

Workforce Transfers:

Workforce Transfers Reporting:

Workforce Turnover:

Workforce Turnover Reporting:

Leadership:

Leadership Reporting:

Leadership Rates:

Leadership Rates Reporting:

Leadership Compensation:

Leadership Compensation Reporting:

Leadership Health:

Leadership Health Reporting:

Leadership Retention:

Leadership Retention Reporting:

Leadership Satisfaction:

Leadership Satisfaction Reporting:

Leadership Transfers:

Leadership Transfers Reporting:

Leadership Turnover:

Leadership Turnover Reporting:
year. We will still be limited in expansion with only two faculty members. During the upcoming year students’ research interests will still be limited due to the presence of only one research faculty. To increase access to cadaver lab experience for the graduate anatomy course.

**Publications and Presentations**—Note in this section any articles published or presentations made at professional conferences by staff.

One article was published by Shelley W. Linens. One presentation was made by Shelley W. Linens at National Athletic Trainers’ Association Annual Meeting and Clinical Symposia.

**Academic Teaching Activities**—If the staff participated in teaching (or assisted in the teaching of) academic courses as part of their responsibilities to the department, please note that here.

Shelley W. Linens taught 3 courses (KH 8820, KH 8900, KH 7530) Cheryl Appleberry taught 3 courses (KH 7680, KH 7580, KH 8300)

**International Activities**—Note here any international activities of the department or its staff.

One faculty member, Shelley W. Linens, submitted an abstract for presentation at the 4th Annual International Ankle Symposium.

**Service to the External Community**—Note here any initiatives or activities of your department that impact the external community (e.g., providing assistance to needy populations).

100% of students volunteered at least twice, serving as part of the sports medicine team for events such as football games for Atlanta Public Schools, the Georgia Games and the Peachtree Road Race.

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Sports Science PhD**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST*

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

Recognizing that physical activity is vital for all people, the Department of Kinesiology and Health at Georgia State University seeks to: 1. Discover new knowledge and advance the understanding of the role of physical activity in attaining optimal health and well-being, 2. Educate members of society and prepare future professionals, and 3. Promote healthy lifestyles through life-long activity and learning. The Ph.D. major in Kinesiology is designed to prepare students for research and teaching careers at colleges and universities and for health, physiological performance, rehabilitative science, and related fields. Three concentration areas, Biomechanics 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, biomechanics, and exercise psychology 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**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1: Physiology and biomechanics fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will successfully complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All eligible students (n=2) passed their comprehensive exams. All graduating students (n=1) in fall 2011 or spring 2012 received professorships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 2: Research presentations (O: 1, 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must present papers at professional conferences before they are allowed to sit for comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O1: Prepare for careers as professors and researchers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% of eligible students met this requirement (one student did not meet this requirement because he was on medical leave). All of the other students conducted research but did not present their findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3: Research and statistical design (O: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students must successfully pass courses and projects that include statistical and research design and methods components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O2: Understanding of research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of the students will complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of enrolled students met this goal (one student did not meet the goal because he was on medical leave).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4: Cognate (O: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of the cognate portion of their doctoral program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O3: Specialization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students that successfully complete the program will develop skills in areas of specialization within their respective fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% of students have successfully completed their cognate. The remaining 29% of students are on track to complete their cognate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5: Seminar and professional development (O: 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of seminars and dissertation grant proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O4: Grant writing and management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% of students will meet this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% of the eligible students have completed seminars addressing grant writing/management and/or have written grant proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 6: Cultural and individual sensitivity (O: 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and individual sensitivity will be emphasized in coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target for O5: Cultural sensitivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of students will complete this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All doctoral students are exposed to multicultural perspectives in their coursework, class projects, and/or research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

**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

**PETE concentration**
Meeting to discuss the management of the outcome assessments for the new Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) concentration in Kinesiology.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **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?

Although not reflected in the assessment or action plan, the College of Education’s change core and course requirements in Doctoral programs will allow enhanced matriculation through the program with fewer course requirements and greater emphasis on research experience. The department changed its program of study course requirements (change in college core and reduced total number of credit hours) and added a concentration in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) to the existing concentrations of Exercise Physiology, Biomechanics and Physical Rehabilitation, and Exercise Psychology within the Kinesiology program. This change in the college requirement is in line with our department’s philosophy of greater emphasis on research experiences of doctoral students throughout their entire program and not just limited to their dissection project. The program continues to meet our goals related to professional placement of our graduates and comprehensive exam pass rates. In addition, our matriculation rate continues to improve with our latest students taking 4-4.3 years to complete their degrees. We will maintain our policies and procedures related to annual review of doctoral students, which addresses nearly all aspects of the assessment plan. In addition, this meeting serves as the main discussion venue for questions and discussion related to Learning Outcomes Assessment for the Kinesiology 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.
Review of the data indicates that although all students are participating in research related activities on an annual basis, a small percentage of the students are not always presenting their research findings at local, national, or international professional meetings every year. Faculty will meet to discuss this finding and explore whether budgetary restrictions contribute to this observation.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Taxation MTX
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 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.**
Students will demonstrate the ability to correctly and effectively document and cite research conclusions in writing and in oral presentations.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Identifying Tax Issues (O: 1)**
Students complete self-tests on an electronic self-assessment website developed by Georgia State University. The assessments consist of four self-tests related to questions of fact and law and identifying issues in various areas of tax law. Assessment takes place in TX 8030. Target Average score of 70 on questions of Identifying Issues.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
Fall 2011: 69.52 Spring 2012: 76.53

**M 2: Locating Tax Authority (O: 1)**
Students are given a take-home exam in Tx 8030 which requires them under time pressure to perform independent tax research focused on locating the correct authority to support their answers.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O1: To develop ability to conduct tax research**
The target is a score of 85% on the final research exam in Tx 8030.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Fall 2011: 86.05 on Final Research Exam Spring 2012: 88.17 on Final Research Exam
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. Target Average score of 70 on Evaluating Authority self-tests.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Met

Fall 2011: 83.11 Spring 2012: 79.90

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%.

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%.

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

Tx 8120

Since there is insufficient time to cover all current topics, consider eliminating the corporate tax return project or providing it as an additional exercise for students desiring the compliance experience.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Projected Completion Date: 08/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Course Instructor.
Additional Resources: None.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

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: Finished
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 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: Finished
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: 07/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Tx 8030 Professor

Issue ID Score Improvement

In Summer and Fall 2011, the students' did not meet the targeted score on the Identifying Issues assessments. As a result, we will incorporate more in-class practice exercises into the curriculum. The students will be given more issue identification homework assignments which will be reviewed in class with the students working in small groups. This additional practice of this skill should help
raise their assessment scores going forward.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Identifying Tax Issues | Outcome/Objective: To develop ability to conduct tax research

Implementation Description: Add Issue ID practice problems to curriculum with in-class discussion
Projected Completion Date: 01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Lucia Smeal

Tx 8120
College registration system does not prevent MTx students from taking courses out of sequence. Hence, when pre-req's are not taken class averages suffer. We hope to have implemented in the next year registration blocks on all courses with pre-req's.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Registration programing.
Responsible Person/Group: College of Business

---

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree program is to prepare researchers, scholars, and teacher educators in the fields of language and literacy to work in diverse national and international academic settings, with a special focus on urban education. As part of this degree, graduates engage fully and deeply in the language and literacy research and scholarship, theory and practice. Graduates of this program understand the Ph.D. as a lifelong engagement with research, scholarship, teaching and service in language and literacy.

Goals
G 1: G-1 have expert knowledge of language and literacy education theory and research.
Candidates have expert knowledge of language and literacy education theory and research.

G 2: G-2 have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of language and literacy.
Candidates have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of language and literacy.

G 3: G-3 are active contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels
Candidates are active participants and contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels in language and literacy education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and theories of language, reading, and writing research, as well as methodologies specific to language and literacy education research.

Institutional Priority Associations
2. Student promotion and progression

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (G: 2) (M: 2)
Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars in language and literacy education.

Strategic Plan Associations
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

SLO 3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement (M: 3)
Candidates participate in and contribute to professional organizations in language and literacy education through the publication of manuscripts, presentations at conferences, leadership roles, review of manuscripts and proposals for publications, presentations, and grants.
SLO 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology (M: 4)
Candidates access, develop, and promote the use of technology in their research, teaching, and service contributions to the field of language and literacy education.

M 1: Research Knowledge (O: 1)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 1 and 2 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All students of students have met this target.

M 2: Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (O: 2)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 3 and 4 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All students have met this target.

M 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 3)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 5 and 6 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All students have met this target.

M 4: Engagement with Technology (O: 4)
Candidates are assessed using a language and literacy education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standard 7 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target for O4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
All students have met this target.
Increased International Visibility
Students will begin to work within and/or with international projects and educational spaces.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Engagement with Technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology
- Measure (Key Assessment): Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

Increased Number of Full Time Students
Our program intends to admit students interested in full time study.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Service and Engagement | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement

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 admitted four full-time students into our program. We also recruited international students, one of whom was awarded a Dean's fellowship.

**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 prepared to go on international and national searches. This demands a high degree of critical thinking that is expected across each course in the program. Students are prepared to discuss and extend solutions for literacy issues.

**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 the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** How will you use your findings from this year? 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 Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree program is to prepare researchers, scholars, and teacher educators in the field of mathematics education to work in diverse national and international academic settings, with a special focus on urban education. As part of this degree, graduates engage fully and deeply in the mathematics education research and scholarship, theory and practice. Graduates of this program understand the Ph.D. as a lifelong engagement with research, scholarship, teaching and service in mathematics education.

**Goals**

**G 1: Possess expert knowledge of mathematics education theory and research**
Candidates have expert knowledge of language and literacy education theory and research

**G 2: Possess expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of mathematics education**
G-2 have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of language and literacy.

**G 3: Are active contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels**
Candidates are active participants and contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels in mathematics education.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (M: 1)**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and theories of language, reading, and writing research, as well as methodologies specific to mathematics education research.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (M: 2)**
Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars in mathematics education.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement (M: 3)**
Candidates participate in and contribute to professional organizations in mathematics education through the publication of manuscripts, presentations at conferences, leadership roles, review of manuscripts and proposals for publications, presentations, and grants.

**SLO 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology (M: 4)**
Candidates access, develop, and promote the use of technology in their research, teaching, and service contributions to the field of mathematics education.

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Knowledge (O: 1)**
Candidates are assessed using a mathematic education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 2 and 3 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a level of exceptional knowledge (High Pass).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers demonstrated advanced level of knowledge (Pass), and 40% + demonstrated a level of exception knowledge (High Pass).

**M 2: Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (O: 2)**
Candidates are assessed using a mathematics education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a level of exceptional knowledge (High Pass).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100 % of program completers demonstrated advanced level of knowledge (Pass), and 40% + demonstrated a level of exception knowledge (High Pass).

M 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 3)
Candidates are assessed using a mathematics education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 2, 4, and 5 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement

100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a level of exceptional knowledge (High Pass).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100 % of program completers demonstrated advanced level of knowledge (Pass), and 40% + demonstrated a level of exception knowledge (High Pass).

M 4: Engagement with Technology (O: 4)
Candidates are assessed using a mathematics education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standard 9 from the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target for O4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology

100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of knowledge (Pass) needed to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 20% will demonstrate a level of exceptional knowledge (High Pass).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met
100 % of program completers demonstrated advanced level of knowledge (Pass), and 40% + demonstrated a level of exception knowledge (High Pass).

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

Continue monitoring degree program
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

Responsible Person/Group: All tenured and tenure track mathematics education faculty
Additional Resources: None

Continue monitoring degree program
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Research Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Research Knowledge

Responsible Person/Group: All tenured and tenure track mathematics education faculty
Additional Resources: None

Continue monitoring degree program
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Professional Service and Engagement | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement

Responsible Person/Group: All tenured and tenure track mathematics education faculty
Additional Resources: None
Continue monitoring degree program
Given that all completers Met/Exceeded Target there are no specific actions plans except to continue to monitor the degree program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure (Key Assessment) | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure (Key Assessment): Engagement with Technology | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology

Responsible Person/Group: All tenured and tenure track mathematics education 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?
All completers met or exceeded target; no changes were made to degree 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.
All completers met or exceeded target; no changes were made to degree program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
How will you use your findings from this year? 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
This post-master's degree emphasizes development of research skills and high levels of practice in the teaching and learning of music, particularly in school settings. Applicants must demonstrate strong potential for conducting successful research and a record of exemplary teaching. Students pursue studies in research methodology, music education, and a cognate area consistent with background and interests. This program is intended for those who wish to teach in colleges and universities or to work in the education programs of cultural and arts organizations.
### Goals

**G 1: MusEd Goal #1 (Ph.D.)**
1. Our graduates will be informed teachers who know the content in music needed for teaching students in P-12 schools.

**G 2: MusEd Goal #2 (Ph.D.)**
2. Our graduates will be informed teachers who know the content in music teacher education needed for teaching undergraduate students in teacher preparation programs.

**G 3: MusEd Goal #3 (Ph.D.)**
3. Our graduates will be informed researchers who know how to identify research problems, pose appropriate research questions, employ methodologies sufficient to answer the questions, and draw meaningful implications for music teaching and learning.

**G 4: MusEd Goal #4 (Ph.D.)**
4. Our graduates will be informed theorists and philosophers who are able to articulate current theories and philosophies related to music education pedagogy both in the United States and worldwide.

### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

**SLO 1: MusEd Objective #1 (Ph.D.) (M: 1)**
(1.) Our graduates will be able to teach P-12 students while demonstrating mastery-level musicianship skills, research-supported pedagogical techniques, and appropriate assessment practices.

**SLO 2: MusEd Objective #2 (Ph.D.) (M: 2)**
(2.) Our graduates will be able to teach undergraduate students, develop coherent syllabi, evaluate student work, provide model lessons, and institute appropriate assessment practices.

**SLO 3: MusEd Objective #3 (Ph.D.) (M: 3)**
(3.) Our graduates will be able to conduct rigorous research projects that hold the potential for meaningful impact on either P-12 music education or undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

**SLO 4: MusEd Objective #4 (Ph.D.) (M: 4)**
(4.) Our graduates will be able to demonstrate the application of theory and philosophy to the decisions made during pedagogy and assessment.

### Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings

**M 1: MusEd Assessment Measure #1 (Ph.D.) (O: 1)**
Assessment Measure: Ph.D. students will teach P-12 students on many occasions during their program of study at Georgia State University. They will do so either in their own teaching positions, or through the school-university collaborations facilitated by our Center for Educational Partnerships. Rubric: "MusEd - Clinical Practice (Ph.D.)." Minimum Score: 3 of 4.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: MusEd Objective #1 (Ph.D.)**
3 of 4 points.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Two students completed internships in 2011-12. Both scored 4.0 of 4.0.

**M 2: MusEd Assessment Measure #2 (Ph.D.) (O: 2)**
Assessment Measure: Ph.D. students will teach an undergraduate course at least once during their program of study at Georgia State University. Rubric: "MusEd - Undergraduate Teaching (Ph.D.)." Minimum Score: 3 of 4.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O2: MusEd Objective #2 (Ph.D.)**
3 of 4 points.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Three students taught undergraduate courses during 2011-12. The average rubric score was 3.8 of 4.0.

**M 3: MusEd Assessment Measure #3 (Ph.D.) (O: 3)**
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O3: MusEd Objective #3 (Ph.D.)**
Rating of "Pass" by consensus vote of committee.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
No student presented their thesis or dissertation before a committee during 2011-12.

**M 4: MusEd Assessment Measure #4 (Ph.D.) (O: 4)**

Assessment Measure: Ph.D. students will teach an undergraduate course at least once during their program of study at Georgia State University. They will assess their teaching and student learning throughout the course and will recommend final course grades to the faculty supervisor. Rubric: "MusEd - Effect on Student Learning (Ph.D.).” Minimum Score: 3 of 4.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O4: MusEd Objective #4 (Ph.D.)**

3 of 4 points

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Three students taught undergraduate courses in 2011-12. On this measure, students scored an average of 3.3 of 4.

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

**Faculty oversight**

2011-12 was the first year in which Ph.D. students taught undergraduate courses. The instructors (Ph.D. students) requested that the schedule be configured so that they team teach similar content. We are accomplishing this in two ways: Spring 2013: The two courses (MUS 3310 and MUS 3350) will meet consecutively on Monday nights, and undergraduate students will be required to enroll in both. Fall 2013: We have submitted a curriculum change to fold the content of MUS 3350 into the content of MUS 3310, creating a single course that will be team-taught by two Ph.D. students.

**Established in Cycle: 2011-2012**

**Implementation Status: Planned**

**Priority: High**

**Implementation Description: Curriculum change as identified above.**

**Projected Completion Date: 08/2013**

**Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Freer, Coordinator of Music Education**

**Redefinition of Comprehensive Examinations**

Our comprehensive examination process has been revised for an initial administration of November 2012. The wording below is contained in our new handbook for Ph.D. students in music education (for Ph.D.): "Each Ph.D. student will engage in the comprehensive examination during the final semester of course work as determined by the faculty academic advisor. The comprehensive examination occurs over a period of at least three weeks. The first two weeks involve written projects, and the final week includes the oral portion of the exam. All parts of the exam are to be completed at least one month (30 days) before the final day of classes for that semester. This will allow time for the completion of any additional work requested by the Doctoral Advisory Committee. Detailed information about the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) requirements in Georgia State University's College of Education can be found in the current edition of the university Graduate Catalog. The relevant section is Section 4320. This section includes information about the Comprehensive Examination, assembling the appropriate faculty committee, and registering for courses after successful completion of the Comprehensive Examination. The catalog is online, and can be accessed through: http://www.gsu.edu/enrollment/catalogs.html Scheduling. The first step is to schedule the date for the oral comprehensive examination (see Week Three below). This must be done in consultation with the faculty academic advisor.**

**Week One: Written Project (Research Methodology, Analysis & Interpretation) 2500 minimum words (approximately 8 pages) in strict accordance with the current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The above minimum word count does not include the required title page and references. The paper topic will be assigned by Friday at noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Two: Written Project (Music Education Pedagogy and Research) 2500 minimum words (approximately 8 pages) in strict accordance with the current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The above minimum word count does not include the required title page and references. The paper topic will be assigned by Friday at noon and due via email by Monday at 11:59 PM. Week Three: Oral Examination Duration: 90 minutes Part One: Prepared Responses o The Ph.D. student will be assigned to answer four questions, one related to each of the four semesters of MUS 8960 (Proseminar in Music Education). The student will be assigned to speak to each question for ten minutes each (40 minutes total). For each question, the student may prepare a single side of a 3x5 index card (4 cards total) for reference during the presentation. o The four questions will be presented to the Ph.D. student seven days prior to the scheduled oral examination. - Part Two: Identification o The Ph.D. student will be asked to identify 25 items discussed in MUS 8960. These may include terms, people, movements, publications, philosophies, studies, and all manner of related topics within music education. Following successful completion of the Comprehensive Examination, Ph.D. students are required to form their Dissertation Advisory Committee. Instructions can be found online at the website of the College’s Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions (see “Graduate Forms” and scroll down to “Dissertation Advisory Committee”).**

**Established in Cycle: 2011-2012**

**Implementation Status: In-Progress**

**Priority: High**

**Implementation Description: Implementation will be in the Fall 2012 semester.**

**Projected Completion Date: 11/2012**

**Responsible Person/Group: Patrick Freer, Coordinator of Music Education**

**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 CTW courses are not housed within the music 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?**

The CTW courses are not housed within the music education program.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the
The CTW courses are not housed within the music education 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?

There is no change in the assessment process prior to the final comprehensive examination. The revisions to the comprehensive examination are detailed in the previous section of this report ("Action Plan").

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?

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 described earlier, we have opted to include team-teaching in our new requirement for undergraduate teaching. This will require a series of curriculum and scheduling changes that will begin in Spring 2013 and become final in Fall 2013.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

We do not have assessment data from 2010-11 and cannot answer this question.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?

As previously addressed, we have instituted several curriculum changes and revised the final comprehensive examination process. In addition, we compiled all policies and advising documents into a new departmental "Ph.D. Handbook in Music Education." The handbook is available both in hard copy and on our website. We did not find any problems with our assessment findings for 2011-12, but we did note that students were occasionally confused about where to find information. We hope we have addressed that issue.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Beginning in Spring 2013 we will have aligned the two undergraduate courses that our Ph.D. students instruct. We hope to see improvements in the student overall ratings (Question 17) as a result of this change. We also hope to see improvements in the teaching self-efficacy of the Ph.D. students as they begin team-teaching. We will measure this, initially, through informal conversations. We hope to see improvements, specifically, in the assessment titled "Effect on Student Learning."

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Teaching & Learning PhD--Science Education**

As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST

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

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning with emphasis in Science Education is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced expertise in research and scholarship of teaching and learning in science education to work in diverse national and international academic settings.

**Goals**

**G 1: have expert knowledge of science education theory and research.**
Candidates have expert knowledge of science education theory and research

**G 2: have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of science education**
Candidates have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of science education.

**G 3: are active contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels**
Candidates are active participants and contributors to professional organizations at local, national, and international levels in science education.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge of Science Education (M: 1)**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of historical perspectives and prominent theories of science education research, as well as methodologies specific to science education research.

**Institutional Priority Associations**
2 Student promotion and progression

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Science Teacher Education (M: 2)**
Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars in science education.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement in Science Education (M: 3)**
Candidates participate in and contribute to professional organizations in science education through the publication of manuscripts, presentations at conferences, leadership roles, review of manuscripts and proposals for publications, presentations, and grants.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology in Science Education (M: 4)**
Candidates access, develop, and promote the use of technology in their research, teaching, and service contributions to the field of science education.

**Strategic Plan Associations**
2.3 Other efforts in support of Goal 2 (Graduate and Professional Programs).
3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Research Knowledge (O: 1)**
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 1 and 2 from the rubric.

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

**Target for O1: Demonstrates Research Knowledge of Science Education**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students of students have met this target.

**M 2: Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (O: 2)**
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 3 and 4 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Science Teacher Education**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students of students have met this target.

**M 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 3)**
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standards 5 and 6 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement in Science Education**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
All students of students have met this target.

**M 4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology (O: 4)**
Candidates are assessed using a science education unit-wide rubric. A rating will be determined using Standard 7 from the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O4: Demonstrates Engagement with Technology in Science Education**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill (Score 3) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher)

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

All students of students have met this target.

---

**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 admitted one more full-time international students into our 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?**
Students are prepared to go on international and national searches. This demands a high degree of critical thinking that is expected across each course in the program. Students are prepared to discuss and extend solutions for science education issues.

**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 the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department’s effectiveness?
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
How will you use your findings from this year? 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**

**2011-2012 Teaching & Learning PhD--Social Studies Education**
*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST*

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

**Mission / Purpose**
The mission of the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree program is to prepare researchers, scholars, and teacher educators in the
fields of social studies education to work in diverse national and international academic settings. As part of this degree, graduates engage fully and deeply in social studies education research and scholarship, theory and practice. Graduates of this program understand the Ph.D. as a lifelong engagement with research, scholarship, teaching and service in social studies education.

**Goals**

**G 2: Competent Researchers in Social Studies Education**
G-1: have expert knowledge of social studies education theory and research.

**G 1: Knowledge and skills of teacher educators and scholars**
G-2 have expert knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be teacher educators and scholars of social studies education.

**G 3: Contributors to professional organizations**
G-3 are active contributors to professional organizations at international, national, and local levels.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education (G: 1) (M: 1, 3)**
Candidates create and implement research- and evidence-based pedagogies for teaching future teachers, working teachers, and future leaders and scholars in social studies education.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates Research Knowledge (G: 2) (M: 1, 2)**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of histories and methodologies of social studies education research.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

3.1 Enhance a research culture.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement (G: 3) (M: 3)**
Candidates participate in and contribute to professional organizations in language and literacy education through the publication of manuscripts, presentations at conferences, leadership roles, review of manuscripts and proposals for publications, presentations, and grants.

**Measures (Key Assessments), Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam (O: 1, 2)**
The comprehensive exam is comprised of four questions. It is given by the professors on the students' committee. Assessment is qualitative and feedback is given by each of the professors. Results are Pass or Fail.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target for O1: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

75% of program completers will pass the comprehensive examination on their first try. 90% will pass the examination within no more than two attempts.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers passed the comprehensive examination on their first try. Target met.

Target for O2: Demonstrates Research Knowledge

75% of program completers will pass the examinations on their first attempt. 90% will pass within no more than two tries. An advanced level of knowledge (Pass) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 20% will demonstrate an exceptional level of knowledge (High Pass).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of program completers passed the examinations on their first attempt. Target met.

**M 2: Doctoral Dissertation and Defense (O: 2)**
The measure for Research Knowledge is the doctoral dissertation and defense. Evaluation of students' work is qualitative. Professors respond to the dissertation project and provide feedback. Results are measured by Pass or Fail.

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

Target for O2: Demonstrates Research Knowledge

100% of program completers will demonstrate an advanced level of research knowledge by achieving a pass on the dissertation defense from all faculty members on the dissertation committee. 20% will demonstrate an exceptional level of knowledge (high pass) by achieving a high pass from all faculty members on the doctoral dissertation committee.

**M 3: Professional Service and Engagement (O: 1, 3)**
Candidates are assessed by their attendance and presentation at professional organizations and conferences, as well as residency plans.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
**Target for O1: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education**

Candidates are assessed using a written dissertation and oral defense. 100% of program completers will demonstrate a advanced level of knowledge (Pass) need to achieve this standard through independent and collaborative research projects in courses and internships and 20% will demonstrate an exceptional level of knowledge (High Pass).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target met. 100% of program completers demonstrated an advanced level of knowledge.

---

**Target for O3: Demonstrates Professional Service and Engagement**

100% of candidates will demonstrate attendance and presentations at professional organizations (pass) and 20% will demonstrate exceptional presentation and professional service skills.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Target met. 100% of candidates demonstrated attendance at professional organizations and 20% demonstrated exceptional presentation and professional service skills.

---

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

**Continue monitoring the degree program**

Given that all completers met/exceeded the target, there are no specific action plans except to monitor the degree program.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

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

- **Measure (Key Assessment):** Comprehensive Exam
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills for Teacher Education

---

**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?

All program completers met or exceeded the target. No changes were made to the degree 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.

All program completers met or exceeded the target. No changes were made to the degree program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**

Explain how your department used the results from the previous cycle’s (2010-2011) assessment. What actions did you take this past year based on the results from the previous cycle? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**

What have you learned from your assessment findings this year (2011-2012)? What do they reveal about your department's effectiveness?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**

How will you use your findings from this year? What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
**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, NAECY, 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, NAECY, 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a 3.96 mean score on a 4.0 scale. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on any element of the assessment were required to redo that element of the unit to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See attached detailed aggregated data).

**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: Field Experience Observation Assessment.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.57 on a 4.0 scale. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on any element of the assessment were required to redo that element of the unit to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See attached detailed aggregated data).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.87 on a 4.0 scale. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on any element of the assessment were required to redo that element of the unit to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See attached detailed aggregated data).

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
100% of UACM Master's candidates met expectations for this assessment with a mean score of 3.68 on a 4.0 scale. Although all candidates overall score met expectations, candidates that fell below satisfactory on any element of the assessment were required to redo that element of the unit to meet a minimum score of satisfactory. We will continue to monitor and maintain candidates' ability to meet the standards assessed by this assessment. (See attached detailed aggregated data).
Start Fall Mentorship Earlier

We plan to start the mentorship experience the first week students (PreK-5) are in school. This will help our 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. As currently implemented, when the orientation is done on the first day of school, 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 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)

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 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
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 a 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: Finished
Priority: Medium

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: Finished
Priority: High

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: Finished
Priority: High

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: Finished
Priority: High

ECE 6415 and ECE 6416 Course Change
The UACM Faculty have decided to change the name and some of the focus of ECE 6415 and ECE 6416 to Curriculum and
Field-Based Approach
From analyzing our program data and student feedback, we believe that the UACM Master’s Program would be more effective if there was a tighter theory to practice focus. We are currently in the planning stages for how this might be implemented. We will start with faculty planning meeting to continue to analyze program data, student feedback, and research literature to determine the approach.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Faculty Rating 1 - Committed to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Shows commitment to student learning & development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 2 - Expertise for Learning & Develop | Outcome/Objective: Applies expertise for learning and development
- Measure: Faculty Rating 3 - Manage & monitor student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
- 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: 08/2012
Responsible Person/Group: UACM Program Director
Additional Resources: None

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 the last assessment report, the following changes have been made: LiveText Assessment System now is being used for all assessment data collection and analysis. Rubrics have been refined to be more sensitive to student learning. This will allow for more detailed and reliable data with which to analyze the program effectiveness. For the upcoming academic year, key assessments may need to be aligned with the goal of a closer link between theory and practice as we look to develop a field-based program (See Action Plan).

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 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 candidates’ 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 apply their teaching knowledge into practice. Specifically candidates scored lower on the following elements: a.) Utilizes students’ identified needs to create developmentally appropriate lessons and to increase student achievement; b.) Develops and uses a variety of strategies to accommodate individual student needs; c.) Uses effective management strategies to engage and motivate students in purposeful learning activities; d.) Provides opportunities for successful collaborative and independent learning; and e.) Uses varied assessment techniques to identify students’ strengths, needs, and learning processes. This has led the UACM faculty to conclude that there is still a need to restructure parts of the program in order to scaffold candidates’ ability to apply theory to practice. The overall structure of the UACM was developed to address this issue. Specifically, the UACM MEd program's approach to teacher certification and graduate school involves an accelerated certification process in the first year of the program, followed by candidates continuing their graduate studies into their first year as teacher of record so that they can be guided in the application of theory to practice. Program faculty have made improvement to the structure of the program in bridging the gap between theory and practice, including: a.) university mentors increasing observation time to the entire day for the first visit to help induct our new Master’s candidates into the teaching profession; b.) faculty examining and testing different approaches to ECE 6415/ECE 6416 Curriculum and Assessment courses. Although these changes did improve our outcomes, the faculty feels that there is still room to make the Master’s program a more powerful experience for our candidates. As such, we are currently in the planning stages for how this might be implemented. We will start with monthly faculty planning meeting to continue to analyze program data, candidate feedback, and research literature to determine the best approach supporting candidates’ growth in their ability to be effective teachers. We had our first meeting in June 2012. At this meeting we decided to start the mentorship process earlier in the candidates first year as teacher of record. As a result, we have scheduled and implemented (July 2012) a mentorship orientation for candidates moving into the
second year of the program. This will allow university field mentors to start visits earlier in the school year, which should help candidates get off to a successful start.

Georgia State University
Assessment Data by Section
2011-2012 Urban Teacher Leadership MEd
As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The M.Ed. Urban Teacher leadership program prepares practicing educators for an initial certification as a teacher leader and a coaching endorsement. The program is based on current research in teacher education and education leadership and supports data-based planning, exemplary teaching and supervision in areas of concentration, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in education.

Goals
G 1: M.Ed Urban Teacher Leader Program
The goal of the M.Ed Urban Teacher Leader program is to prepare teacher leaders (a) who exhibit exemplary practice in a content concentration area, (b) who are effective mentors of colleagues across the P-12 levels, and (c) who are advocates of excellence in urban education.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Objective 1 (M: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
A teacher leader completing our program will facilitate the design and implementation of sustained, intensive, and job-embedded professional learning based on identified student and teacher needs.
Relevant Associations:

SLO 4: Objective 4 (M: 2, 3)
A teacher leader completing our program model best practices in pedagogy and serve as a mentor and coach for other educators

SLO 5: Objective 5 (M: 2, 3)
A teacher leader completing our program will work with others to design and implement assessment practices and analyze data for monitoring and improving teaching and learning through data-informed decision making.

SLO 6: Objective 6 (M: 5)
A teacher leader completing our program will access and conduct research, and apply research findings to improve teaching and learning

SLO 7: Objective 7 (M: 4, 5)
A teacher leader completing our program will demonstrate the ability to collaborate with stakeholders to improve student learning and to guide positive change.

Other Outcomes/Objectives
O/O 2: Objective 2 (M: 4, 5)
A teacher leader completing our program will work with stakeholders to promote the development of a school culture that fosters excellence and equity in teaching and learning and focuses on continuous improvement creating a sense of belonging and building a collaborative work environment

O/O 3: Objective 3 (M: 1)
A teacher leader completing our program demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of curriculum and apply this knowledge to the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to standards.
Relevant Associations:

Measures, Targets, and Findings
M 1: Content-Based Professional Development Curriculum Module (O: 1, 3)
M 2: Planning: Teacher Leader Work Sample (O: 1, 4, 5)

Strategies are varied over time to account for the student teachers’ learning styles and demonstrate knowledge of how mentoring is created and developed for assessment and evaluation. Outcomes are clearly stated in behavioral forms.

Standard 4 and 5 provide evidence to evaluate the teaching and learning of your student teacher. You will provide written feedback on your student teacher’s final TWS project. You should focus on identifying multiple sources of assessment plan alignment with learning goals and provide students with constructive feedback on their learning.

The Teacher Leader Work Sample (TLWS) assignment is part of EDCI 7680. EDCI 7680 is a field-based course where the M.Ed. students (teacher leaders) host a preservice student teacher from GSU for their student teaching experience. The TLWS from EDCI 7680 is designed to parallel an Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assignment given to preservice teachers to complete during their student teaching experience in their teacher leader’s classroom. The purpose of this TWS project is to provide opportunities for student teachers to show how they use information about the learning-teaching context and students’ individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. The teacher leader’s TLWS assignment happens at the same time and engages teacher leaders in planning, enacting, and reflecting upon their role as a mentor who is supporting their student teachers’ work on the TWS. Copy of the assignment as given to students: Teacher Leader Work Sample (Total project = 25%). Your student teacher will be completing a Teacher Work Sample this semester. The purpose of this project is to provide opportunities for student teachers to show how they use information about the learning-teaching context and students’ individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.

Areas covered will be knowledge of community, school, and classroom factors, knowledge of characteristics of students, knowledge of students’ varied approaches to learning, knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, and implications for instructional planning. At the same time, you will be completing a Teacher Leader Work Sample as you plan, enact, and reflect upon your role as a mentor who is supporting your student teachers’ work on their work sample. As your student teacher works on their teacher work sample assignment, you will be guiding them through the process while creating your own teacher leader work sample. The content of the Teacher Leader Work Sample will include: You will list the learning goals (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery, and assessment of your mentoring/coaching plan. These goals should reflect the goals you expect your student teacher to know and be able to do at the end of your work together. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline) challenging, varied, and appropriate. Assessment/Evaluation plan: You will design an assessment plan to monitor your student teacher’s progress toward your learning goal(s). You should describe why your assessments are appropriate for monitoring learning. Describe for your student teacher what you will do and how you will provide feedback. Describe for your student teacher how you will provide feedback on what you observe. You will provide written feedback on your student teacher’s final TWS project. You should focus on identifying multiple sources of evidence to evaluate the teaching and learning of your student teacher. 

Teacher Leader Standards: 1.01, 1.05, 1.07, 1.10, all of standard 4 and 5 and Teacher Leader Work Sample: Planning Rubric Teacher Leader Work Sample: Planning Rubric Unacceptable (1 pt) Developing (2 pts) Acceptable (3 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Exemplary (5 pts) Clarity of Learning Goals (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.1 GA-GSU-COE-CF.3.1 Goals are vague or not in evidence. Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes Goals are clearly stated in behavioral forms Assessment plan alignment with learning goals (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.3 Minimal plans for assessment and evaluation Methods of assessment and evaluation lack congruence with learning goals or lack complexity Some learning goals are assessed through assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals Each of the learning goals is addressed through learning goals are assessed by the assessment plan All learning goals are assessed by the assessment plan All learning goals are assessed by the assessment plan The mentoring plan does not demonstrate knowledge of how mentoring is created and developed The activities and meetings are not logically organized The activities and meetings have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful Most activities and meetings appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving learning goals All activities and meetings are useful and relevant to student teachers’ learning and reflection Use of a variety of activities, assignments, etc. (1, 25%) GA-GSU-COE-CF.1.3 Only one method of mentoring is used Little variety of mentoring is used. Heavy reliance on one type of activity, reflection, and/or method of feedback Some variety of mentoring is used Significant variety of mentoring is used and this variety makes a clear contribution to learning Mentoring strategies are varied over time to account for the student teachers’ learning style.
Reflection Journal

How this assignment is used in the program

This assignment is used during the residency experience in EPEL

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**EPEY 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

**Practicum (EPEL 7680A and 7680B) Requirements**
Because of changes to programs in the educational leadership unit, the requirements and assignments for EPEL 7680A and EPEL 7680B were modified to better support the roles required of school leaders and teacher leaders. EPEL 7680A now focuses on preparing students better understand data. EPEL 7680B now focuses on action research and specifically, research designed to give educators a stronger understanding of their own cultural proficiency.

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

---

**Georgia State University**

**Assessment Data by Section**

**2011-2012 Women’s Studies Assessment of Core**

*As of: 12/12/2016 04:42 PM EST*

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

Women's Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women's Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

**Goals**

**G 1: 1) Develop Critical Thinking Skills**
Students should develop critical thinking skills, which include the ability to read and write clearly and carefully, and they should be able to evaluate and analyze claims presented in various textual sources.

**G 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
For this year, we found that 100% of students scored at least a 3, suggesting they come in with competent reading skills. In terms of scoring a 4 or 5, we found that students went from 84% to 100%, suggesting that the papers from the end of the semester demonstrating more "excellence" in reading skills than the ones earlier in the semester, suggesting clear student improvement and meeting our 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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

On the first set of papers, we found that 84% received at least a 3, and 16% received a 4 or 5. For the second batch, we found that all students scored a 4 or 5, suggesting substantial improvement during the semester. Although we did not technically meet our target for the first set of papers, we more than made up for it in the second, suggesting high teaching effectiveness.

**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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For the earlier papers, we found 100% of students received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5 in terms of organization and development. In terms of basic clarity of writing, we found that 100% received at least a 3, and 84% received a 4 or 5. For the later papers, we found that 100% received a 4 or 5 on both aspects of this rubric, suggesting that, in terms of low-stakes writing assignments, the students are definitely improving throughout the semester.

**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. We have now included a revision component in this assignment. Therefore, our target is that students should both show improvement, and meet our target by the revised paper. We have also switched the scale for clarity, so that 5 is high and 1 is low; so we hope 3/4 of our students score a 3, and 1/2 score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

For thesis development, we found that on the first draft, 80% of students scored at least a 3, and 40% scored a 4 or 5. For the revised paper, we found that 85% scored at least a 3, and 50% scored a 4 or 5, suggesting some degree of improvement and that we (barely) met our target.

**Target for O3: Writing skills**

In terms of the first rubric measuring organization, evidence, and development, we found that on the original papers, 85% scored at least a 3, and 25% scored a 4/5. On the revised papers, 90% scored a 3, and 65% scored a 4/5, suggesting substantial improvement, particularly in terms of students demonstrating skills that are above basic competence. In terms of the second rubric measuring writing skills on the sentence level (basic clarity), we found that, on the drafts, 75% of students scored a 3, and 30% scored a 4/5. On the revised papers, 100% scored at least a 3, and 80% scored a 4/5, suggesting once again that revision contributed to substantial improvement, particularly in achieving excellence. Since these numbers echo each other, it seems useful to continue to keep this rubrics together.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In terms of both aspects of this rubric: one involves evidence, development, and organization, and the second involves writing on the level of the sentence, including syntax, grammar, and punctuation.

**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. We have now included a revision component in this assignment. Therefore, our target is that students should both show improvement, and meet our target by the revised paper. We have also switched the scale for clarity, so that 5 is high and 1 is low; so we hope 3/4 of our students score a 3, and 1/2 score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

On this aspect of the rubric, we found that, on the original papers, 85% scored at least a 3, and 25% scored a 4/5. On the revised paper, we found that 85% scored at least a 3, but only 30% scored a 4/5, suggesting that revision is much less effective in terms of contributing to students’ ability to demonstrate their knowledge of feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives. Not only was there very little difference, but students also seem to be showing that they have basic competence but are not as likely to be excelling in this aspect.

**M 3: Final Exams (O: 3, 4)**
For this assessment session, we used a final essay exam, in which students responded to one of two essay questions in a clear and coherent fashion. We thought that this style of exam would more accurately assess the learning outcomes that we have in women’s studies, and the results might contribute to our overall assessment more coherently.

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. We have also switched the scale for clarity, so that 5 is high and 1 is low; so we hope 3/4 of our students score a 3, and 1/2 score a 4 or 5. For this measure, we also used two separate rubrics: one measured the development of the argument, and the other measured the clarity of the writing, so that one looked at writing skills from a macro perspective, whereas the other focused on sentence-level skills.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

For the rubric that measures argument development, we found that 86% received at least a 3, and 72% received a 4 or 5, so that met our target in terms of overall argument. In terms of writing skills, we found that 86% received at least a 3, and 43% received a 4 or 5, suggesting that although we came close, we did not quite meet our target in terms of the clarity of sentence structure.

**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. We have also switched the scale for clarity, so that 5 is high and 1 is low; so we hope 3/4 of our students score a 3, and 1/2 score a 4 or 5.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In terms of students demonstrating their knowledge of feminist/womanist perspectives, we found that 86% received a 4/5, suggesting that we met our target, and almost all our students did quite well in terms of this particular aspect on this measure.

**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.

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) Your paper should be approximately 4-6 pp. long, typed, double-spaced, 12 point font. You do not need a title page (although you do need a title) – simply put your name and course title 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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In terms of this rubric, we found that 100% received at least a 3, and 70% received a 4/5, suggesting that we have exceeded our expectations, and that our focus on thesis development has been proving effective!

**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. In terms of this particular aspect, we measure it using two rubrics: one measures evidence, organization, and development, and the other focuses on basic writing clarity.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In terms of organization/evidence/development, we found that 93% received at least a 3, and 64% received a 4/5. In terms of sentence level writing skills, such as basic clarity, we found that 100% received at least a 3, and 79% received a 4/5, showing that we also met our target quite handily here as well.

**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.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

In terms of this rubric, we found that 93% of students scored at least a 3, and 85% scored a 4/5, so that we have exceeded our target here.
### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add additional rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After we have completed our collection of personal narrative papers, we will include an additional rubric: Students connect what they learn to lived experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collect additional measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We intend to collect personal narratives in addition to the analysis papers for our evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Julie Kubala, director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Develop materials to enhance writing instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 12/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rework targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Completion Date:</strong> 06/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong> Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased writing instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased writing instruction (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot program with WAC consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. We are also planning, in these two sections, to include a revision component with the aid of these consultants, which has proven successful in our CTW courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong> 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong> In-Progress</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?

The major effective change that we have made in the assessment process is to directly focus on comparing papers by the same student. We have done this in two ways: first, in terms of short low-stakes papers, we have collected a sample early paper and late paper from the same student in order to evaluate their progress, and in terms of analytic papers, we have collected both a draft and a finished paper in order to evaluate improvement. Both of these collected samples suggests that the revision process is being extremely effective in terms of increasing students’ critical thinking through writing skills. In particular, students ability to organize, develop and provide evidence for their papers increased substantially. They also performed better in terms of developing a thesis, and basic sentence structure skills. I would also like to note that we would be unable to include as much revision without the invaluable help of WAC trained graduate students in our introductory classes. These students are really able to help students in a one-on-one fashion, which seems to really be helping their writing skills. The other change that we have made to the assessment process is that we have collected a different sort of exam to assess. Instead of collecting exams that have students answer a variety of essay questions, we collected exams that focus on a 3 page answer to a single question, which allows us to assess thesis statements, organization and development of arguments much more clearly. We still need to focus on the connecting theory to lived experience rubric. We should add that in for next year as a specific rubric in the upcoming 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.

What we found through this year’s assessment primarily confirms what we have been working on in terms of the process; namely, that increasing revision is key to increasing student writing skills. We are therefore do not see the need for major changes in the upcoming year. In general, we would like to extend the success of the revision process; we have been focusing primarily on revision in terms of writing skills, but this year, we saw the need for improvement in terms of demonstrating appropriate feminist/womanist theoretical perspectives. Therefore, we will work to include more content-based revision in the process this year, since we had not been focusing on that aspect previously. We will also continue to work on developing clear writing skills in terms of student performance on examinations.
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**Mission / Purpose**

Women's Studies at Georgia State University contributes to the university's broader mission of encouraging critical thinking through a focus on feminist and womanist interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching, and community participation. Women's Studies began by recognizing how sex and gender inform academic disciplines and impact the politics of knowledge production. We therefore make explicit the ways in which gender and sexuality, in connection with other categories such as race, class, ability, and age, construct our understandings of the world. Furthermore, we analyze the ways public discourse relies on gender and sexuality to conceptualize such issues as war and militarism, policy, the environment, education, healthcare, economics, the media, and popular culture. In order to explore these issues, we emphasize the following: race, globalization, sexuality, and social change. We promote transformative thinking and activism toward ending oppression and working for freedom and justice.

**Goals**

**G 1: New and innovative ideas**

To develop innovative approaches to relevant issues and debates within the field.

**G 2: Critical Thinking through Writing**

To be able to display critical thinking through writing skills, such as organizing material clearly, developing ideas clearly and carefully, and providing sufficient evidence for claims.

**G 3: Demonstrate knowledge of field**

Demonstrate the knowledge of and ability to use appropriate interdisciplinary theoretical perspectives within the fields of feminist/womanist scholarship.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

**SLO 1: Research Questions (G: 1) (M: 3)**

Students should demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist/womanist scholarship.
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.

**Target for O5: Application of skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 1/2 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor). 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.

**Target for O6: Critical thinking through writing skills**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor). 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.

**M 2: Creative Project (O: 3, 4, 5)**
The basic idea is for you to further develop an idea from class that you want to in a creative fashion. Presenting the creative project is an important point of the project; be sure you can talk about why you chose what you did in a way that makes sense in terms of the class. 1) Be sure to consult with me about your individual topic! 2) You may use any variety of artistic or creative means to present the project; however, be sure you can communicate clearly their relevance to the class. 3) I am not qualified to grade you on artistic merit; therefore the grade will focus mainly on organization and contribution to the ideas of the class. 4) Be sure to include an analysis of the complexity of these ideas. It should be approximately 5-7 pages. 5) Be sure that your analysis is focused and coherent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target for O3: Organization**
We hope that all students will achieve at least a 3 on our rubric, and over 3/4 will receive a 2 or higher (the rubric runs from 1-5, with 1 as excellent and 5 as poor).

**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).

**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).

**M 3: Final Paper (O: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)**
Students shall write a final paper, on a topic that they will determine that is relevant to the class and approved by the professor, that utilizes the knowledge and applies the skills learned in the class in order to develop an innovative approach to a particular question in the interdisciplinary fields of feminist/womanist scholarship. Additionally, students will demonstrate their critical thinking through writing
skills in this assignment; these skills include thesis development, organization, support for claims, and clear, concise writing, following appropriate grammar and syntax. We are including in this measure not only final seminar papers, but senior research papers as well. The senior research papers have similar requirements, although the standards are higher since they involve a semester long project.

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
For this measure, we found that 94% received at least a 3, and 50% received a 4 or 5. Once again, while we have not met our target, we have come quite close to it, so we will continue to work on improving this particular aspect.

**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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
We had a very small sample for this particular measure, suggesting that we might not use it in the future. For this sample, 100% received a 4 or higher, meeting our target.

**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.

**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 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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
We had a very small sample for this particular measure, suggesting that we might not use it in the future. For this sample, 100% received a 4 or higher, meeting our target.
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 2011-2012 - Target: Met**
Again, with such a small sample size, it is hard to tell what it shows, but 100% scored a 4 or higher, meeting our target.

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 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**
For this measure, we found that 100% received at least a 3, but we did not have any that received a 4 or 5, so we met the basic competence aspect of this measure, but not the doing well in terms of clarity of writing.

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

**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
Collect final paper drafts
As a pilot program, we are going to collect drafts in an upper-level course in order to see if that helps students with the various aspects of assessment, especially those focused on writing.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** We are beginning this semester to collect rough drafts and compare them to final drafts.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 08/2013
- **Responsible Person/Group:** core faculty
- **Additional Resources:** more time

### 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?

Last year, we have been able to complete two of our assessment plans: gain 100% participation and systematize assessment. These two are related plans, since they both involve ensuring that all faculty cooperate with the collection of data. We are happy to report that this is becoming easier, as everyone has become more accustomed to collecting samples of work. We are also streamlining the assessment process. One of the recurrent problems we have had is that, while most faculty assign some sort of written assignment as the major assignment for the class, we have had to collect other sort of assignments, depending on the professor’s organization of the class. At first, we thought assessment would be stronger with a wider variety of assignments, but we have found that process to be counter-productive for a number of reasons. First of all, we don’t have enough examples of alternative assignments to contribute meaningfully to a discussion of our pedagogical strategies. Secondly, since so many of our learning outcomes involve critical thinking through writing, we still find the seminar paper to be the most consistent and reliable indicator of student learning. Therefore, we are no longer trying to increase the sorts of assignments we assess, because that seemed contrived. We are now almost wholly focusing on substantial analytical papers. We also, as an earlier action plan indicated, had decided to add an element to the rubric called “demonstrating skills.” Since the scores on that rubric were almost exactly the same as on the rubric that emphasizes demonstrating knowledge and ability to use feminist/womanist perspectives, we decided that it was not really contributing anything to the process to measure the same thing twice. Therefore, we have decided to cut that rubric from future assessment. We are still working on the action plans that involve early intervention in the writing process to increase critical thinking through writing skills. While one thing we are doing successfully is having students turn in proposals for their final papers, so that they can have feedback before writing their final papers for classes, we have also decided to increase this particular process. Therefore, we are developing a pilot program this semester through which students should turn in a complete rough draft of a seminar paper three weeks before the end of the semester. This change will hopefully enable students to both develop more carefully their papers earlier, and to allow them to receive clear feedback on a complete draft before finishing their paper. We hope that this change will increase students writing skills more directly than general writing instruction, as it will allow them to have individual feedback. We are worried, however, that this process will prove too work-intensive to be carried out throughout all the classes.

#### 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, as of yet, not decided to make any significant changes to the educational degree program. While there are still areas for improvement, we still feel like we are on the right path for addressing these issues, and so we do not need any significant changes. We have been considering more 3000 level courses, as students frequently jump from Introduction to Women’s Studies to upper-level courses, but we do not have the number of majors required to make that change, even though our credit hours have improved. I also think I mostly answered this question in the previous answer.
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**Mission / Purpose**

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.

**Goals**

**G 1: Interdisciplinarity**

WSI MA graduates will be interdisciplinary scholars; this means that they will be conversant in feminist epistemologies (i.e., they will understand and be able to articulate a critique of masculinist forms of knowledge, and to critique the power dynamics inherent to the production of knowledge). They will also be able to ask broad questions that transverse traditional disciplines.

**G 2: Knowledgable in the field of WGSS**

WSI MA graduates will be conversant in the field of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (i.e., they will understand, and be able
to synthesize, a range of feminist and/or womanist theories and frameworks.)

G 3: Successful scholars/practitioners
WSI MA graduates will be successful scholars and practitioners in fields and/or career placements relevant to the core concerns of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.

## Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

### SLO 1: Research Questions (M: 1)
Students will demonstrate their ability to formulate new research questions, providing innovative approaches to existing feminist and/or womanist research.

### SLO 2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing (M: 1, 2, 3)
Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills through innovative, well-organized arguments that are publication-ready. This means that students will structure their papers and thesis proposals in a clear and coherent fashion and that students will demonstrate proficiency in overall writing and grammar skills, including syntax, punctuation, and citation.

### SLO 3: Theoretical Frameworks (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.

### SLO 4: Feminist Epistemology (M: 2)
Students will be conversant in feminist epistemologies (i.e., they will understand and be able to articulate a critique of masculinist forms of knowledge, and to critique the power dynamics inherent to the production of knowledge).

### SLO 5: Placements (M: 4)
Students will get accepted to PhD programs (either in WGSS or a field related to their research) or they will achieve placement in a desired career path.

## Measures, Targets, and Findings

### M 1: Thesis (O: 1, 2, 3)
Students will complete a thesis project that demonstrates interdisciplinary thought as well as mastery of some of the key theoretical frameworks of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Theses are either research-based, action research projects (i.e., interning with a community organization and working to supplement and/or transform it positively), or creative writing projects. All require a section (literature review or documented essay) that explains the significance to the field of WGSS.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target for O1: Research Questions**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average of 4.4 on this measure, with the lowest score being 4 and the highest being 5.

**Target for O2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Met**

Our students received an average score of 3.8 on this measure, with most of them receiving a score of 3 and the rest a score of 5.

**Target for O3: Theoretical Frameworks**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Our students received an average score of 3.4 on this measure, with two of them falling below the target (at 2), one receiving a 3, and the rest at 5.

### M 2: Comprehensive exams (O: 2, 3, 4)

Students are required to take comprehensive exams after completing the four core academic courses in the MA program. The comprehensive exams consist of two questions; one measures their ability to synthesize major feminist theories and methodologies and the other measures their ability to apply feminist theories to globalization.

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

**Target for O2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing**

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

**Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met**

Our students received an average score of 3.75, with one falling significantly below target (1.33), three in the 3 range, four in
Target for O3: Theoretical Frameworks

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Our students received an average score of 3.7 on this measure, with one falling significantly below the target (1.67), four in the 3 range, two in the 4 range, and one receiving a 5.

Target for O4: Feminist Epistemology

Our target is for all of our students to receive at least a score of 3 (on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest).

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Partially Met

Our students received an average score of 3.65 on this measure, with one student falling significantly below target (1.33), four in the 3 range, two in the 4 range, and one receiving a 5.

M 3: Annual Evaluations/Student CVs (O: 2)

Students are required to turn in CVs for the annual evaluation process. From these data, we will collect information about how many conferences students are attending in order to present their own research, how many publications they have succeeded in getting accepted and/or published.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target for O2: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing

At least half of our students will attend one conference and at least 15% will have a publication accepted.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

Our students delivered ten total conference presentations in 2011-2012, and they participated in six total panels or brown bags (as presenters), which were not at conferences. For the overall student body (15), this averages to .75 conference papers per student and .40 panel or brown bag presentations per student. The actual number of students presenting at conferences was 5, which is a third of our student body. Our students had one article accepted for publication and one article published during the 2011-2012 year. In terms of percentages, that means that 7% of our students had an article accepted for publication and 7% of our students had an article published.

M 4: Exit Interviews (O: 5)

Student placement will be measured and evaluated based on their exit interviews, at which time they usually know what their future plans are.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target for O5: Placements

At least 80% of our MA graduates will go on to a PhD program or be placed in a job relevant to their professional goals.

Findings 2011-2012 - Target: Not Met

Two out of five graduating students last year went on to pursue PhDs in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. As far as we know, none of the rest have been placed in jobs relevant to their degree. Therefore, 40% of our students went on to pursue a PhD. However, one graduate was a participant in the “GSU at 62” program, so she did not have the goal of obtaining a PhD degree or gaining employment after graduation. Adjusting for this, 50% of our graduates last year went on to pursue PhD programs or otherwise directly use their MA degrees.

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: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing

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
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: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Overall Critical Thinking through Writing

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: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Feminist Epistemology
  | Theoretical Frameworks
  Measure: Thesis | 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: Comprehensive exams | Outcome/Objective: Feminist Epistemology
  | Theoretical Frameworks
  Measure: Thesis | Outcome/Objective: 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)

focus on proseminar
The exit interviews and annual evaluations (specifically the CVs) are designed to measure the main goal of fostering successful scholars and practitioners of Women's Studies. These skills (presenting at conferences, applying to PhD schools, publishing papers, etc.) are desired outcomes of the Women's Studies Proseminar, which we instituted a few years ago to accommodate a variety of needs among our students (including helping them move more quickly through the program). Therefore, when we don't meet these goals, it makes sense that we would re-evaluate the structure of the WS proseminar to see if it can adjust to fit the needs of the students. So far, the feedback from students in exit interviews is that the Proseminar is extremely helpful, and they don't suggest any changes in it. From the perspective of the faculty, we also think that it is achieving its main goals (progress toward graduation seems to have improved significantly). We will wait another cycle to see what the findings are next year, since these set of data have a significant number of students who did not take the Proseminar (about 1/3). If the target remains unmet next year, we will re-evaluate to see if we should adjust the expectation or if we should revise the Proseminar.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Evaluations/Student CVs</td>
<td>Overall Critical Thinking through Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interviews</td>
<td>Placements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>